

Human Trafficking by the Numbers:

The Initial Benchmark of Prevalence and Economic Impact for Texas

Final Report
December 2016



The University of Texas at Austin

Institute on Domestic Violence
& Sexual Assault

School of Social Work

Page was intentionally left blank

Human Trafficking by the Numbers:

The Initial Benchmark of Prevalence and Economic Impact for Texas

Final Report
December 2016

Noël Busch-Armendariz, PhD, LMSW, MPA
Nicole Levy Nale, MSW
Matt Kammer-Kerwick, PhD
Bruce Kellison, PhD
Melissa Irene Maldonado Torres, PhD
Laurie Cook Heffron, PhD
John Nehme, MPEc

Staff & Consultant Contributors:

Melody Huslage
Sandra Molinari
Amber McDonald
McKenna Talley
Alex Wang
Anna Wasim
Leila Wood, PhD

“Harriet Tubman did not wait around for a proper measurement of how many slaves were in the South. Neither should we. The work needs to be done while we try to measure it.”

-- Timothy McCarthy, Harvard Kennedy School
The Freedom Ecosystem, Monitor Deloitte/Deloitte Consulting LLP

This project was funded by the Texas Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division (Contract No. 2847101). The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the Texas Office of the Governor.

Permission to reproduce any portion of this report is granted on the condition that the authors are credited. When using these data use this citation:

Busch-Armendariz, N.B., Nale, N.L., Kammer-Kerwick, M., Kellison, B., Torres, M.I.M., Cook Heffron, L., Nehme, J. (2016). Human Trafficking by the Numbers: The Initial Benchmark of Prevalence and Economic Impact for Texas. Austin, TX: Institute on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault, The University of Texas at Austin.

Page was intentionally left blank

Acknowledgements

This project has been made possible through the commitment, vision, and efforts of many in Texas who are working in the anti-trafficking movement and fighting to end exploitation and trafficking of some of our most vulnerable populations.

Our sincere thanks goes to the many research participants who worked closely with us over the last two years, answering survey questions, participating in interviews and focus groups, and supporting us as we worked towards a greater understanding of the prevalence and economic impact of human trafficking in Texas. In particular, we are deeply grateful to the social service providers and advocates, law enforcement officers and victim specialists, prosecutors, legal service providers, educators, and the many others working to protect adults and children from exploitation and trafficking.

We would like to acknowledge the following individuals and agencies for their expertise and specific contributions through this research study.

We extend our sincere gratitude to the leadership at the Texas Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division and, in particular, the newly established Child Sex Trafficking Team. This team's expertise and commitment to children impacted by trafficking will continue to elevate our response as a state and continue our reputation of being a nationally recognized leader for protecting minor and youth victims of sex trafficking. We thank them for their continued vision to support and fund empirically-grounded research that increases the understanding of the prevalence and impact of this crime, research that we hope will influence our future response, legislation priorities, and ability to serve victims and survivors.

We would like to extend our sincere appreciation to our core partner on this research, Allies Against Slavery. John Nehme and his team contributed vision and field expertise to this research that deserves special recognition. We look forward to their continued impact in this field, and we thank them for all they do to promote innovation and elevate our expectations for the anti-trafficking field.

A big Texas thank you to the team at Polaris, CEO Bradley Myles and Data Analysis Director Jennifer Kimball. The innovative work of Polaris and the National Human Trafficking Hotline continues to illuminate the complexity of human trafficking and support the field through actionable insights. Their pioneering approach has helped the anti-trafficking movement improve data collection efforts and has shaped the entire solution ecosystem by grounding promising practices in evidence.

Numerous IDVSA staff and consultants deserve a special recognition for their contributions to this research. We are indebted to all of you for your service.

Dr. Leila Wood, IDVSA Director of Research, who provided support and guidance on the research methodology and social justice perspectives.

Amber McDonald, member of the Colorado Human Trafficking Council's Data and Research Task Force, for her guidance and expertise as a forensic social worker and consultant of this research. We are grateful for her commitment to youth affected by trauma and exploitation.

We are especially grateful for the contributions of all our graduate research assistants and research associates. GRAs McKenna Talley, Melody Huslage, Melissa Forrow, and Research Fellow Sandra Molinari contributed their thinking, time, and exemplary skills to this project; it is better for their input. Thanks also to Research Associates Alex Wang and Anna Wasim for their commitment to this issue and contribution to the development of this report.

A very special thanks to the many individuals and agencies that we met with as part of this research; we simply cannot name them all. We do want to acknowledge the work of agencies who have been committed to the research and the anti-trafficking field for many years: the Human Trafficking & Transnational Organized Crime Section of the Attorney General of Texas, U.S. Attorney's Office, Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center, Federal Bureau of Investigations and the Innocence Lost National Initiative, Homeland Security Investigations, Department of Public Safety, Department of Family and Protective Services, and the Texas Association Against Sexual Assault. Their contributions continue to advance and elevate Texas's human trafficking prevention, protection, and prosecution efforts.

Page was intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	13
<i>Prevalence Highlights.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Cost Highlights.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Background</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Methods.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Overall Findings.....</i>	<i>14</i>
Prevalence of minor and youth sex trafficking in Texas.	14
Prevalence of labor trafficking in Texas.	15
Economic impact of human trafficking in Texas.....	16
Introduction.....	18
Research Methodology	20
Background and Theory	21
<i>U.S. Federal Human Trafficking Policy.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>U.S. Federal and Texas State Labor Policy.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Building on Lessons About Vulnerabilities Seen in DMST.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Victim Typologies.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Estimation of risk.....</i>	<i>27</i>
Research Activities	28
<i>Secondary research.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS).</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>National Human Trafficking Hotline Data (Hotline).</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Primary research</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Agency Survey.</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Victimization Rates.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Agency Survey: Collaboration with New Orleans Trafficking Task Force.</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Follow-up in-depth interviews.....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Focus groups, including worksheets filled out prior to the group.</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>DMST working group.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Pilot study on labor trafficking: Houston.</i>	<i>47</i>
Prevalence of Human Trafficking in Texas.....	51
<i>Minor and youth sex trafficking.</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>How large are these community segments?.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>How many are at risk?.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Labor trafficking.</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>How large are these labor segments?.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>How many workers are at risk?.....</i>	<i>56</i>
Economic Impact of Human Trafficking in Texas	57
<i>Sex trafficking.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Labor trafficking</i>	<i>59</i>
Our Understanding of Human Trafficking in Texas	60
<i>Law enforcement response.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Prosecution response</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Under investigation: Labor trafficking</i>	<i>62</i>
Discussion.....	63

<i>Conclusions</i>	64
<i>Recommendations</i>	66
<i>Next Steps: Phase 2</i>	66
References	67
Appendix A: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)	77
Appendix B: Resources	80
Appendix C: Definitions detailed in Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000	82
Appendix D: DPS Offense Codes Related to Human Trafficking	84
Appendix E: Secondary Sources in Support of Victimization Rate	87
Appendix F: Gaps Analysis	89
Appendix G: Research on Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking	97
Appendix H: Research on Labor Trafficking	103
Appendix I: Hierarchy of Information Needs: Victims	105
Appendix J: IDVSA History	107
Appendix K: Human Trafficking and Transnational Organized Crime Section	110

Figures and Tables

Figure 1: Trafficking and exploitation summary	50
Table 1: Statewide Prevalence of Human Trafficking in Texas	14
Table 2: Economic Impact of Human Trafficking in Texas	14
Table 3: Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking in Texas.....	15
Table 4: Labor Trafficking in Texas	15
Table 5: Lifetime Costs of Care for Victims of Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking	16
Table 6: Annual Value of Labor Exploited from Trafficking Victims	17
Table 7: BJA Anti-Trafficking Task Force Funding for Texas, since 2005	30
Table 8: The National Human Trafficking Hotline Cases– Texas Data	31
Table 9: The National Human Trafficking Hotline Segments– Texas Data.....	32
Table 10: The National Human Trafficking Hotline by Region – Texas Data.....	32
Table 11: Agency Survey Summary	38
Table 12: Agency Survey – Services Provided.....	39
Table 13: Research to Support Sex Trafficking Victimization Rate	40
Table 14: Participants in Follow-Up Depth Interviews	42
Table 15: Clients Served by Type of Stakeholder – Focus Groups.....	43
Table 16: Common Gaps and Barriers Identified by Stakeholders – Focus Groups	44
Table 17: Labor Exploitation and Trafficking Criteria.....	48
Table 18: Trafficking Typology with Data Sources	52
Table 19: Examples of Community Segment Sizes in Texas (Annually) at High Risk for Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking	53
Table 20: Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking in Texas.....	54
Table 21: Example of Individual Segment Sizes in Texas at High Risk for Labor Trafficking ..	56
Table 22: Labor Trafficking in Texas.....	56
Table 23: Unit Costs	58
Table 24: Lifetime Cost of Care for Victims of Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking.....	59
Table 25: Annual Value of Labor Exploited from Trafficking Victims.....	60

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IMPACT IN TEXAS

APPROXIMATELY

79,000

MINORS AND YOUTH
ARE VICTIMS OF
SEX TRAFFICKING
IN TEXAS ★ ★

APPROXIMATELY

234,000

WORKERS ARE
VICTIMS OF
LABOR TRAFFICKING

THERE ARE CURRENTLY AN ESTIMATED **VICTIMS OF**
313,000 **HUMAN TRAFFICKING**
IN TEXAS ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

TRAFFICKERS
EXPLOIT
APPROXIMATELY

\$600 MILLION

FROM VICTIMS OF LABOR TRAFFICKING
★ ★ ★ ★ ★ IN TEXAS

MINOR AND YOUTH
SEX TRAFFICKING COSTS
THE STATE OF
TEXAS
APPROXIMATELY

\$6.6
BILLION

Executive Summary

Prevalence Highlights

Currently, there are approximately 79,000 minor and youth victims of sex trafficking in Texas.

Currently, there are approximately 234,000 workers who are victims of labor trafficking in Texas.

Currently, there are an estimated 313,000 victims of human trafficking in Texas.

Cost Highlights

Minor and youth sex trafficking costs the state of Texas approximately \$6.6 billion. Traffickers exploit approximately \$600 million from victims of labor trafficking in Texas.

Background

Though human trafficking is widespread in geographically large states with large urban centers like Texas, the true scope of this hidden crime is largely unconfirmed as data on human trafficking are difficult to ascertain. Existing data gathered in anti-trafficking efforts focus almost exclusively on identified victims, shedding light on only a fraction of the problem. The first phase of the Statewide Human Trafficking Mapping Project of Texas focused on providing empirically grounded data as a benchmark about the extent of human trafficking across the state. The following three primary research questions guided our data collection efforts, which included queries of existing databases, interviews, focus groups, and web-based surveys.

1. What is the prevalence of human trafficking in Texas?
2. What is the economic impact of human trafficking in Texas?
3. What is our understanding of human trafficking in Texas?

Methods

The findings in this report were derived using a multi-methods approach to quantify the prevalence and economic impact of human trafficking in Texas. Higher-than-average risk industry and community segments were chosen for sex and labor markets. We defined community segments as groups of people considered to be at higher-than-average risk of trafficking because of risk indicators found in trafficking cases (e.g. homelessness). More specifically, rather than attempting to establish prevalence of trafficking among the 27.4 million people living in Texas, for the purposes of demonstrating our methodology, establishing some benchmarks on human trafficking prevalence and economic impact estimates, and providing a concrete example of our planned activities moving forward, victimization rates were applied to a

select few community segments that are at higher-than-average risk of trafficking. The methodology has addressed the critical industry and community segments to accurately estimate prevalence while reducing overlap between the chosen segments.

Overall Findings

Table 1

Statewide Prevalence of Human Trafficking in Texas

Types of Human Trafficking	Estimated Number of Victims
Minor and youth sex trafficking	78,996
Labor trafficking	234,457
Total	313,453

Table 2

Economic Impact of Human Trafficking in Texas

Types of Economic Impact of Human Trafficking	Estimated Economic Impact (\$)
Net present value (NPV) of estimated lifetime cost of minor and youth sex trafficking victims	\$6,566,529,071
Estimated annual value of lost wages for labor trafficking victims	\$598,127,942

Prevalence of minor and youth sex trafficking in Texas.

For minor and youth sex trafficking, we selected groups that are believed to be at higher-than-average risk of sex trafficking, including children in the foster care system, those who have experienced abuse, and the homeless. Furthermore, for at-risk youth being served by the Department of Family and Protective Services, we focused on the population currently receiving services due to being identified as at-risk select sub-segments of minors and youth who are at highest risk of exploitation.

Table 3

Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking in Texas

High-Risk Sex Trafficking Community Segments*	Community Size Segment	Victimization Rate	Estimated Victims
Child abuse/maltreatment	290,471	25%	72,618
At-risk youth being served by DFPS	24,097	25%	6,024
Homeless	1,416	25%	354

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

Prevalence of labor trafficking in Texas.

For labor trafficking, we conservatively estimate the number of workers at higher-than-average risk of trafficking victimization within select industries: agriculture, domestic services, construction, restaurant and food service industries, and landscaping/grounds keeping. Furthermore, for greater clarity, within these industries we focus on select sub-segments of workers who are at the highest risk of exploitation.

Table 4

Labor Trafficking in Texas

High-Risk Labor Trafficking Segments*	Community Size Segment	Victimization Rate	Estimated Victims
Migrant farmworkers	132,034	28%	36,970
Cleaning services	233,610	36%	84,100
Construction	101,250	35%	35,438
Kitchen workers in restaurants	190,390	32%	60,925
Landscaping and grounds keeping workers	63,050	27%	17,024

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

As this research continues, we will expand this list to include other industries and labor segments at high risk of labor trafficking victimization that emerge from our primary data collection efforts in Houston and elsewhere.

Economic impact of human trafficking in Texas.

For the purposes of this benchmark research, we have focused on two main aspects of human trafficking's economic impact: 1) Measuring the value of the economic output, including the value of the labor produced by human trafficking activity; and 2) Quantifying the costs to provide care to victims and survivors of human trafficking, including costs related to law enforcement, prosecution, and social services.

For victims of sex trafficking, we estimate lifetime social service costs that both society and trafficking victims can expect to incur, such as mental and physical health costs, strains to the public health system, and law enforcement expenses.

Table 5

Lifetime Cost of Care for Victims of Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking

High-Risk Sex Trafficking Community Segments*	Estimated Victims	NPV of Cost of Care Required as Consequence of HT (Lifetime)	Estimated Lifetime Cost
Child abuse/maltreatment	72,618	\$83,125	\$6,036,358,905
At-risk youth being served by DFPS	6,024	\$83,125	\$500,743,976
Homeless	354	\$83,125	\$29,426,190
Total			\$6,566,529,071

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

We offer the following estimates for the annual value of labor expended by trafficking victims in the five vulnerable industries presented previously.

Table 6

Annual Value of Labor Exploited from Trafficking Victims

High-Risk Labor Trafficking Segments*	Estimated Victims	Estimated Annual Value Wages Lost
Migrant farmworkers	36,970	\$94,314,906
Cleaning services	84,100	\$214,549,192
Construction	35,438	\$90,406,591
Kitchen workers in restaurants	60,925	\$155,426,986
Landscaping and grounds keeping workers	17,024	\$43,430,267
Total		\$598,127,942

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

This report presents what we learned during the first phase of this research, some preliminary findings from our research activities, and a description of future research activities, which will focus on the accrual of additional primary and secondary data to expand our understanding of the prevalence and economic impact of trafficking in Texas. We will also continue to build upon past research about the needs of victims and survivors and our understanding of traffickers. With this continued research, in the future we expect these emerging data to be more exhaustive, especially since this research is running parallel to a time when both governmental and non-governmental agencies are improving data collection efforts, increasing and improving screening of potential victims, and working to share that information in the name of more effective, comprehensive solutions.

Introduction

The United States Department of State considers human trafficking a form of modern-day slavery and broadly defines it as when a person is deceived or coerced in situations of prostitution, forced labor, or domestic servitude. An accurate scope of human trafficking is unknown, although it has been hypothesized that states larger in geography and populous are higher in prevalence and rates. The study of human trafficking is challenging for a variety of reasons that are well documented (Small, Adams, Owens, & Roland, 2008; Barrick, Lattimore, Pitts, & Zhang, 2014; Clawson, 2006; Dank, 2014; Farrell, 2009; Busch-Armendariz, Nsonwu, and Cook Heffron, et al., 2009; Muslim, Labriola, & Rempel, 2008; Owens et al., 2014; Smith, 2010; S. X. Zhang, Spiller, Finch, & Qin, 2014; S. X. Zhang, 2012; Newton, Mulcahy, and Martin, 2008, just to list a few). Fundamental to this challenge is the hidden nature of the crime and the need for a deeper understanding of it beyond what is visible. Data on human trafficking is difficult to ascertain and the widely held belief among stakeholders involved in anti-trafficking efforts is that existing information focuses almost exclusively on identified victims, shedding light on only a fraction of the problem.

The purpose of this study is to provide empirically grounded data about the extent of human trafficking across the state. The study's impetus is grounded in the scarcity of empirical studies of trafficking, compounded by a "hidden population" that is historically difficult to reach.

The general approach has been to:

- Assess and use available data (the tip of the iceberg);
- Network and collaborate with and collect data from the people doing this work;
- Develop a methodology for converting data into insights and wisdom; and
- Engage with and collect data from high-risk segments and locations across the state.

Funded by a \$500,000 grant from the Texas Office of the Governor Criminal Justice Division, this two-year initiative is a collaborative effort by:

- Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (IDVSA) at The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work
- Bureau of Business Research at The University of Texas at Austin
- Allies Against Slavery

This report is organized in a way that explains our learning to date about the prevalence of human trafficking, its financial impact on the economy, and how we understand trafficking in Texas. An explanation of our research activities will illuminate how we arrived at our preliminary findings. We then offer some insight about where we think we are headed—most specifically the way forward during phase 2—and what we need to be able to offer as better solutions to a complex crime.

In its 2014 report to the Texas legislature, the Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force cited the limitations of human trafficking statistics and the need for improving data collection efforts. It stated:

“Collecting accurate data on human trafficking is difficult, yet becoming increasingly more important. This challenge makes the scope of trafficking across the state difficult to fully understand, which also affects the provision of resources.”

This study looks broadly at human trafficking to include adults and children, labor and sex trafficking, and domestic and international victims. It expands our perspective from criminal cases and community outreach to a risk assessment of industry and community segments in Texas. The approach taken starts with and goes beyond what we can easily see when looking at reports of criminal cases and national hotline calls. However, phase 1 of this study has struggled under the limitations of both extant data and research. Those resources have allowed us to produce initial benchmarks for both sex and labor trafficking, while providing a much deeper set of insights for sex trafficking.

Summarized below is case data as well as hotline calls recorded for the State of Texas. As will be discussed later, most of these pertain to sex trafficking.

Criminal Cases

The following is 2014 data from the Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force Report, human trafficking reporting system cases from January 1, 2007, to August 31, 2014:

- 737 human trafficking-related incidents
- 628 reported victims
- 320 reported child victims
- 210 suspects arrested
- 85 suspects convicted

Hotline Calls

The following is 2015 data from the National Human Trafficking Hotline for Texas.

- 1,876 calls in 2015 from Texas alone
- 452 human trafficking cases

The following is data for victims and survivors identified from the same dataset.

- 393 (with high indications of victimization)
- 448 (moderate)
- 246 calls from victims themselves

The risk assessment approach taken in this study expands our perspective beyond cases and community outreach by producing an assessment of expected levels of trafficking. This expectation is conditioned on the risk of trafficking in an industry or community segment coupled with an assessment of the risk of victimization for an individual who is a member of that segment. This expectation approach can then be applied in parallel to various victim typologies, including victims in both licit labor sectors and illicit sectors like prostitution.

Research Methodology

This research study employs a mixed design that uses both qualitative and quantitative methods. Primary and secondary data collection efforts, including but not limited to queries of existing databases, interviews, focus groups, and web-based surveys contribute to the understanding of our three primary research questions:

1. What is the prevalence of human trafficking in Texas? Primary and secondary data collected by the research team will contribute to our understanding of the scope of the crime and increase our understanding of the extent of trafficking across the state.
2. What is the economic impact of human trafficking in Texas? According to the International Labor Organization, human trafficking is a \$150 billion annual criminal industry worldwide. Texas has a large and diverse economy and the economic impact analysis will benchmark our understanding of the tangible and human costs of the crime to our economy, its victims, and the systems that must respond.
3. What is our understanding of human trafficking in Texas? Human trafficking is a complex crime that involves a broad spectrum of the community, from survivors and advocates to social service agency professionals. As the experiences of the many stakeholders develop, we gain perspective on a new and different angle of the crime of human trafficking. Furthermore, elements of the crime are fluid and dynamic, resulting in continuous reconfiguration of the issue and its factors. This research attempts to gain better images of what human trafficking looks like and how it functions, while considering the varying experiences and perspectives of its many stakeholders.

Background and Theory

U.S. Federal Human Trafficking Policy

Human Trafficking is a broad umbrella term that encompasses trafficking of persons of any age, nationally or internationally, for sex or labor purposes. Empirical research on the issue dates back to 1928; however, human trafficking did not become salient in US politics until the late 1990's (Atkins, Moran, & Hanser, 2013). Attention toward human trafficking came as a response to criticism from Janie Chuang, Harvard Law School graduate and United Nations advisor, on the 1949 United Nations *Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others* (1998). Chuang (1998) highlighted the importance of international trafficking law, but emphasized that without social and political support at the domestic level, international law would be meaningless. Also in 1998, Congresswomen Linda Smith established a faith-based, international organization in Vancouver, Washington committed to combatting child sex trafficking abroad (Shared Hope International, 2016). In 1999, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA, 2000) was proposed by Republican Representative Christopher Smith, and it was adopted as federal law in 2000.

The enactment of the TVPA paralleled the United Nation's adoption of the *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children*, which served as an international agreement made between 80 countries to address human trafficking. Similarly, the TVPA's initial efforts were geared towards international persons, and both policies became the driving force behind international efforts to combat human trafficking (Atkins, Moran, & Hanser, 2013). Specifically, the TVPA was enacted to address issues of human trafficking among immigrant women and children abroad. Subsequent revisions and reauthorizations of the TVPA continued to focus on international persons as President George W. Bush successfully framed human trafficking as a terrorist threat after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States (Weitzer, 2011).

In the case of minors involved in commercial sex, the TVPA removed the words "force, fraud, or coercion" from the statutory definition of human trafficking. As previously mentioned, the initial intent of the removal of the language was not geared towards domestic persons, but was broad enough to be applied to youth in the US. Additionally, the TVPA established a three-pronged approach to trafficking: prevention, protection, and prosecution, with prosecution being the predominant focus of implementation efforts (Shamir, 2012).

The TVPA has been revised and renewed five times (2003, 2005, 2008, 2013, and 2015) since its enactment, and in 2008, minor victim service provisions were added for US citizens and permanent residents. In 2015, the first provisions, which specifically address services for domestic youth programming related to commercial sex, were added to the TVPA. Definitions detailed in the federal statute can be found in Appendix C.

U.S. Federal and Texas State Labor Policy

For labor trafficking, one of the biggest vulnerabilities faced by immigrant labor is being undocumented without legal permission to work. Because this permission is lacking, immigrant laborers are at risk of exploitation by those who believe that lacking legal immigration status means that the immigrant laborer is a criminal unable to report any abuse or exploitation at the risk of deportation. Many immigrant laborers themselves are unaware of the law or their rights, and believe that they should stay silent and hidden rather than risk any consequences. However, being an undocumented presence in the US is not a criminal offense, and all workers (with minor exceptions), are covered by the same basic labor rights in the US regardless of immigration status. Under federal law, the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) apply to any employee and do not distinguish between U.S. citizens and undocumented laborers. Therefore, any worker laboring in the US has the right to 1) minimum wage, 2) maximum 40 hours a week and overtime, 3) the ability to organize and negotiate with employers, and 4) freedom from unfair labor practices (including discrimination or retaliation for an employee filing charges against them).

Furthermore, if an undocumented worker files charges or sues their employer for unfair labor practices and the employer tries to use the worker's undocumented status to nullify the contention, undocumented workers may not have immigration proceedings brought against them. The Department of Labor and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement will not interfere with one another when an undocumented laborer is involved in a labor dispute. The federal policy on human trafficking, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, also includes undocumented laborers in protecting and offering legal recourse for exploitation and labor trafficking. In addition, several state laws in Texas include undocumented laborers in their labor rights policies. Under the Texas Payday Law, private employers must follow Texas Labor Code standards in paying their employees, including undocumented workers.

Building on Lessons About Vulnerabilities Seen in DMST

Existing research on domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST) provides a valuable frame of reference for our efforts in characterizing a more comprehensive view of trafficking victimization. While further research is also needed for DMST and should occur as part of a broader typology of victims, the next paragraphs review DMST as a portion of that broader typology. The following section then expands that discussion toward the goal of developing a more complete typology that encompasses the vulnerabilities and risks faced by different types of trafficking victims.

DMST is a narrow subset of human trafficking, and involves individuals under the age of 18 years who are citizens or lawful residents of the US and are involved in commercial sex (Gibbs,

Hardison Walters, Lutnick, Miller & Kluckman, 2015). Under the TVPA, individuals under the age of 18 years involved in commercial sex of any kind or for any reason are identified and labeled as victims of a crime (P.L. 106-386). In addition, under the TVPA any adult who aids or benefits from a relationship with an underage person involved in commercial sex is labeled as a human trafficker (Marcus, Horning, Curtis, Sanson, & Thompson, 2014).

DMST is a relatively new term and recognized phenomenon within the US. The term has received criticism because of its application of overarching labels that ignore the many structural factors and inequalities that precede youths' involvement in the sex industry (Lutnick, 2016). Empirical attempts to quantify the number of young people involved in DMST has been generally unsuccessful and has been criticized as being inflammatory (Gibbs et al., 2015), specifically for not using rigorous statistical methods to identify the numbers given (Stranskey & Finkelhor, 2008). Overall, prevalence is difficult to extrapolate due to the varying reasons youth become involved in commercial sex (e.g. survival sex, romantic relationships, etc.), (Anderson, Coyle, Johnson, & Denner, 2014; Cecchet & Thornburn, 2014; Kennedy, Klein, Bristowe, Cooper, & Yuille, 2007; Marcus, Horning, Curtis, Sanson, & Thompson, 2014; Mones, 2011; Reid, 2012), and the clandestine nature of the behavior.

Even more scarce is the empirical literature available related to causes and consequences of child victims of sex trafficking. The literature available is predominantly descriptive in nature and the information reported is largely influenced by the sample recruitment methods (recruitment to the study from treatment programs after an arrest/social service intervention). Scholars have started to explore the phenomenon of individuals' involvement in commercial sex through the use of qualitative methods; however, participants in these studies are adults who engaged in commercial sex as children/youth, thus placing a large emphasis on retrospective memories of participants. Notably, there are a few quantitative studies that highlight the use of commercial sex among homeless/street youth (under TVPA definition is considered DMST) as survival mechanisms. However, the central focus of these empirical studies is on homeless/street youth in general, and not their involvement in commercial sex in particular. Therefore, these quantitative studies do not provide any additional information pertaining to DMST behavior except that it exists (Green, Ennett, & Ringwalt, 1999; Ferguson, et al., 2011; Halcon & Lifson, 2004).

The following is a comprehensive review of the literature regarding DMST available to-date. Each section concludes with a brief critique of the literature and areas for future research.

Risk factors.

There is no argument that there are clear health risks associated with involvement in commercial sex at any age (e.g., sexual transmitted infection). However, those who are deceived into commercial sex or who enter prior to maturity exhibit poorer health outcomes than those who

enter at an older age (Muftic & Finn, 2013). Adult survivors of child sex trafficking report that there is a continuous threat to life while engaged in commercial sex and that severe mental health problems such as depression, anxiety, flash-backs, avoidance, and the experience of numbness and detachment from feelings and interactions with others exists (Cecchet & Thornburn, 2014; Hossain, Zimmerman, Abas, Light, & Watts, 2010). Additionally, 70-90% of those involved in commercial sex report that they have a childhood sexual abuse history (Bagley & Young, 1987).

Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is the most common primary mental health diagnosis of youth exiting sex trafficking; this is followed by depression (Twill, Green, & Traylor, 2010). On average, youth receiving treatment after engaging in sex trafficking are managing two primary mental health diagnoses (Twill, et al., 2010). Adult women *actively* involved in prostitution report PTSD as well, but at much lower rates than those who are involved in trafficking or those who have exited sex work entirely. Similarly, a study that interviewed youth who were actively engaged in commercial sex found that study participants described their work experience as positive (Holger-Ambrose, Lengmade, Edinburgh, & Saewyc, 2013).

When we look to validate the general risks associated with commercial sexual involvement of people, these are compelling findings. This literature also promotes the idea that there is a possible difference between individuals who are involved in trafficking versus those who are involved in commercial sex. This is a conundrum to be explored considering all youth who are involved in commercial sex are deemed trafficking victims. Additionally, methodological limitations and the lack of theoretical application in commercial sex literature involving youth prevent this information from providing a comprehensive picture of the risks and experiences of youth.

Pathways.

The varying ways or reasons youth get involved in commercial sex contributes to the contention in the literature. There is a large disagreement in the literature about the level of agency of youth and the appropriate use of terms “trafficker/pimp,” and “victim” when referring to youth who are involved in commercial sex (see Kennedy, et al., 2007 vs. Marcus, et al., 2014). Potential avenues for entering commercial sex for youth have been described as follows: the youth is kidnapped or manipulated by an unrelated adult into engaging in exchanging sex for money (Reid, 2012; Mones, 2011), engaging in survival sex in order to get money for food, drugs, shelter, or other goods (Kennedy, et al., 2007); youth commit sex acts as an extension of the sexual abuse and/or general abusive relationships that already exist within their own families (Anderson et al., 2014; Cecchet & Thornburn, 2014; Marcus et al., 2014; Reid, 2012); youth participate in commercial sex as validation or an exploration of their sexual identity (Lutnick, 2016); youth believe commercial sex provides easy and quick money (Lutnick, 2016); or youth simply do not have any other viable job opportunities (Marcus et al., 2014). Regardless of a

youth's pathway into commercial sex, there *is* agreement among scholars that some level of vulnerability (e.g. child abuse/neglect, emotional insecurities, etc.) precedes a youth's entry into commercial sex, and that many youths rarely identify themselves as victims.

Relationship with traffickers.

When youth involved in commercial sex are contacted by law enforcement officials, they are either arrested or placed in a residential treatment facility (Greve, 2014). Almost immediately after placement, youth run and return to their "trafficker" or overtly refuse to participate in the proposed treatment (Anderson et al., 2014; Cecchet & Thornburn, 2014; Marcus et al., 2014; Reid, 2013; Mones, 2011). This behavior by a youth indicates a relationship with third parties, and is worth exploring. Mainstream media's narrative is that brutal violence and manipulation between youth and traffickers is what causes these youths to return. Frequency and duration of the use of violence by third parties/traffickers is highly contested in the literature; however, most agree that there is at least some form used. Some research suggests that there is a complex and sometimes mutually beneficial relationship between the child and those benefitting from their sexual labor; as a result, when the violence is too excessive youth voluntarily leave (Marcus et al., 2014). Others have suggested that physical violence is used later in the relationship as a form instilling fear in the youth to keep them from leaving the business entirely (Kennedy et al., 2007). All agree that when family members or those acting as legal guardians are in the role of third party/trafficker violence is most perilous and the hardest to escape (Anderson et al., 2014; Cecchet & Thornburn, 2014; Marcus et al., 2014; Reid, 2013; Mones, 2011).

The use of manipulation and control by third parties/traffickers is also minutely explored in the literature. Much of the literature paints a picture of a cis-gender female who is enticed into a committed and loving relationship with an adult cis-gender male who then convinces the youth to engage in commercial sex as a way of earning money because they are both in a desperate situation (Anderson et al., 2014; Reid, 2014). Others have said that these adults then prey on the vulnerabilities of these youth and their trauma histories (Cecchet & Thornburn, 2014) by using threats of ending the relationship to keep the females working in the sex trade (Raphael & Shapiro, 2010).

Conversely, the few studies that have spoken with youth directly found that youth are describing their experience in commercial sex as positive and without fear (Reid, 2013). Moreover, they are describing their relationship with the third party/trafficker as someone who cares for them like no one else ever has before (Marcus et al., 2014), and that only 10% of them were forced by another to trade sex the first time (Lutnick, 2016).

Conclusively, the state of DMST research is still exploratory in nature. The research available is starting to uncover the intricacies of youth involvement in commercial sex, but much more needs

to be done to understand the complexities of the phenomenon. Once there is a more in-depth and comprehensive understanding of the varying facets of youth involvement in commercial sex appropriate intervention and treatment options can be explored and tested.

Victim Typologies

Extant research has clearly shown that human traffickers target individuals who are perceived to be vulnerable in society, and understanding the conditions contributing to a person's vulnerability to being trafficked is central to preventing the crime from occurring (Cho, 2015; UNODC, 2008). We have used that research to begin the development of an empirically grounded, theoretically sound victim typology. This theory-grounded approach has been used effectively (Busch-Armendariz, Nsonwu, and Cook Heffron, 2014) to better understand the benefit to victims and service providers of ecological, strengths-based, and victim-centered approaches to service delivery. While this effort is ongoing in phase 2, progress on this typology informed our thinking and allowed us to establish priorities among the community segments included in our benchmark estimates.

Drawing from the field of criminology, opportunity theory focuses on the conditions precipitating the targeting of an individual or group for exploitation rather than focusing on the motivations of the offender (Felson & Clarke, 1998), making it a useful theoretical lens for examining the typologies of human trafficking victims. Applying this theoretical framework to "conditions of vulnerability" (UNODC, 2008) or characteristics and behaviors of populations that place them at increased risk of trafficking strengthens our methodology as it pertains to identifying the extent of human trafficking in Texas.

Opportunity theory synthesizes rational choice theory, routine activity theory, and situational crime theory to assess what factors contribute to a person's risk of victimization (Guerette & Santana, 2010). Rational choice theory controls for offender motivation, theorizing that offenders engage in crime as part of a logical decision-making process and participate in crime when the benefits of the crime outweigh the assessed risk (Clarke & Cornish, 1985). Routine activity theory posits that crime occurs when an offender has access to a suitable target and there is a lack of capable guardians to prevent an offense from occurring (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Victims may enter this scenario as a result of their daily activities, with certain populations at an increased risk depending on their individual characteristics and lifestyle choices (Meier & Miethe, 1993). Situational crime theory places these components in an "opportunity structure for crime" (Clarke, 1995, p. 103), or a dynamic environment where motivated offenders are continuously assessing their ability and method for victimization. These dynamic environments allow for the gradual engagement of victims and the collaboration between co-offenders, elements common to human trafficking situations. While this theory has been applied to understanding the

experiences of sex trafficking victims (Cockbain & Wortley, 2015; Lutya & Lanier, 2012), in extant research opportunity theory has yet to be extended to labor trafficking victims.

Human trafficking perpetrator typologies were developed in previous work by Busch-Armendariz, Nsonwu, and Cook Heffron (2009). These typologies laid the groundwork for conceptualizing the broad spectrum of human trafficking crimes and how they impact victims. The authors reviewed 67 prosecuted cases related to human trafficking and conducted six interviews with federal and state prosecutors and other national experts with experience working cases involving human trafficking crimes. Based on this analysis, four working perpetrator typologies were developed: 1) organized labor exploitation for profit, 2) family-based domestic servitude, 3) sex trafficking of U.S. citizens, and 4) sex trafficking of foreign-born victims. Each typology was discussed in terms of the demographics of traffickers and victims, the nature of the victimization, the methods of recruitment, the location, scope, and size of an operation; and methods of control and coercion. Additionally, across all typologies commonalities of cases were broadly reviewed based on the scope of operation, age, gender, socio-economic status, immigration status, and countries of origin.

Using this framework, we have begun to develop victim-oriented typologies to better illustrate the prevalence of human trafficking. Through conversations with human trafficking experts and an exhaustive review of the literature (such as Verité, 2015), a concept of a preferred typology has begun to emerge. Ideally, this typology would be hierarchically differentiated by non-overlapping segments concerning sex trafficking and labor trafficking, and domestic and foreign victims. At the top level, this hierarchy would resemble a tree with four branches: domestic sex trafficking victims, international sex trafficking victims, domestic labor trafficking victims, and international labor trafficking victims. Subsequent branches may differentiate between non-overlapping demographic factors such as age (e.g. minor trafficking victims), gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic background. Additionally, these branches may be further differentiated by overlapping segments such as industry, for labor (e.g. agriculture, Verité, 2005) and sex trafficking (e.g. massage parlors, bars) victims alike.

Although this model is not yet complete, understanding how these typologies are differentiated within this hierarchy will provide a more complete understanding of the unique vulnerabilities associated with different types of human trafficking, and will allow us to make a more accurate estimation of risk for each type of human trafficking.

Estimation of risk

The risk perspective produces an assessment of expected levels of trafficking as conditioned on risk of trafficking in an industry or community segment, and the risk of victimization given that an individual is a member of that segment. This expectation approach can then be applied in

parallel to various segmentation schemes, including victims in both licit and illicit labor sectors like prostitution.

To this end, we have identified industry and community segments that are at higher-than-average risk of human trafficking. We have applied victimization rates to a select few for the purposes of demonstrating our methodology, establishing some preliminary benchmarks for human trafficking prevalence estimates, and providing a concrete example of our planned activities moving forward in phase 2 of this project. Our estimation methodology thus far addresses industry and community segments that have minimal overlap to avoid double counting. We have applied this methodology to only a small number of segments as a proof of concept.

As such, the results in this report are preliminary benchmarks that remain a conservative understatement of the prevalence of human trafficking in Texas.

It is important to recognize that our approach was *not* to count cases or conduct a census of the 27.7 million people living in Texas to assess trafficking victimization rates. Not only would such an approach be unlikely to succeed due to the hidden nature of this crime, in our view, cases and victim counts represent only the observable portion of the population of trafficking victims. However, phase 2 of this project does include community-focused research activities designed to improve our ability to estimate victimization rates among at-risk community segments by incorporating more primary research activities among those segments.

Research Activities

To address our three primary research questions, our activities to date include:

- Extensive review of the relevant literature;
- Development of an approach tailored for this study that leverages available secondary sources of data for the state; and
- Identification of primary research to fill data gaps. For the purposes of illustrating our planned process, we also apply this approach to selective commercial activities as a proof of concept.

These research activities provide initial benchmarks on the prevalence, economic impact, and description of human trafficking in Texas.

To these ends, this project has included the following secondary research activities.

- Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS)
- National Human Trafficking Hotline (formerly known as National Human Trafficking Resource Center, Operated by Polaris)
- Statewide Governmental Agencies

This project has also included the following primary research activities.

- Agency survey
- Follow-up in depth interviews
- Focus groups, including worksheets filled out prior to the group
- DMST working group
- Pilot study on labor trafficking (Houston)
- Telephone interviews (in field)
- Combo survey (in field)
- Additional focus groups (planned)

Each of these is reviewed in the sections that follow. The summaries provided highlight key results germane to our research questions.

Secondary research

The research team explored the data contents of numerous databases and data sets at the national and state levels. Interviews with content experts contributed to our understanding of the variables available and how these variables might contribute to our understanding of the problem. While we cannot rely on information in these databases to tell the whole story, they are useful data points to increase understanding of the information currently collected about the crime.

Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS).

The Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS) is an online database developed by researchers at The Institute on Race and Justice at Northeastern University, and is managed by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) provides federal funding for Anti-Human Trafficking Task Forces and has provided funding to a total of 48 task forces since 2004. HTRS is an incident-based system utilized by BJA-funded task forces to report data on all investigations into suspected or confirmed trafficking (both sex and labor) in their jurisdictions. Agencies are also expected to update the status of incidents previously reported. Information collected includes incident status, type of human trafficking, lead investigating agency, number of known victims, and number of known offenders.

Since 2005, Texas has received close to \$6 million in BJA anti-trafficking task force funding (see Table 7). As of 2015, federal funding for all Texas anti-trafficking task forces has been retracted, and the limited information being entered into HTRS has become outdated and obsolete. The Texas Office of the Attorney General encourages local law enforcement to utilize HTRS; however, since there are no incentives, inadequate information is being entered. We know that the work of these task forces continues, but without the mandate to submit information to HTRS, we lose the input of data that would help us understand the extent of this crime.

Severely limited access to law enforcement data, either because of lack of authority to access or the fact that the information is not collected in a way that can be shared, exacerbates this issue.

*Table 7 BJA Anti-Trafficking Task Force Funding for Texas, since 2005
Organized by city/county*

El Paso	\$450,000
Ft. Worth	\$669,992
Bexar (San Antonio)	\$726,862
Austin	\$820,000
Arlington (Ft. Worth / Dallas)	\$1,450,000
Harris (Houston)	\$1,781,708

National Human Trafficking Hotline Data (Hotline).

We collaborated with Polaris Project, through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), to access the data specific to Texas in order to apply their risk ratio stratification more specifically to a broader range of industries. Polaris operates the National Human Trafficking Hotline to provide annual statistics on the number of signals (i.e. phone calls, online tip reports, and emails) about human trafficking in the US. Since December 2007, the Hotline has received over 115,000 signals. The Hotline uses this data to help human trafficking victims and survivors and to provide information to law enforcement and other professionals in the anti-trafficking field.

In Texas in 2015, 1,731 phone contacts were made to the Hotline and 433 potential human trafficking cases were reported. One in four calls came from victims and survivors. The vast majority of the 433 potential cases in Texas last year were sex trafficking (77.8%), although labor trafficking was not insignificant, making up 14.5% of cases. Seventy percent of phone contacts were to report a trafficking tip.

Professionals often cite Hotline statistics in the absence of more accurate case data to describe the scope of the problem in their area. What many do not realize is that signals to the Hotline are only one data point in the scope of trafficking, and many signals are not connected to actual cases. The Hotline includes the following disclaimer on all published data: “The data are not intended to represent the full scope of human trafficking, but to help identify trends.” Polaris recently reported that calls to the Hotline are on the rise, but as the Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force concluded in 2012, “increased education and awareness of trafficking is a more likely explanation for the increase in calls,” rather than that Texas’s trafficking problem is becoming more severe. Understanding more about these calls is important for the purposes of this research.

Fortunately, the Hotline database has evolved and is now a case-based system, “crucial to hotline operations as situations tend to develop over time and resolution is rarely reached on the first interaction with an individual” (Polaris).

The Hotline currently classifies victimization risk as high, moderate, and none. Cases coded as “high” contain a high level of human trafficking indicators. Cases coded as “moderate” contain several indicators of human trafficking, or fit a pattern of trafficking, but might lack core details of force, fraud, or coercion. Furthermore, the Hotline provides data on the numbers of victims for the high and moderate categories for Texas.

The National Human Trafficking Hotline data from 2013 – 2015 are shown in Table 8 below.

Table 8

The National Human Trafficking Hotline, Cases, Texas Data

	2015	2014	2013
Cases	433	452	431
High indicators	427	393	499
Moderate indicators	453	448	537
Total victims	880	841	1036

Taken in aggregate these data provide a strong indication of the community segments facing trafficking, as well as the strength of the indicators. Table 9 summarizes the segments seen in Hotline data for the State of Texas from 2013 – 2015, a total of 1,228 suspected cases.

Table 9

The National Human Trafficking Hotline, Segments, Texas Data

SEGMENT	TOTAL	HIGH	MODERATE
<i>Agriculture/farms/animal husbandry</i>	12.7%	4.3%	20.3%
<i>Arts and entertainment</i>	9.9%	14.6%	5.7%
<i>Bar/club/cantina</i>	6.9%	5.3%	8.4%
<i>Begging rings</i>	5.5%	4.6%	6.2%
<i>Commercial front brothel</i>	4.1%	4.8%	3.4%
<i>Construction</i>	3.7%	3.9%	3.4%
<i>Domestic work</i>	3.5%	2.7%	4.2%
<i>Escort service/delivery services</i>	3.3%	4.6%	2.2%
<i>Health and beauty services</i>	2.7%	3.3%	2.2%
<i>Hospitality</i>	2.4%	1.5%	3.3%
<i>Hostess/strip club</i>	2.1%	2.1%	2.2%
<i>Hotel/motel-based commercial sex</i>	1.6%	1.5%	1.7%
<i>Other</i>	12.9%	10.8%	14.9%
<i>Unknown</i>	28.6%	35.8%	22.0%

Table 10 summarizes the same cases by region, illustrating that, for the most part, Hotline tip data track the population distribution in the State of Texas.

Table 10

The National Human Trafficking Hotline, Texas Data by Region

Region	% of Tips
Greater Houston	41.6%
Dallas/Fort Worth Metro Area	23.6%
Greater Austin	7.3%
Greater San Antonio	6.5%
Corpus Christi Metro Area	2.6%
McAllen–Edinburg–Mission	1.6%
El Paso Metro Area	1.0%
Other and redacted*	15.6%

* The Hotline redacted the location of tips for locations with small numbers of tips for the protection of victims and witnesses. Other regions included in the data received less than 1% of tips, but include Killeen, Temple, Beaumont/Port Arthur, and Brownsville/Harlingen.

Collectively, these data from the Hotline allow us to assess the proportion of potential victims at high risk for trafficking victimization by industry and community segment. These data reveal patterns and gradients of risk associated with a diverse range of trafficking victimization in the State of Texas.

Statewide Governmental Agencies.

DPS Arrest and TDCJ Conviction Data

The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), as part of improvements to the criminal justice system in 1989, created a comprehensive system called the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) that includes relevant data for criminal justice agencies responsible for the arrest, prosecution, adjudication and correction of criminal offenders. Similar reforms were made years later to the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), and both CJIS and JJIS data is maintained in a statewide Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system regulate by the Crime Records Service of DPS.

To improve understanding of prevalence for all types of trafficking, the research team requested CCH data dating back to 2011 for a broad set of offenses that might relate to trafficking based on elements of the case and nature of the crime. The 91 offense codes are documented in D. The list of requested variables was developed with support of DPS and the list of offense codes was developed with support from professionals in the field, including law enforcement familiar with human trafficking and legal professionals involved in prosecuting human trafficking cases. The variables requested per offender are detailed below:

- SID numbers (for purposes of cross-referencing with TDCJ)
- Demographics (including age, gender, race, etc.)
- Address provided
- Dates (both offense and disposition)
- Location of offense
- Prior offenses & incarcerations
- Final pleading
- Prosecution action and any notes available
- Court decision(s) - included history from court clerk report
- Literal field, even if sparse
- Probation information
- Any details related to costs incurred

- Agency case # and Cause #
- Any other variables applicable and available

The research team constructed a relational database from data files received from DPS. The database included 23,656 records dating back to 1973. Exploratory work with the DPS data revealed only 1500 cases since 2012 in the data set. More importantly, only three trafficking charges were included in the data set – one each of "trafficking of person," "smuggling of persons," and "trafficking child engage conduct/sexual." In the entire dataset, there were only 1772 related offenses.

Conviction data that can be linked to the DPS arrest data are available from Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) and were requested but were not obtained.

DPS and TDCJ data continue to have potential to provide insights about trafficking activity in phase 2, but the data received to date have contributed little to phase 1 benchmark estimates.

Texas Office of Court Administration (OCA)

The limitations in trafficking data collected by state agencies are well documented. As reported in previous reports from the Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force:

Even when a victim is discovered and a trafficker is arrested, tried, and convicted, data collection and dissemination is not necessarily easy or reliable. Due to 2011 legislation, the Texas Office of Court Administration (OCA) is now required to collect data on court cases. DPS is also required to collect data on human trafficking arrests. The two agencies collect data on two different aspects of trafficking, but there is not a statewide system in place to consolidate, evaluate, and disseminate information on the crime. In addition, the new data collection requirements have been problematic to implement. Both agencies cited extremely low numbers – which were not necessarily indicative of the actual extent of trafficking. Furthermore, due to the hidden and convoluted nature of human trafficking, identifying, and deciphering trafficking cases from other cases is difficult.

The research team worked with Texas Office of Court Administration (OCA) to assess the degree to which data collected by the courts might help inform estimates of cases in the State of Texas. OCA routinely reports on the progression of cases associated with several major crime categories and has recently begun efforts to similarly track trafficking cases. The research team intended to cross reference OCA with DPS arrest and TDCJ conviction data, but due to the nature of the current court activity reporting system highlighted above, the statistics reported by the courts cannot be compared directly to information reported to the Department of Public Safety (cited from 2012 testimony to the Joint Interim Committee).

OCA found that some counties were reporting criminal case information as required, although the human trafficking section was blank due to outdated case management software. Counties across Texas have converted to new case management systems in recent years, but even still, there are case management systems that are not programmed properly to capture required information.

In recent years, there has been dramatic improvement in data collection efforts, which can be credited not only to improved legislation (House Bill 2014, effective September 1, 2011) but also to the advocacy efforts of those in influential positions within state agencies. OCA has reported corrections in over-reporting; improvement in completeness of reporting, which OCA credits to an improvement in identification of human trafficking cases and criminal case activity reports submitted to OCA in a more timely manner; and a substantial increase in reported cases, due to improved and continued reporting by specific counties with a large volume of activity (Bexar, Harris, Dallas, Tarrant, Travis).

House Bill 2014 (HB 2014) requires district courts and county courts at law to report to OCA each month the number of cases filed for the following offenses:

1. trafficking of persons under Section 20A.02, Penal Code;
2. prostitution under Section 43.02, Penal Code; and
3. compelling prostitution under Section 43.05, Penal Code.

Reporting of data has been incomplete and at times problematic. For example, some counties were using outdated offense codes even after DPS had implemented new offense codes in September 2011.

A major consideration is that a case with multiple charges is reported on the monthly report as one case under the most serious charge. Some case management systems may not be able to capture and report the required information if one or more of the human trafficking violations is not the most serious charge. In addition, as noted during 2012 testimony at the Joint Interim Committee to Study Human Trafficking (Joint Interim Committee) hearing and in the Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force Report 2011, prosecutors usually charge defendants with non-human trafficking related violations (sexual assault, kidnapping, etc.) or with more serious charges (weapons violations, drug violations, etc.).

A 2012 survey request from the Joint Interim Committee to all district and county clerks to better understand the current state of data collection, to determine which counties are reporting completely and accurately, which are reporting data but have issues with completeness and accuracies, and which counties are not reporting for whatever reason. Over 290 district and county clerks were surveyed – only 13 counties responded that they had human trafficking cases

to report. An overwhelming majority (120 counties) indicated that they had no human trafficking cases to report.

Based on our review of the survey results, testimonies, and memos from 2011-2012, OCA has worked diligently to educate district and county clerks about reporting requirements of HB 2014, but issues with case management systems, offense codes, and reporting compliance persist and will likely need to be addressed on a county by county basis, an arduous task. Additional issues such as prosecutors charging defendants with non-human trafficking related violations (sexual assault, kidnapping, etc.) or with more serious charges (weapons violations, drug violations, etc.) contribute to the data issues. From interviews with OCA, it appears there have been improvements in data reporting accuracy and completeness since 2011, to date there remains an absence of any substantive data on specific cases, (i.e. no case level information is collected; aggregate totals are reported by county for each court level. Additional funding was earmarked for OCA to modify the existing database and possibly pursue case-level information, although OCA has 5 years to complete this work.

House Bill 2455 (Texas 84th Legislature) established a task force to promote uniformity in the collection and reporting of information relating to family violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and human trafficking. The task force, and various working groups, convened between October 2015 and September 2016 to “develop policy recommendations and best practice guidelines for the uniform collection and reporting of information” (see Recommendations in references). The task force report was released in September 2016 and can be accessed online at <http://www.txcourts.gov/media/1436043/hb-2455-final-report-september-2016.pdf>.

DPS Suspicious Activity Reporting

In addition to the data query from the DPS Computerized Criminal History system, the research team collected information about suspicious activity reporting (SAR). We received data from 34 SAR reports in an excel file. SAR data is based on a level of suspicion – based on observations by the reporter – including prostitution, alien smuggling, and human trafficking. A preliminary review of SAR data, specifically observations flagged as potentially human trafficking in nature, was exploratory to understand data points available from those reports, for example, indicators of trafficking, source of the SAR, geographic region, victim demographic, to name a few.

The effort to build a statewide SAR is a new initiative we will learn more about over time is network. The initiative is terrorism focused, but will provide insights about human trafficking since the SAR network will have an all-crimes perspective. Data from such reports, consist of leads for future investigations, and could be very useful in increasing understanding of prevalence.

Primary research

While available secondary sources provided context and additional background on human trafficking in the State of Texas, they also confirmed the paucity of data available to policy makers about the extent, impact, and character of this crime. Several primary research activities were developed and implemented to begin to close the informational gaps. Specifically, due to the inherent difficulty of studying victims directly, our research focused initially on collecting data from providers of services to victims. Several phases of mixed methods research provided significant learning about trafficking in Texas and have allowed us to transition to community data collection in the latter part of phase 1. Data obtained and analysis performed to date, allowed us to develop preliminary benchmarks for our three research questions and to develop a comprehensive plan for phase 2 of this project. The sections that follow summarize our findings and highlight how these data inform our preliminary benchmarks.

Agency Survey.

The research team designed an in-depth, mixed-methods, web-based survey instrument (Agency Survey, developed for this study) to administer to a wide range of professionals working in the fields of human trafficking, violence against women, policy development, law enforcement, prosecution, survivor services, legal immigration assistance, community advocacy, and related fields. Phone interviews, consultation with professionals (including during the survey testing phase), and research on gaps in current knowledge contributed to the survey development phase. The purpose of the Agency Survey is to create new knowledge, collect new data, and establish new facts related to human trafficking in Texas.

To date, 230 professionals have participated in the survey from 171 unique Texas zip codes in 108 cities across the state (33 criminal justice, 20 social service, 12 medical or health provider, 113 elementary or secondary education providers, 52 “Other”). Data from additional stakeholders is still being collected as part of this primary data collection survey. Below we provide a quick summary of those results that are germane to our current estimation efforts. Tables 11 and 12 illustrate who responded to our survey: a cross-section of service providers who provide a broad range of services to their clients, and thus, we argue, provide a reasonable perspective on sex trafficking victimization in Texas among the clients they serve.

Table 11.

Agency Survey Summary

Mission of Responding Organizations	Who Participated (n=44)
Victim services	48%
Human trafficking and sexual exploitation	41%
Advocacy	34%
Community-based programming	27%
Family services	25%
Human trafficking	23%
Faith-based	23%
Domestic violence and sexual assault	20%
Legal services	14%
Homelessness	11%
Refugee resettlement	5%
Immigrant advocacy/ethnic group	5%
Other	27%

Table 12

Agency Survey - Services Provided (n=31)

Services Provided	Percentage of Respondents Providing Service
Clothing and goods	100%
Case management	100%
Advocacy	97%
Mental health/counseling	94%
Food	87%
Transportation	77%
Housing	74%
Familial support/reunification	68%
Medical care	65%
Education	65%
Legal services	61%
Financial support	39%
Job training	35%
Language services	23%

Victimization Rates.

A key preliminary finding from our survey relates to the frequency with which representatives of social service agencies provide services to potential and confirmed human trafficking victims. We estimate that in the last 12 months the overall human trafficking victimization rate among clients is 25.1%. In other words, one in four agency clients are victims of human trafficking. This estimate has the following assumptions.

- Numbers were calculated from total client and human trafficking victim counts.
- Nineteen service providers offered client and victim counts in survey responses.
- These 19 providers served 7,484 clients and saw 1,877 human trafficking victims among those clients. (Note: double-counting clients (and victims) is possible in our survey methodology, but this effect should not impact the estimate of victimization rate seen by agencies.)
- Ninety-seven percent of reported victimization was sex trafficking.

Currently, our Agency Survey provides preliminary estimates of the number of known or highly likely cases seen in the last 12 months relative to the number of clients served. There will be continued analyses on the data collected to date. Moving forward, we plan to enroll various service provider partners in the field to track what they actually see among clients served during the next 6–12 month period. A visual of the research team’s hierarchy of information needs about victims is included as Appendix I. However, the results of the Agency Survey are corroborated by several other studies summarized in Table 13. These studies collectively estimate a range of trafficking victimization between 21% and 37%, with estimates clustering near 25%. For more detail about these studies, see Appendix E for a brief summary.

Table 13

Research to Support Sex Trafficking Victimization Rate

Research*	Percentage
Homeless/street youth who acknowledge involvement in commercial sex	28%
Homeless and sexually abused youth	21%
Homeless youth who were propositioned for sexual favors	37%
Children who reported trading sex for money, sex, or gifts	23%
Homeless youth who indicated exchanging sex for food, shelter, or drugs	36%
Youth who revealed to health care providers they were involved in prostitution	25%
Overall survival sex among shelter and street youth	28%

*Swaner, R., Labriola, M., Rempel, M., Walker, A., Spadafore, J. (2016); McDonald, A. R., & Laser Maira, J. A. (2016); Beech, B. M., Myers, L., & Beech, D. J. (2012) ; Greene, J. M., Ennett, S. T., & Ringwalt, C. L. (1999) ; Stoltz, J. M., Shannon, K., Kerr, T., Zhang, R., Montaner, J. S., & Wood, E. (2007) ; Terrell, N. E. (1997) ; Tyler, K. A. (2009); Yates, G. L., Mackenzie, R. G., Pennbridge, J., & Swoffor, A. (1991).

Based on the totality of our secondary sources and the results of our Agency Survey, we adopt a victimization rate of 25% for sex trafficking among community segments included in our phase 1 results.

Agency Survey: Collaboration with New Orleans Trafficking Task Force.

The Greater New Orleans Human Trafficking Task Force (NOLA Task Force) disseminated our Agency Survey to their membership to increase understanding of human trafficking in their area. Some highlights of their data collection are included below.

- Fifty-eight respondents participated in the survey (17 social service, six medical or health provider, five criminal justice, five religious non-profits, and nine elementary or secondary education providers).
- Service providers reported serving 245 victims of sex trafficking and 14 victims of labor trafficking. (Of those reported victims of sex trafficking served, 136 of them were female adults, 72 were female minors, 20 were male adults, and nine were male minors.)
- Law enforcement reported recovering 16 victims of sex trafficking and arresting four sex traffickers.

The NOLA Task Force collected data about gaps in services, needs of both victims and professionals who serve them, and challenges with victim identification and service provision. Identified gaps included housing, trauma-informed counseling/mental health services, and legal services for victims. Education and training specific for service providers on how to interact with and best serve victims of human trafficking was identified as a top need. Challenges identified by law enforcement and service providers included victims not self-identifying as victims, and victims not wanting to cooperate with treatment because of a fear of criminalization and retribution by their traffickers. The task force also identified areas where further research was needed: labor trafficking, foreign national victims, men and boys as victims, and the victims of the LGBTQ population.

The NOLA Task Force has planned important next steps to combat human trafficking in New Orleans based on the findings from the Agency Survey. They concluded that law enforcement and service providers are only identifying a limited demographic of victims. They identified these issues prior to the survey, but the results from the survey provided empirical evidence and a primary source of data to support their theories. According to the NOLA Task Force Director of Operations, the task force's next action steps are based on results from the Agency Survey. Data collected provided valuable information needed to create training plans responding to gaps and to better support efforts of shelter programs across New Orleans. As a result, service providers will receive more training on serving victims of human trafficking, law enforcement will participate in training on the neurobiology of trauma, outside organizations will provide trainings on labor trafficking, and trainings will focus on LGBTQ populations. The results from the Agency Survey

provided a way for the NOLA Task Force to focus their efforts and zoom in on the highest areas of need among victims of human trafficking in their community.

Follow-up in-depth interviews.

Select participants in the Agency Survey were contacted by phone to obtain additional information about the percentage of their agency budget that is related to human trafficking, the percentage of their agency staff who spend a portion of their time dedicated to human trafficking issues, and the amount of funding made available to agencies dedicated to addressing human trafficking.

Table 14

Participants in Follow-up Depth Interviews

Stakeholders	Total Number of clients served	Number of CST victims
Health care providers	1,000 to 2,200	9 to 35
Service providers	7 to 8,000	1 to 546
Criminal justice	16 to 1,532	1 to 130

While these interviews were informative, they mostly confirmed gaps and barriers of which we were already aware. The following are key take-aways.

- Participants did not feel comfortable or equipped with the necessary information to make estimates about costs to their organizations.
- Only service providers made estimates on the human trafficking funding within their organizations. Estimates ranged from \$50,000--\$1.6 million of their agency budget.
- Many felt that cost-related questions were outside of their scope. For example, one health care provider described not making human trafficking a priority in tracking costs to hospitals because they haven't seen a need for it.
- Law enforcement all said that their organizations were not currently tracking costs of providing services to victims of human trafficking.

Focus groups, including worksheets filled out prior to the group.

In collaboration with the Child Sex Trafficking Team (CSTT) from the Office of the Governor, the research team convened focus groups with professionals working in the field of human trafficking (and related fields) to assess perceived gaps in services currently available to child victims of human trafficking and exploitation.

In order to stimulate a more detailed, empirically grounded discussion prior to attending the focus group respondents were sent a set of background questions regarding their professional

experience in working with victims. The background questions focused on direct service provision to clients. Participants were asked to submit their responses before attending focus groups in part to allow the research team to review the range of responses, but also to allow participating organizations to gather those data ahead of time. Nearly one-third of the responses were returned before the focus groups occurred. Participants were asked about specific data points as well as reflection on services to victims. Participants were informed that, for the purpose of this discussion, a “victim” referred to a child who is trafficked and is served by their agency.

Sample questions were as follows.

1. How many victims does your agency serve, confirm, or interact with somehow per year?
2. What types of victims do you serve (include typology or segmentation scheme used, if available)?
3. What services do you offer to victims?
4. For budget planning, what is the estimated unit cost per victim per day used?

There were 36 sets of responses to the background questions that were submitted by participants. Table 15 describes the responses to question 1 from the background questions. The number of clients served varied between participants so to represent the responses given, we used ranges of the highest and lowest number of clients and victims served. The table is divided into the total number of clients served by their agency versus how many of those clients are victims of child sex trafficking (CST).

Table 15

Clients Served by Type of Stakeholder – Focus Groups

Stakeholders	Number of clients served	Number of CST victims
Health care providers	1,000 to 2,200	9 to 35
Service providers	7 to 8,000	1 to 546
Criminal justice	16 to 1,532	1 to 130

Based on the responses from the medical, criminal justice, and social service sectors we compiled Table 16 with descriptions of their views of the gaps in services, investigation, and prosecution. While there were varied responses, we decided to present the responses that were most commonly mentioned among participants. Additional analysis of the responses to background questions may help clarify the findings covered in this report. For instance, further analysis of housing and shelter needs are necessary because we have learned that shelter is a need. But an appropriate shelter for trafficking victims must be more than a safe house in order to fully offer effective and long-term care for victims. For further detail, please refer to F – Gaps Analysis.

Table 16

Common Gaps and Barriers Identified by Stakeholders – Focus Groups

Stakeholders	Common gaps in resources (training, funding, etc.)	Common gaps in services, investigation, prosecution
Health care providers	Medical personnel need training in identifying and treating victims. More funding is needed.	A lack of communication between hospitals and law enforcement (LE). Victims are picked up by LE and never brought to hospitals or doctors for care. A lack of communication between hospitals and social service agencies/knowing where to refer.
Criminal justice	There is a need for forensic interviewers. More needs to be done with community awareness. There need to be lock down facilities where girls can't leave, but that are not punishment based. There is a need for more placement funds.	No universal screening tools exist. Coordination between LE, child welfare, Juvenile Justice is unclear. There is no easy way to share data with other agencies/organizations. A lack of training for prosecutors and law enforcement. A lack of residential or safe housing options for victims waiting for prosecution/not involved in Juvenile Justice.
Service providers	A lack of consistent and reliable funding sources leads to lack of staff. A lack of proper educational resources (child victims are usually missing a lot of school and need proper support to catch up). Licensure for housing should be put in the name of the agency and not an individual.	A lack of collaboration with LE. A lack of long term housing. Penalties for buyers/traffickers need to increase. A lack of LGBTQ services. A lack of prosecutors for human trafficking cases.

DMST working group.

The Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking (DMST) Working Group formed one of the primary research activities of the Texas Slavery Mapping Project during phase 1. Allies Against Slavery convenes and facilitates the group, which consists of more than 20 regional criminal justice personnel, service providers, and survivor leaders. The DMST Working Group was initially formed in early 2015 and meets biweekly to develop comprehensive solutions to domestic minor sex trafficking in Central Texas and beyond.

The Texas Slavery Mapping Project research team participated throughout the inception and initial work of the group by:

- Contributing to the shared learning of the group by providing insights from the broader literature on domestic minor sex trafficking;
- Sharing expertise about data collection and data management;
- Evaluating and co-designing solutions, such as a screening tool to identify possible victims of domestic minor sex trafficking;
- Participating in group discussions and interviews about how group members defined domestic minor sex trafficking, what they perceived as gaps in services, and other insights about the field, which helped shape research methodology and supplemented the agency survey.

While the DMST Working Group focused on a range of issues and solutions over the last 18 months, one activity is of particular relevance to phase 1 and phase 2 of the Texas Slavery Mapping Project: the development of the Tier 1 Screening Tool.

The Tier 1 Screening Tool was developed in response to an identified gap shared by the majority of Working Group members: the need to more quickly and effectively identify possible victims of domestic minor sex trafficking who come in contact with the “system” or one of the member agencies. The Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force in its 2014 report to the Texas Legislature highlighted the complex yet critical task of identifying victims of trafficking—the private nature or concealment of some victims, the denial of victimization by those who may in fact encounter help, and others who may be “hiding in plain sight.”

This challenge of accurate identification was corroborated by the Working Group members, who agreed that victims often “slip through the cracks.” In response to this need, the group focused on creating a brief assessment tool meant to be flexible enough to fit into any intake process and able to be administered by staff with little-to-no specific training on DMST. The tool was designed to be used with every youth the agencies encountered to help form a “suspicion of victimization” and funnel possible victims toward a deeper screening.

The Tier 1 Screening Tool was the resulting instrument. It is comprised of a section of strong indicators of victimization observable during intake, followed by targeted but conversational questions that can be utilized or skipped. Intake staff then make a final assessment indicating if the youth in question is a “possible victim of DMST” or if there is “not enough information” to make a determination. This tool is now being piloted in multiple counties among various types of service providers and institutions.

For example, the research team worked closely with administrators from Bell County Juvenile Services Center (Juvenile Services) in Fall 2015 to learn more about current screening and data collection efforts, specifically how those efforts could be developed to improve identification of potential victims of trafficking being placed at the juvenile detention center. Juvenile Services needed a way to screen all incoming youth in its care for child sex trafficking. Through some training and awareness, senior staff had developed a “gut instinct” that they were seeing victims of child sex trafficking, but they had no tool to confirm their suspicions or collect and report data about victimization. Juvenile Services’ early efforts to identify victims of sex trafficking mostly relied on a victim self identifying, which is extremely rare, before funneling that victim to specialized services.

The research team worked closely with administrators to develop a draft intake flowchart for the DMST Internal Response Team to follow when screening youth. As part of that process, Allies Against Slavery worked with administrators to implement the Tier 1 Screening Tool. Allies helped establish a procedure for using the Tier 1 Screener to evaluate each child during their standard intake process. Juvenile Services is now able to use the tool as a first touch point to build rapport with the child and form an initial suspicion that sex trafficking may have occurred. The research team provided information about existing screening tools that the DMST Internal Response Team could potentially use as a “Tier 2” screening tool to further assess the potential victim. One of those tools was developed specifically for a juvenile services setting and the DMST Internal Response Team has been able to gather additional information and build rapport with the youth.

Now Juvenile Services uses the Tier 1 Screener with every youth who comes through its doors. Additionally, the Tier 1 Screener has been a standard training tool for senior staff to use with front-line intake staff where there are high levels of turnover. Each front-line staff member now receives quarterly training on child sex trafficking and how to identify victims using the Tier 1 Screener. Juvenile Services is now identifying more trafficking victims and diverting them into services. After using the Tier 1 Screener for 12 months (November 2015 – November 2016), Juvenile Services identified 27 possible victims of child sex trafficking. One hundred and thirty-one female youth were screened and 20% were identified as possible victims of sex trafficking, further supporting our victimization rate. Juvenile Services reports that the Tier 1 Screener has equipped it to better advocate for youth in juvenile court. It can also report how many victims its

sees and identifies trends in victimization, a vital next step in improving data collection across the state.

Organizations and professionals who are most likely to encounter and interact with victims need to be fully invested in this effort. This is a positive next step in our efforts to get below the tip of the iceberg, increase screening (and ultimately, identification) of victims.

Fundamentally, this activity in phase 1 does not contribute to our preliminary benchmarks, but it improves our estimation activities in phase 2.

Pilot study on labor trafficking: Houston.

In Spring 2016, the research team began a pilot study focused on labor-related exploitation in Houston, specifically targeting immigrant day laborers, primarily those that work in construction, house cleaning, and child or elder care. The purpose of this pilot is to assess, among other things, levels of victimization risk among these community segments. The research team developed a brief structured interview tool modified from the interview protocol developed for the San Diego study (Zhang et al., 2014) with migrant laborers, and informed by the VERA Trafficking Victim Identification Tool (TVIT) Short Form. One member of the research team had unique access to migrant workers in Harris County and she conducted interviews. These data will provide Texas-specific primary estimates of victimization in several at-risk industry segments and allow us to assess the relevance of the estimates from sources like Barrick et al., (2014) and Zhang et al., (2014) to Texas. Table 17 summarizes the trafficking and exploitation criteria that we have adapted from their study.

Table 17

Labor Exploitation and Trafficking Criteria

Abusive practice during transportation

- Forbade you from leaving the traveling group, or restricting what you could do.
- Forbade or restrict you from communicating freely with family.
- Forbade or restrict you from communicating freely with other travelers.
- Assaulted/fined you when you failed to obey the rules.
- Required you to pay more smuggling fee than originally agreed or bad things would happen to you or your family (e.g. be abandoned halfway, be turned over to U.S. border patrol, family members would be hurt).

Trafficking violation during transportation

- Withheld your identification documents (including passport, visa, and birth certificate).
- Held you hostage at or prevented you from leaving a safe house while demanding ransom from your family.

Labor exploitation

- Denied you pay for work you performed in Houston or anywhere in the US.
- Received less pay than what you had been promised.
- Received a bad check.
- Employer disappeared before paying you.
- Were told to work in hazardous environments (with unknown chemicals) without proper protection.
- Any other work experience you consider grossly abusive or exploitative.

Threats to physical safety (Trafficking)

- Physical abuse (including beating, kicking, slapping, etc.).
 - Sexual abuse (including repeated unwanted groping, touching, exposing oneself, deliberate display of pornographic materials, repeated solicitation of sexual favors, etc.).
 - Locked up (including physically restrained).
 - Threatened with physical abuse (including beating, kicking, slapping, etc.).
 - Threatened with sexual abuse.
 - Threatened with harm to you in any other form.
 - Threatened with harm to your family in any form.
 - Threatened to get you deported.
 - Threatened to get you arrested.
 - Threatened to turn you over to police or immigration officials.
-

Restriction/Deprivation (trafficking)

- Forbade you from leaving the workplace.
- Restricted where you could go during non-work hours.
- Withheld your identification papers (such as passport, visa, birth certification, or other identification documents).
- Didn't allow you to have adequate food or sleep.
- Prevented or restricted you from communicating freely with family, other workers, others outside the workplace.

Deception and lies (exploitation)

- Pay was less than you were promised.
 - The type of work was different than what you were promised.
 - The work environment was different than what you were promised.
 - The amount of work was different from what you were promised.
 - Told you that you would not be believed if you try to seek help from U.S. authorities.
 - Instructed you to lie about your identity.
 - Instructed you to lie about the identity of your employer.
-

To date, 44 interviews have been conducted (22 female) among respondents ranging in age from 20 to 70 (mean 40). These interviews have revealed substantial levels of labor exploitation and trafficking victimization, with the results shown in Figure 1. Approximately two-thirds of participants reported experiences that meet the force, fraud, or coercion criteria for labor trafficking. This effort continues in phase 2.




Figure 1. Trafficking and exploitation summary. This figure illustrates trafficking and exploitation rates from our Labor Trafficking Pilot.

The rates of trafficking observed in our pilot study are alarming and require additional study and continued data collection. Two recent larger studies using similar victim identification methods have provided consistent and lower estimates for labor sectors at high risk for trafficking victimization (the percent of laborers who have experienced human trafficking are included in parentheses).

Barrick et al. (2014)

- Farm workers in NC (25%)

Zhang et al. (2014)

- Spanish-speaking migrant workers in San Diego County (28%)
- Construction (35%)
- Janitorial and cleaning (36%)
- Landscaping (27%)
- Agriculture (16%)
- Food processing (32%)
- Manufacturing (38%)

These studies use a common methodology that establishes robust estimates of prevalence using respondent-driven sampling (RDS) that can be generalized to the broader population. RDS uses study participant referrals in a systematic way to increase the randomness and representativeness

of the resulting sample. This sampling process is combined with a formal screening process that uniformly and systematically assesses victimization rates among the population being studied.

We plan to expand our pilot survey in phase 2 to other geographic areas and different economic sectors in Texas. In addition, the survey's reach and effectiveness could expand through the use of RDS.

Our preliminary benchmarks for the prevalence of labor trafficking in this phase 1 report adopt the more conservative rates reported by both Barrick and Zhang, but it is important to keep in mind that rates in Texas could be higher, even substantially so.

The pilot survey also provides an initial estimate of the degree of victimization laborers have experienced. The survey asked participants to estimate their typical earned wages and then to estimate the amount of money that they had not been paid. Data was collected in a variety of formats (hourly wage, weekly pay, etc.) as appropriate and familiar for the participant. In aggregate, these data reveal that participants who have experienced labor exploitation or trafficking perceive that they had not been paid approximately 11% of wages earned. We use this preliminary estimate of degree of victimization in our calculations of the economic impact of labor trafficking.

Prevalence of Human Trafficking in Texas

Estimation of the prevalence of human trafficking is challenging for a variety of reasons that are well documented (Small, Adams, Owens, & Roland, 2008; Barrick, Lattimore, Pitts, & Zhang, 2014; Clawson, 2006; Dank, 2014; Farrell, 2009; Muslim, Labriola, & Rempel, 2008; Owens et al., 2014; Smith, 2010; Zhang, Spiller, Finch, & Qin, 2014; Zhang, 2012; Newton, Mulcahy, and Martin, 2008, to list just a few).

Among the most conservative representations of the prevalence of human trafficking are statistics for reported cases and reported outreach by victims and witnesses. Central to the estimation challenge is that victims are difficult to count. They may not identify as being victims if they are concurrently involved in illicit activities or have a legal status that makes them reluctant to seek or accept help. Human trafficking occurs across broad geographies and commercial activities, further complicating the estimation task.

Although our victim typology begins to provide a theoretically grounded vision for how our phase 2 efforts will extend our understanding of the prevalence, economic impact, and character of trafficking in Texas, current limitations in available data constrain our ability to address these issues in the phase 1 report. Table 18 summarizes those community and labor segments that have been analyzed in phase 1, with an indication of which do not have sufficient data to be included in our preliminary benchmarks.

Table 18

Trafficking Typology with Data Sources

Sex	Labor
Child abuse/maltreatment	Cleaning services
At-risk youth being served by DFPS	Construction
Homeless	Farmworkers
Juvenile justice*	Kitchen workers in restaurants
Unauthorized population*	Landscaping and grounds keeping workers
	Migrant farmworkers
	Nail salon workers*

* Current data sources insufficient to include in preliminary benchmarks, either because population sizes are poorly understood or because of the potential for overlap with other segments included.

Our phase 1 estimates for sex trafficking focus on children, and our selection of community segments is informed by recent research identifying risk factors for domestic minors. For example, Fedina, Williamson, & Perdue (2016) found that childhood experiences, including emotional and sexual abuse, a history of running away from home, having family members in sex work, and having friends who purchased sex, were significantly associated with subsequent sex trafficking victimization. The community segments from Table 18 were selected based on secondary research regarding different populations at risk for sexual exploitation (Countryman-Roswurm and Bolin, 2014; Knight, S., 2002; Reid, J. A., & Piquero, A. R., 2013; Edberg, M. C., Gies, S. V., Cohen, M. I., & May-Slater, S., 2014; Shively et al., 2010; Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2015; California Child Welfare, 2013; Smith, L., Vardaman, S. H., Snow, M.A., 2009; Halcon, L. L., & Lifson, A. R., 2004; Ferguson, K. M., Bender, K., Thompson, S., Xie, B., & Pollio, D., 2011; Salisbury, E. J., Dabney, J. D., & Russell, K., 2014; Hammer, H., Finkelhor, D., Sedlak, A. J., & Porcellini, L. E., 2002). More support for our minor and youth sex trafficking typology selections can be found in Appendix G.

Minor and youth sex trafficking.

Fundamentally, our approach to estimating the prevalence of minor and youth sex trafficking requires three levels of information: identification of community segments that are at higher-than-average risk for human trafficking, the number of individuals in a community segment, and a quantification of the risk of victimization within that segment. We researched community segments at higher-than-average risk for this specific type of victimization.

Estimates of the numbers of individuals involved in the commercial sex industry are vague at best. Our methodology for assessing the prevalence of minor and youth sex trafficking looks at

how such victims might be encountered by various professions that provide services to or are otherwise engaged with community segments whose members are at high risk of sex trafficking victimization. We use secondary sources to size these community segments and a survey of experts from agencies that serve these individuals (see Agency Survey on pages 37-42 for more detail) to estimate the high risk of trafficking victimization. Note that our phase 1 estimates for sex trafficking focus on minors and youth, whereas “minors” are under 18 years of age and “youth” includes those up to 20 years of age who remain enrolled with Department of Family & Protective Services.

How large are these community segments?

The research team continues to learn about community segments vulnerable to sex trafficking through available secondary sources of data, but knowledge of the size of some of these populations may not yet exist. For this report, we have selected example community segments that are believed to be at higher-than-average risk of sex trafficking: youth who have experienced child abuse or maltreatment, at-risk youth being served by the Department of Family and Protective services (DFPS), and homeless youth.

Table 19

Examples of Community Segment Sizes in Texas (Annually) at High Risk for Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking

High-Risk Sex Trafficking Community Segments	Size of Community Segment
Child abuse/maltreatment	290,471
At-risk youth being served by DFPS	24,097
Homeless	1,416

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development; Texas Department of Family & Protective Services; Center for Missing and Exploited Children

How many are at risk?

We apply the 25% victimization rate developed from the Agency Survey (and corroborated with similar studies found in the extant literature) to estimate numbers of victims in the community segments. We view the use of this calculation as conservative because most service providers who shared victimization data with us in the Agency Survey indicate that they use a formal process to screen clients for victimization; in fact, more than half (56%) of those service providers use an evidence-based or validated tool.

Our prevalence calculation then takes the following form.

$$V_s = N_s \times VR_s$$

- V_s is the number of expected victims in a community segment.
- N_s is the number of individuals in a segment, i.e. the size of the segment.
- VR_s is the rate of trafficking victimization in that segment.

Results for the example community segments are shown in Table 20.

Table 20

Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking in Texas

High-Risk Sex Trafficking Community Segments*	Size of Community Segment	Victimization Rate	Estimated Victims
Child abuse/maltreatment	290,471	25%	72,618
At-risk youth being served by DFPS	24,097	25%	6,024
Homeless	1,416	25%	354

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

Since example community segments do not represent the entirety of at-risk communities in Texas, we have not summed the individuals at high risk of victimization across these community segments. Just as in labor trafficking, we offer this example list as illustrative only of the methods we are using to estimate the prevalence of trafficking in Texas.

Labor trafficking.

Labor trafficking is 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. According to the ILO, an estimated 21 million people around the globe are forced labor victims in either the private economy or state-imposed forms of forced labor. Sixty-six percent of professional respondents to our web-based survey (see pages 38-42 for more detail) noted that labor trafficking is a serious or very serious problem in their area, with 86% believing that it is bigger problem than most people think.

Fundamentally, our approach to estimating the prevalence of labor trafficking requires three levels of information: 1) identification of commercial activities that are at higher-than-average risk for human trafficking, 2) the number of workers participating in the at-risk activity, and 3) a

quantification of the risk of victimization within that activity. It is also worth noting that there is an intersection of sex and labor trafficking in some industries (see section *Our Understanding of Human Trafficking in Texas*). That intersection is minimized in this report by our choice of labor sectors.

Verité's (2015) methodology assesses risk of labor trafficking by evaluating five factors, concluding that these industries possess at least four out of five of the following.

1. Hazardous/undesirable work
2. Vulnerable, easily replaced, and/or low-skilled workforce
3. Migrant workforce
4. Presence of labor contractors, recruiters, agents, or other middlemen in labor supply chain
5. Long, complex, and/or non-transparent supply chains

Polaris provides a largely corroborating view of vulnerable industries in Texas. Data from 2013 through 2015 indicate that the following industries are represented by human trafficking cases reported to the National Human Trafficking Hotline from Texas.

- Agriculture
- Begging rings
- Construction
- Domestic service
- Health and beauty services
- Landscaping
- Restaurant and food services
- Traveling sales crews

Although all of these industries have relevancy for Texas, for this report we only consider agriculture, construction, and restaurant and food services. These are three vulnerable industries for which we argue that the overlap in the associated workforce is minimal. Furthermore, for clarity, within these industries we focus on sub-segments of workers who are at the highest risk of exploitation.

1. Migrant farmworkers
2. Cleaning Services
3. Construction
4. Kitchen Workers in Restaurants
5. Landscaping and Grounds Keeping Workers

How large are these labor segments?

We use secondary sources to establish the size of the selected segments, shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Examples of Industry Segment Sizes in Texas at High Risk for Labor Trafficking

High-Risk Labor Trafficking Segments	Size of Community Segment
Migrant farmworkers	132,034
Cleaning services	233,610
Construction	101,250
Kitchen workers in restaurants	190,390
Landscaping and grounds keeping workers	63,050

Sources: Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs; Bureau of Labor Statistics

How many workers are at risk?

We have applied Barrick et al. (2014) and Zhang et al. (2014) victimization rates to our selected industry segments. We view this approach as conservative because the screening process by Barrick and Zhang already partitions trafficking victimization as being distinctly different than exploitation that occurs without the required elements of force, fraud, or coercion. Furthermore, our own labor trafficking pilot project has provided preliminary data that suggest that labor trafficking prevalence in Texas may be substantially higher than seen in their studies.

This approach allows us to conservatively estimate the number of workers in the example industries who have likely experienced some form of trafficking victimization. Table 22 shows these results for select agriculture, construction, and restaurant and food service industry segments.

Table 22

Labor Trafficking in Texas

High-Risk Labor Trafficking Segments*	Community Size Segment	Victimization Rate	Estimated Victims
Migrant farmworkers	132,034	28%	36,970
Cleaning services	233,610	36%	84,100
Construction	101,250	35%	35,438
Kitchen workers in restaurants	190,390	32%	60,925
Landscaping and grounds keeping workers	63,050	27%	17,024

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

Since these are example industry segments, they in no way represent the entirety of the labor force in Texas. As such, we have not summed the individuals at high risk of trafficking victimization across these industry segments. We offer this example list as illustrative only of the methods we are using to estimate the prevalence of trafficking in Texas. We plan on expanding this list to include industries that emerge from our primary data collection efforts in Houston and elsewhere.

Economic Impact of Human Trafficking in Texas

There are two main aspects to human trafficking's economic impact:

- 1) Measuring the value of the economic output, including the value of the labor, produced by human trafficking activity; and
- 2) Quantifying the costs to provide care to victims and survivors of human trafficking, including costs related to law enforcement, prosecution, and social services.

Sex trafficking

The Agency Survey was a first step toward quantifying the costs to provide care to victims and survivors of human trafficking, but initial survey responses related to costs of services were incomplete. Additional data collection efforts, such as a survey specific to quantifying cost, have yielded additional yet still preliminary information. These data allow us to multiply the estimated number of trafficking victims in high-risk industry and community segments with the cost figures supplied by both secondary and primary sources, to arrive at a cost-per-victim estimate that could be rolled into a statewide cost figure.

Table 23 presents an estimate of the Net Present Value (NPV) of the estimated lifetime social service costs that both society and trafficking victims themselves can expect to incur, such as mental and physical health costs, burdens on the public health system, and law enforcement expenses. It builds on a cost-benefit analysis approach presented in Martin & Lotspeich (2014).

We have adjusted the Martin & Lotspeich (2014) model by inflating the NPV from 2011 to 2016 dollars and have added a component to our assessment of costs to cover the expected consumption by victims of shelter and associated services. The unit costs from their model (in 2016 dollars) are listed in Table 23.

Table 23

Unit Costs (2016 \$)

Unit Cost	2016 \$\$
Public health expenditures	
Injury from assault	
Minor (a)	4,757
Major	68,859
PTSD	6,609
STIs	
Chlamydia-early treatment	116
Chlamydia-late treatment	1,431
HIV/AIDS	29,303
Pregnancy with abortion	681
Pregnancy with birth (c)	14,866
Chemical dependency	39,810
Criminal justice expenditures (b)	
Homicide investigation	10,730
Adolescents: Arrests	2,356
Adults	
Arrests	2,356
Court hearings	621
Incarcerations	97
Probation supervision	951
Child foster care expenditures (child of victim)	8,551
Forgone income tax revenue	1

Consumption of shelter and related services were omitted from the Martin & Lotspeich (2014) study purposefully because they were conducting a benefit cost analysis wherein the lifetime societally born costs were being compared to an intervention designed to divert victims of child sex trafficking from those circumstances. That intervention included long-term shelter and associated therapeutic services. Our inclusion of shelter and associated services covers only those services that our research indicates many victims periodically receive on a short-term basis.

Anecdotally, we have evidence that minor and youth victims fall back into victimization situations several times before escaping (if they ever do), and that they make five to seven trips to some sort of facility or service provider before victims have processed enough of their situation to engage in a meaningful recovery. These trips to shelters vary in length, but anecdotally it seems that a minimum stay necessary for any sort of meaningful progress could be around two weeks. Many victims leave much sooner (very likely returning to their victimized circumstance), and some receive services for as much as a year. It seems that a duration of around two months is needed to provide truly meaningful and effective services; however, it seems short-term stays are likely closer to a week.

In summary, we adopt a lifetime NPV of \$83,125 for the cost of care born by society for a victim of minor and youth sex trafficking. This NPV probabilistically incorporates the likelihood of various costs and covers the likelihood for various durations of time being in circumstance of sex trafficking.

Table 24

Lifetime Cost of Care for Victims of Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking

High-Risk Sex Trafficking Community Segments*	Estimated Victims	NPV of Cost of Care Required as Consequence of HT (Lifetime)	Estimated Lifetime Cost
Child abuse/maltreatment	72,618	\$83,125	\$6,036,358,905
At-risk youth being served by DFPS	6,024	\$83,125	\$500,743,976
Homeless	354	\$83,125	\$29,426,190
Total			\$6,566,529,071

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

Labor trafficking.

Table 25 presents an estimate of the annual value of labor expended by trafficking victims in the three vulnerable industries presented earlier: agriculture, construction, and restaurant and food services.

These economic impacts are presented here with important data limitations. For instance, we can only estimate how many hours the average victim works under conditions of modern slavery (we know that most episodes of victimization last only a few days or weeks and not months or years). We also do not yet fully understand how to make a reasonable estimate of the wages that a

trafficking victim is actually paid. Data from our labor pilot study reveal that participants who have experienced labor exploitation or trafficking perceive that they had not been paid approximately 11% of wages earned. We use this preliminary estimate of degree of victimization in our calculations of the economic impact of labor trafficking and applied to a normal 2080-hours worked per year. The Department of Labor’s “Adverse Effect Wage Rate” of \$11.15 per hour for H-2A workers is used here as a proxy for what we are calling the Fair Market Wage Rate. The Department of Labor sets that wage rate for migrant farmworkers on H2-A visas so as not to discriminate against domestic labor and depress wages in the agriculture sector. (Other wage rates could be used; the prevailing Texas wage for low-skilled workers in the other sectors may be the federal minimum wage, currently \$7.75 per hour).

Table 25

Annual Value of Labor Exploited from Trafficking Victims

High-Risk Labor Trafficking Segments*	Estimated Victims	Estimated Annual Value Wages Lost
Migrant farmworkers	36,970	\$94,314,906
Cleaning services	84,100	\$214,549,192
Construction	35,438	\$90,406,591
Kitchen workers in restaurants	60,925	\$155,426,986
Landscaping and grounds keeping workers	17,024	\$43,430,267
Total		\$598,127,942

* The research team acknowledges the limitations of this narrow definition of human trafficking. Phase 2 benchmarks will incorporate additional segments such as adult sex trafficking, other economic sectors, etc.

These industry and community segments do not represent the entirety of populations at higher-than-average risk for trafficking victimization in Texas and are provided here as a preliminary benchmark and a demonstration of our methodological approach. We plan to further develop the list of industry and community segments to be included in the study during phase 2.

Our Understanding of Human Trafficking in Texas

As data related to our understanding of the economic impact and the prevalence of trafficking increase, so will the dimensions, descriptions, and understanding of the complex crime of human trafficking as it operates in Texas. To date, we have collected data that help describe some of these dimensions, and continue to collect and analyze data that will expand our shared knowledge.

Law enforcement response

While law enforcement task forces report important criminal justice insights, standardized measures that accurately estimate the number of trafficking victims remain relatively elusive. This is in part due to barriers faced by law enforcement regarding identification, investigation, and prosecution of these crimes, and an understanding that this crime is not static. Understanding the factors that promote and hinder law enforcement strategies will effectively guide future programs, policies, and laws about trafficking. The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics tracks human trafficking incidents by federally funded law enforcement human trafficking task forces. Banks and Kyckelhahn (2011) found that 80% of trafficking cases were suspected sex trafficking cases, 10% were labor trafficking cases, and 10% were identified as other or unknown forms of trafficking. Of the 2,515 total incidents investigated, 389 cases were confirmed as human trafficking, with 488 suspects and 527 victims identified. Of the sex trafficking victims, 83% were U.S. citizens. Of confirmed cases opened for one year, 30% were later confirmed to be human trafficking, 38% were confirmed not to be human trafficking, and the remaining were still under investigation. One hundred and forty-four arrests were made. Of those opened and confirmed, “64% involved allegations of prostitution or sexual exploitation of a child, and 42% involved allegations of adult prostitution. Most cases that were not confirmed as human trafficking involved allegations of adult prostitution” (Banks & Kyckelhahn, 2011, p.8).

Law enforcement responses to human trafficking are varied and complex. Many law enforcement professionals have previously perceived human trafficking as rare or nonexistent (Farrell et al., 2011). A National Institute of Justice (NIJ)-sponsored study found that 32% of trafficking cases were discovered as a result of the investigation of other cases (Clawson et al., 2006), highlighting the need for broadly trained law enforcement. Agents themselves have called for more training (Clawson et al., 2006), knowing that well-crafted investigations are central to successful prosecution. Human trafficking investigations are time- and resource-intensive for law enforcement (David, 2008). Given this reality, law enforcement agents have cited the need for specific techniques and resources for investigating human trafficking cases, including dedicated agents and new technology (Busch-Armendariz, Nsonwu, & Heffron, 2014, 2008; Clawson et al., 2008).

Prosecution response

Responsiveness through prosecution is bleak. Worldwide only 7,000 human trafficking cases were prosecuted for a crime in which 40,000 victims were identified (in 2012, according to U.S. Department of State, 2013). We have little empirical data available about prosecutions of human trafficking in the US at the federal or state levels. According to the Office of Research and Evaluation, NIJ has funded several studies (for instance, Shively, Kliorys, Wheeler, & Hunt, 2012)) that inform the prosecutorial processes. What we do

know is that the prosecution of human trafficking cases is also fraught with hurdles, especially for state and local prosecutors, who operate with fewer resources and less training than federal prosecutors (Clawson et al., 2008).

Sentencing and punishment for human traffickers is another area of concern (Clawson et al., 2008). Research from Europe, Australia, and North America indicate a clear need to develop collaborations among law enforcement entities, from the federal to local level (Reichel, 2008; David, 2008). Law enforcement agents and service providers in the United States have cited the need for creating and improving mechanisms for such collaborative efforts (Busch-Armendariz et al., 2007). Federally funded task forces have a positive impact on the delivery of services to victims (Busch-Armendariz, et al., 2007), and on investigation and prosecution efforts (Farrell, et al., 2008). Despite recent increases in the identification and prosecution of traffickers (Busch-Armendariz, et al., 2014), the numbers for each remain dismally low in relationship to the extent of the crime.

Under investigation: Labor trafficking

Research shows that both men and women are affected by labor trafficking. Although the TVPA splits sex and labor trafficking by definition, sexual violence can be present in situations of labor exploitation. In studies from the University of California, Santa Cruz and Human Rights Watch, most female farmworkers interviewed reported experiencing or knowing someone who had experienced some form of sexual harassment as part of their work (Waugh, 2010; Meng & Coursen, 2012).

In our previous work, *A Research Study on Human Trafficking Victims: Survivors Speak Out about Long-Term Needs* (Busch-Armendariz, Nsonwu, & Heffron, 2009), IDVSA reported that sex trafficking often overlaps with labor trafficking. That is, sex trafficking cases often include elements of labor trafficking (such as being coerced or forced to cook, clean, or perform other labor). Similarly, labor trafficking cases frequently include sexual violence as a component of the strategies of control and coercion used by traffickers. Given these overlapping elements of sex and labor trafficking, it is critical that initiatives to learn more about human trafficking in Texas incorporate all possible manifestations of the crime.

During phase 1, the research team coordinated numerous efforts to increase our understanding of the prevalence and impact of labor trafficking in Texas. Interviews with field experts uncovered a pervasive concern that they are only seeing the tip of the iceberg of a large and complex problem. In fact, 66% of professional respondents to the Agency Survey noted that labor trafficking is a serious or very serious problem in their area, with 86% believing that it is a bigger problem than most people think.

This concern is compounded by the fact that organizations whose mission includes service provision to immigrant and migrant worker populations feel isolated, with little to no sharing of information or resources with other organizations. Initial research tasks intended to accomplish two primary goals:

- Increase knowledge about labor industries in Texas and the employment visa process
- Build a network for data collection.

The research team performed an extensive literature review. We compiled a list of stakeholders with knowledge of labor exploitation in Texas. We conducted interviews with the Department of Labor (DOL), officials with the Mexican Consulate, and special agents with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Homeland Security Investigations to learn more about top industries for exploitation, databases housing related data, and existing labor anti-trafficking efforts. A review of labor trafficking cases as part of the 2014 study from the Urban Institute found that most victims worked in the major U.S. industries of agriculture, domestic service, construction and hospitality (Owens, et al., 2014). Researchers found that victims of labor trafficking frequently obtained temporary work visas (usually H-2A or H-2B), which is in-line with information learned from interviews with Texas-based Department of Labor officials and data analysts at the National Human Trafficking Hotline.

These preliminary efforts led to the first focus group with Central Texas professionals who primarily work with immigrants to provide social services, legal services, and advocacy. These connections increased our understanding of service provision, and focus group participants identified numerous challenges to serving the immigrant and migrant worker populations, specifically in Central Texas. Misidentification of cases, confusion among professionals about definitions and blurred lines between extreme labor exploitation and trafficking, lack of education about rights and labor laws among workers, and the geography challenges of Texas were some of the most common problems professionals identified.

While governmental organizations such as ICE and DOL want to assist victims in exploitive work situations, the challenge of identifying cases continues due to a victim's fear of the economic impact on the family and community. Professionals working with both documented and undocumented workers cannot compel victims to move forward if they cannot guarantee confidentiality. Furthermore, when ICE does not identify exploited workers as being victims of trafficking, it may send a strong message to victims to not seek help.

Discussion

This phase 1 report presents our learning to date, preliminary benchmarks, and how the continuation of these activities will increase our understanding of the crime. We have identified industry and community segments at higher than average risk of human trafficking. We have

applied victimization rates to a select few segments for the purposes of demonstrating our methodology, establishing some baseline human trafficking prevalence and economic impact estimates, and providing a concrete example of our planned activities moving forward.

Our preliminary assessments and quantifications need additional refinement, which requires an expanded level of data collection beyond the timeline of this current research. We will also continue to build upon past research about the needs of victims and survivors and our understanding of traffickers. We expect this emerging data to be more complete in the future, if solely for the fact that organizations are improving data collection efforts, increasing and improving screening of potential victims, and working to share that information in the name of more effective, comprehensive solutions.

In addition to the learning presented thus far, we have also detailed some challenges to researching human trafficking, such as severely limited access to law enforcement data, victims continuing to slip through the cracks because identification is so difficult, and the inability of professionals to quantify costs to provide care to victims and survivors of human trafficking. These challenges, among others, are not unique to Texas and will continue to guide our research activities. In other words, a key component of this work is to identify gaps and work toward better understanding *how* to fill those gaps.

This research is a benchmark of our understanding of human trafficking, especially in prevalence and economic impact; the state's diversity, its cultural context, and regional differences make it difficult to fully describe the scope of trafficking in Texas. Furthermore, the landscape of and the response to the crime are constantly evolving. The research team continues to collect and analyze data as part of this research through the conclusion of the project, and hopefully, beyond.

The preliminary results in this final report are illustrative only and remain a conservative estimate of the prevalence of human trafficking in Texas.

Conclusions

This study is groundbreaking as the first benchmark of prevalence and economic impact of human trafficking for the State of Texas. Few states have invested more to understand the extent of the crime, who is exploited and under what conditions, and the economic impact in order to develop programs, services and policies to alleviate it. Human trafficking research is a young field, making data collection and analysis challenging, particularly as definitions continue to evolve among the disciplines charged with responding to it.

As an example, early on, many limited their understanding of human trafficking to sex trafficking and conflated it with prostitution. Although practice among many professionals has

begun to catch up with the legal definitions, useable data available to determine prevalence may not be available for several years.

The wide range of definitions for DMST, its conflation with prostitution, and low rates of identification have significant implications for data collection across the state. DMST regularly presents as prostitution, and without accurate identification or a consistently applied definition of what qualifies as trafficking, those cases are often documented as prostitution or a similar criminal code. In many cases, stakeholders are able to accurately collect information about children and youth being exploited. Against that backdrop, though, data on domestic minor sex trafficking is low and overlaps considerably with prostitution data. However, when data on domestic minor sex trafficking is collected, it is not standardized across multiple organizations, thus making any aggregated understanding just preliminary.

Our study findings also conclude that labor trafficking is a significant issue for the State of Texas. In fact, this research leads us to conclude that it is woefully understudied and perhaps ignored as a policy area. Our initial steps to explore secondary data from local law enforcement and other governmental agencies on human trafficking crimes generated data that was limited to sex exploitation only. This reflects a narrow understanding of human trafficking that perhaps prioritizes sex trafficking cases over labor trafficking, limiting the ability to reach a large number of vulnerable and victimized Texans.

We know that human trafficking includes the exploitation of different groups of people (adults, youth, children, foreign-born, Texans and other Americans). We encourage our state to continue to expand our understanding of this crime; otherwise we may close off our ability to identify all exploited people in Texas and provide these crime victims with needed services.

Recommendations

We make the following recommendations to stakeholders and policymakers using the findings contained in the report:

- I. Increase investigation and prosecution of traffickers. In general, there are several reasons that the rates of investigation and prosecution of human trafficking cases are low, including: 1) a lack of precedence and case law, 2) victim reluctance to testify, 3) a lack of institutional infrastructure, and 4) a lack of training for investigators and prosecutors on how to investigate and litigate human trafficking cases. The ultimate vision is for law enforcement to preempt strategies used by traffickers so that incidence rates of human trafficking decline. The first step toward this goal is to gain a better understanding of how to increase the success of law enforcement, including its role in the prosecution of trafficking cases. The research team is conducting a survey among prosecutors and investigators of human trafficking cases to gain insights that improve outcomes on those cases. Our initial efforts focus on minor and youth sex trafficking because of the higher number of available cases.

- II. Identify more victims and increase our understanding of how they became victims. During phase 2, the Working Group and the research team will finalize a Screening Starter Pack containing a more in-depth, validated screening tool for professionals who treat victims. Such a screening tool would include a scaled assessment of risk and allow the development of better estimates of the most vulnerable, at-risk populations.

- III. Expand our understanding of traffickers themselves. The methods and strategies used by traffickers, as well as their attempts to evade law enforcement, are dynamic and ever-changing; any attempt to pin down trafficker typologies must be open to continuous exploration and analysis. In this vein, the research will continue to review and refine the typologies of traffickers in operation in Texas.

Next Steps: Phase 2

Phase 2 will expand the initial 2016 human trafficking prevalence and economic impact benchmarks. The current methodology was conservative in its initial assessment of the problem for Texas. As agreed, the next phase of this research will deepen our understanding of the problem of domestic minor sex trafficking. Phase 2 research activities will also include providing the Child Sex Trafficking Team at the Criminal Justice Division with an independent, pre-assessment of several Texas cities in need of programs or services.

References

- Anderson, P. M., Coyle, K.K., Johnson, A., & Denner, J. (2014). An exploratory study of adolescent pimping relationships. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 35, 113-117. doi: 10.1007/s10935-014-0338-3
- Atkins, B., Moran, N. R., & Hanser, R.D. (2013). Human smuggling and the international sex trade: An evaluation of the trafficking victims protection act. *Sociology Study*, 3(1), p. 23-39.
- Bagley, C. & Young, L. (1987). Juvenile prostitution and child sexual abuse: A controlled study. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, 6(1), 5-26.
- Banks, D., & Kyckelhahn, T. (2011). *Characteristics of suspected human trafficking incidents, 2008-2010*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cshti0810.pdf>
- Barrick, K., Lattimore, P. K., Pitts, W. J., & Zhang, S. X. (2014). When farmworkers and advocates see trafficking but law enforcement does not: challenges in identifying labor trafficking in North Carolina. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 61(2), 205–214. doi:10.1007/s10611-013-9509-z
- Beech, B. M., Myers, L., & Beech, D. J. (2012). Hepatitis B and C infections among homeless adolescents. *Family & Community Health*, 25(2), 28-36.
- Biggeri, M., & Ferrannini, A. (2014). Opportunity gap analysis: Procedures and methods for applying the capability approach in development initiatives. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 15(1), 60-78.
- Bigleson, J., Vuotto, S. (2013). *Homelessness, survival sex and human trafficking: As experienced by the youth of Covenant House New York*. Retrieved from <https://traffickingresourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/Homelessness,%20Survival%20Sex,%20and%20Human%20Trafficking%20-%20Covenant%20House%20NY.pdf>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor (2014). *National, state, metropolitan, and nonmetropolitan area occupational employment and wage estimates*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/oes/home.htm>
- Busch-Armendariz, N. B., Fong, R., Heffron, L. C., Faulkner, M., & Mahapatra, N. (2007). Assessing the needs of human trafficking victims: An evaluation of the central Texas coalition against human trafficking. Retrieved from https://socialwork.utexas.edu/dl/files/cswr/institutes/idvsa/publications/evaluation_of_trafficking-2007.pdf

Busch-Armendariz, N., Nsonwu, M., & Cook Heffron, L. (2009). *Understanding human trafficking: Development of typologies of traffickers phase II*. Paper presented at the First Annual Interdisciplinary Conference on Human Trafficking, Lincoln, NE.

Busch-Armendariz, N. B., Nsonwu, M. B., & Cook Heffron, L., Hernandez, M., Garza, J. (2009). *A research study on human trafficking victims: Survivors speak out about long-term needs*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242229476_A_Research_Study_on_Human_Trafficking_Victims_Survivors_Speak_Out_About_Long-Term_Needs

Busch-Armendariz, N. B., Nsonwu, M. B., & Cook Heffron, L. C. (2011). Human trafficking victims and their children: Assessing needs and vulnerabilities and strengths and survivorship. *The Journal of Applied Research on Children*, 2(1), 1-19.

Busch-Armendariz, N., Nsonwu, M. B., & Cook Heffron, L. C. (2014). A kaleidoscope: The role of the social work practitioner and the strength of social work theories and practice in meeting the complex needs of people trafficked and the professionals that work with them. *International Social Work*, 57(1), 7-18. doi:10.1177/0020872813505630

California Child Welfare Council. (2013). *Ending the commercial sexual exploitation of children: A call for multi-system collaboration in California*. Retrieved from <http://www.chhs.ca.gov/Child%20Welfare/Ending%20CSEC%20-%20A%20Call%20for%20Multi-System%20Collaboration%20in%20CA%20-%20February%202013.pdf>

Cecchet, S.J. & Thoburn, J. (2014). The psychological experience of child and adolescent sex trafficking in the United States: Trauma and resilience in survivors. *Psychological Trauma: Research, Practice, and Policy*, 6(5), 482-493.

Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2015). *Child welfare and human trafficking*. Retrieved from <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/issue-briefs/trafficking/>

Cho, S. (2015). Modeling for determinants of human trafficking: An empirical analysis. *Social Inclusion*, 3(1), 2-21. doi:10.17645/si.v3i1.125

Clarke, R. (1995). Situational crime prevention. *Crime and Justice*, 19, 91-150. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147596>

Clarke, R. V., & Cornish, D. B. (1985). Modeling offenders' decisions: A framework for research and policy. *Crime and Justice*, 6, 147-185. doi:10.1086/449106

Clawson, H., Dutch, N., & Cummings, M. (2006, October). *Law enforcement response to human trafficking and implications for victims: Current practices and lessons learned*. Retrieved March 1, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/>

Clawson, H., Layne, M., & Small, K. (2006, December). *Estimating human trafficking in the United States: Development of a methodology*. Retrieved March 1, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/>

Clawson, H. J., Dutch, N., Lopez, S., & Tiapula, S. (2008, September). *Prosecuting human trafficking cases: Lessons learned and promising practices*. Retrieved March 1, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/>

Cockbain, E., & Wortley, R. (2015). Everyday atrocities: Does internal (domestic) sex trafficking of British children satisfy the expectations of opportunity theories of crime? *Crime Science*, 4(1), 1-12. doi:10.1186/s40163-015-0047-0

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), 588-608.

Countryman-Roswurm, K., & Bolin, B. L. (2014). Domestic minor sex trafficking: Assessing and reducing risk. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal* 31(6), 521–538. doi:10.1007/s10560-014-0336-6

Dank, M., Khan, B., Downey, M., Kotonias, C., Mayer, D., Owens, C., & Yu, L. (2014). *Estimating the size and structure of the underground commercial sex economy in eight major US cities*. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/413047-Estimating-the-Size-and-Structure-of-the-Underground-Commercial-Sex-Economy-in-Eight-Major-US-Cities.PDF>

David, F. (2008). Trafficking of women for sexual purposes. *Australian Institute of Criminology Research and Public Policy Series No. 95*. Retrieved from http://www.aic.gov.au/media_library/publications/rpp/95/rpp095.pdf

Edberg, M. C., Gies, S. V., Cohen, M. I., & May-Slater, S. (2014). Trajectories of involvement in commercial sex exploitation and domestic trafficking of girls and young women: Selected qualitative results from an evaluation study. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, 9(2), 89-110.

Fang, X., Brown, D.S., Florence, C.S., and Mercy, J.A. (2012). The economic burden of child maltreatment in the United States and implications for prevention. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 36(2), 156-165.

Farrell, A. (2009). *Understanding the determinants of police identification in human trafficking cases*. Paper presented at the First Annual Interdisciplinary Conference on Human Trafficking, Lincoln, NE.

Farrell, A., McDevitt, J., & Fahy, S. (2010). Where are all the victims? Understanding the determinants of official identification of human trafficking incidents. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 9(2), 201-233. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2010.00621.x

Fedina, L., Williamson, C., & Perdue, T. (2016). Risk factors for domestic child sex trafficking in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0886260516662306

Felson, M., & Clarke, R. V. (1998). *Opportunity makes the thief: Practical theory form crime prevention*. Police Research Series Paper 98. London: Home Office.

Ferguson, K. M., Bender, K., Thompson, S., Xie, B., & Pollio, D. (2011). Correlates of street survival behaviors in homeless young adults in four U.S. Cities. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 81(3), 401-409. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01108.x

Gibbs, D. A., Hardison Walters, J. L., Lutnick, A., Miller, S., & Kluckman, M. (2015). Services to domestic minor victims of sex trafficking: Opportunities for Engagement and support. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 54, 1–7.

Greene, J. M., Ennett, S. T., & Ringwalt, C. L. (1999). Prevalence and correlates of survival sex among runaway and homeless youth. *American Journal of Public Health*, 89(9), 1406-1409.

Greve, A. (2014). *The controversies behind safe harbor*. Retrieved from: www.humantraffickingcenter.org/blog

Guerette, R. T., & Santana, S. A. (2010). Explaining victim self-protective behavior effects on crime incident outcomes: A test of opportunity theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, 56(2), 198-226. doi:10.1177/0011128707311644

Halcon, L. L., & Lifson, A. R. (2004, February). Prevalence and predictors of sexual risks among homeless youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(1), 71-80.

Hammer, H., Finkelhor, D., Sedlak, A. J., & Porcellini, L. E. (2002). *National incidence studies of missing, abducted, runaway, and thrownaway children: National estimates of missing children: Selected trends, 1988-1999*. PsysEXTRA Dataset. doi:10.1037/e401072005-001

Hodge, D. R. (2014). Assisting victims of human trafficking: Strategies to facilitate identification, exit from trafficking, and the restoration of wellness. *Social Work*, 59(2), 111-118. doi:10.1093/sw/swu002

Holger-Ambrose, B., Langmade, C., Edinburgh, L. D., & Saewyc, E. (2013). The illusions and juxtapositions of commercial sexual exploitation among youth: identifying effective street-outreach strategies. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 22(3), 326–40. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2013.737443>

Hossain, M., Zimmerman, C., Abas, M., Light, M., & Watts, C. (2010). The relationship of trauma to mental disorders among trafficked and sexually exploited girls and women. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100, 2442-2449.

Hu, H., Chiu, S., Cheng, C., & Yen, T. (2011). Applying the IPA and DEMATEL models to improve the order-winner criteria: A case study of Taiwan's network communication equipment manufacturing industry. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(8), 9674-9683. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2011.01.147

International Labour Organization. (2012). *Hard to see, harder to count: Survey guidelines to estimate forced labour of adults and children*. Retrieved from <http://un-act.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Harder-to-See-Harder-to-Count.pdf>

International Labour Office. (2012). *ILO global estimate of forced labour 2012: Results and methodology*. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/WCMS_182004/lang--en/index.htm

Kennedy, M. A., Klein, C., Bristowe, J. T. K., Cooper, B. S., & Yuille, J. C. (2007). Routes of recruitment: Pimps' techniques and other circumstances that lead to street prostitution. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 15(2), 1-19. doi:10.1300/J146v15n02

Knight, S. (2002). Children abused through prostitution. *Emergency Nurse*, 10(4), 27-30. doi:10.7748/en2002.07.10.4.27.c1069

Lemieux, C., Thompson, J. L., Dawson, J., Schuster, R. M. (2013). Natural resource manager perceptions of agency performance on climate change. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 114(15), 178-189.

Lu, D., Ertek, G., & Betts, A. (2014). Modeling the supply chain perception gaps. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 71(1), 731-751. doi:10.1007/s00170-013-5504-x

Lutnick, A. (2016). *Domestic minor sex trafficking: The disconnect between research and legislation*. Paper presentation at the Society for Social Work Research, Washington, D.C.

Lutya, T. M. & Lanier, M. (2012). An integrated theoretical framework to describe human trafficking of young woman and girls for involuntary prostitution. In J. Maddock (Eds.), *Public Health: Social and Behavioral Health*. Retrieved from <http://www.intechopen.com/books/public-health-social-and-behavioral-health/an-intergrated-theoretical-framework-to-describe-human-trafficking-of-young-women-and-girls-for-invo>

Marcus, A., Horning, A., Curtis, R., Sanson, J., & Thompson, E. (2014). Conflict and agency among sex workers and pimps: A closer look at domestic minor sex trafficking. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 653(1), 225-246. doi:10.1177/0002716214521993

Martin, L., & Lotspeich, R. (2014). A benefit-cost framework for early intervention to prevent sex trading. *Journal of Benefit Cost Analysis*, 5(1); 43-87.

- Martin, M., Champeau, H., Ullirch, S., Johnson, A., Cardarell, K. (2016). *Experiences of youth in the sex trade in North Texas: Shattered lives*. Retrieved from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/Dallas_0.pdf
- Meier, R. F., & Miethe, T. D. (1993). Understanding theories of criminal victimization. *Crime and Justice*, 17, 459-499. doi:10.1086/4492
- Meng, G., & Coursen-Neff, Z. (2012). *Cultivating fear: The vulnerability of immigrant farmworkers in the US to sexual violence and sexual harassment*. Human Rights Watch. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/report/2012/05/15/cultivating-fear/vulnerability-immigrant-farmworkers-us-sexual-violence-and-sexual>
- Mones, C. (2011). *Domestic sex trafficking the struggle to connect girls to services* (Unpublished bachelor's thesis). Brown University, Providence, RI. Retrieved from <https://dev11980.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/cara-mones-final-thesis.pdf>
- Morris, S., Cassidy, J., Parker, A., Joshi, S., Malik, A., Melfi, D. (2015). *The freedom ecosystem: How the power of partnership can help stop modern slavery*. Retrieved from <https://dupress.deloitte.com/dup-us-en/topics/social-impact/freedom-ecosystem-stop-modern-slavery.html>
- Muftic, L.R. & Finn, M.A. (2013). Health outcomes among women trafficked for sex in the United States: A closer look. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(9), 1859-1885.
- Muslim, A., Labriola, M., & Rempel, M. (2008). *The commercial sexual exploitation of children in New York City, Volume 2*. Center for Court Innovation & John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/225083.pdf>
- Newton, P. J., Mulcahy, T. M., & Martin, E. (2008). *Finding victims of human trafficking*. National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/224393.pdf>
- Office of the Attorney General. (2013). *Report to the Texas legislature, sexually oriented businesses, and human trafficking: Associations, challenges, and approaches*. Retrieved from https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/agency/20131912_htr_fin_3.pdf
- Office of the Attorney General. (2012). *The Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force Report to the Texas Legislature*. Retrieved from https://texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/cj/20121912_htr_fin_3.pdf
- Office of the Attorney General. (2016). *The Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force Report to the Texas Legislature*. Retrieved from https://texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/agency/20162911_htr_fin.pdf
- Owens, C., Dank, M., Breau, J., Bañuelos, I., Farrell, A., Pfeffer, R., & McDevitt, J. (2014). *Understanding the organization, operation, and victimization process of labor trafficking in the*

- United States. Urban Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/413249-Understanding-the-Organization-Operation-and-Victimization-Process-of-Labor-Trafficking-in-the-United-States.PDF>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41.
- Polaris Project. (2014). *Shelter beds for human trafficking survivors in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Shelter-Beds-For-Human-Trafficking-Survivors.pdf>
- Reid, J.A. (2012). Exploratory review of route-specific, gendered, and age-graded dynamics of exploitation: Applying life course theory to victimization in sex trafficking in North America. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 257-271.
- Reid, J. A., & Piquero, A. R. (2013). Age-graded risks for commercial sexual exploitation of male and female youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(9), 1747-1777. doi:10.1177/0886260513511535
- Rood, S.A. & Dziadkowiec, J. (2013). Cross cultural service gap analysis: Comparing SERVQUAL customers and IPA mystery shoppers. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research* 16(4), 359-377.
- Salisbury, E. J., Dabney, J. D., & Russell, K. (2014). Diverting victims of commercial sexual exploitation from juvenile detention: Development of the InterCSECT screening protocol. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(7), 1247-1276. doi:10.1177/0886260514539846
- Santrić Milicevic, M. M., Bjegovic-Mikanovic, V. M., Terzic-Supić, Z. J., & Vasic, V. (2011). Competencies gap of management teams in primary health care. *European Journal of Public Health* 21(2), 247.
- Sedlak, A. , Finkelhor, D., Hammer H., & Schultz, D. (2002). *National estimates of missing children: An overview. National incidence studies of missing, abducted, runaway, and thrown away children*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Shamir, H. (2012). A Labor Paradigm for Human Trafficking. *UCLA Law Review*, 60(1), 76–136. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=83851149&site=ehost-live>
- Shared Hope International (2015). *About Us*. Retrieved from: www.sharedhope.org
- Shared Hope International. (2016). *2016 Protected Innocence Challenge: State report cards on the legal framework of protection for the Nation's children*. Retrieved from <https://sharedhope.org/what-we-do/bring-justice/reportcards/2016-reportcards/>

- Shively, M., Kliorys, K., Wheeler, K., & Hunt, D. (2012). *A national overview of prostitution and sex trafficking demand reduction*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/238796.pdf>
- Schellinck, T., & Brooks, M. (2014). Improving port effectiveness through determinance/performance gap analysis. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 41(4), 328-345. doi:10.1080/03088839.2013.809632
- Shively, M., McLaughlin, K., Durchslag, R., McDonough, H., Hunt, D., Kliorys, D., Nobo, C., Olsho, L., Davis, S., Collins, S., Houlihan, C., SAGE, Pfeffer, R., Corsi, J., & Mauch, D. (2010). *Developing a National Action Plan for Eliminating Sex Trafficking: Final Report*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.
- Simich, L., Goyen, L., Mallozzi, K. (2014). *Improving human trafficking victim identification: Validation and dissemination of a screening tool*. Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/246712.pdf>
- Small, K. M., Adams, W., Owens, C., & Roland, K. (2008). *An analysis of federally prosecuted commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC): Cases since the passage of the victims of trafficking and violence protection act of 2000*. Urban Institute. Retrieved from www.urban.org/research/publication/analysis-federally-prosecuted-commercial-sexual-exploitation-children-csec-cases-passage-victims-trafficking-and-violence-protection-act-2000
- Smith, H. M. (2010). Sex trafficking: Trends, challenges, and the limitations of international law. *Human Rights Review*, 12(3), 271–286. doi:10.1007/s12142-010-0185-4
- Smith, L. A., Healy Vardaman, S., & Snow, M.A. (2009). The National report on domestic minor sex trafficking: America's prostituted children. Retrieved from www.sharedhope.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/SHI_National_Report_on_DMST_2009.pdf
- Solorio, M. R., Rosenthal, D., Milburn, N. G., Weiss, R. E., Batterham, P. J., Gandara, M., & Rotheram-Borus, M. (2008). Predictors of sexual risk behaviors among newly homeless youth: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 42, 401-409. doi:10.1037/e456032008-004
- Stoltz, J. M., Shannon, K., Kerr, T., Zhang, R., Montaner, J. S., & Wood, E. (2007). Associations between childhood maltreatment and sex work in a cohort of drug-using youth. *Social Science & Medicine*, 65, 1214-1221.
- Stransky, M., & Finkelhor, D. (2008). How many juveniles are involved in prostitution in the U.S.? Crimes against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire. Retrieved from http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/CV279_Revised_Sex_Trafficking_Bulletin.pdf
- Swaner, R., Labriola, M., Rempel, M., Walker, A., & Spadafore, J. (2016). *Youth involvement in the sex trade: A national study*. Retrieved from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/Youth%20Involvement%20in%20the%20Sex%20Trade_3.pdf

Terrell, N. E. (1997). Street life: Aggravated and sexual assaults among homeless and runaway adolescents. *Youth & Society*, 28(3), 267-290.

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs. (2006). *Migrant labor housing facilities in Texas: A report on the quantity, availability, need, and quality of migrant labor housing in the state*. Retrieved from <https://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/migrant-housing/docs/06-MLHfacilities.pdf>

Texas Juvenile Justice Department. (2015). *Community juvenile justice appropriations, riders, and special diversion programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.tjjd.texas.gov/publications/reports/AnnualReportFundingandRiders2015.pdf>

Twill, S.E., Green, D.M., & Traylor, A. (2010). A descriptive study on sexually exploited children in residential treatment. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 39, 187-199.

Tyler, K. A. (2009). Risk factors for trading sex among homeless young adults. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 290-297.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2008). *An introduction to human trafficking: Vulnerability, impact and action*. Retrieved from http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/An_Introduction_to_Human_Trafficking_-_Background_Paper.pdf

U.S. Department of State. (2013). *Trafficking in persons report*. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/210737.pdf>

U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development, Office of Community Planning and Development. (2015). *The 2015 annual homeless assessment report (AHAR) to Congress*. Retrieved from <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/2015-AHAR-Part-1.pdf>

Verité. (2015). *Strengthening protections against trafficking in persons in federal and corporate supply chains*. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/237137.pdf>

Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, 22 U.S.C. §§ 7102 101-113 (2000).

Waugh, I. (2010). Examining the sexual harassment experiences of Mexican immigrant farmworking women. *Violence Against Women*, 16(3), 237-261. doi: 10.1177/1077801209360857

Weitzer, R. (2011). Sex trafficking and the sex industry: The need for evidence-based theory and legislation. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 101(4), 1337-1369.

Wheaton, E. M., Schauer, E. J., & Galli, T. V. (2010). Economics of human trafficking. *International Migration*, 48(4), 114-141. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00592.x

Yates, G. L., Mackenzie, R. G., Pennbridge, J., & Swofford, A. (1991). A risk profile comparison of homeless youth involved in prostitution and homeless youth not involved. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 12, 545-548. Texas Department of Family & Protective Services Annual

Report and Data Book. Retrieved from
https://www.dfps.state.tx.us/About_DFPS/Data_Books_and_Annual_Reports/

Zhang, S. X. (2012). Measuring labor trafficking: a research note. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 58(4), 469–482. doi:10.1007/s10611-012-9393-y

Zhang, S. X., Spiller, M. W., Finch, B. K., & Qin, Y. (2014). Estimating labor trafficking among unauthorized migrant workers in San Diego. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 653(1), 65–86. doi:10.1177/0002716213519237

Appendix A: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Are the research findings based on empirical knowledge, and how were prevalence and economic impact calculated?

The findings were derived using a qualitative and quantitative mixed-methods approach. Primary and secondary data collection efforts, including but not limited to queries of existing databases, interviews, focus groups, and web-based surveys, were employed to quantify the prevalence and economic impact of human trafficking in Texas. Higher-than-average-risk industry and community segments are groups of people considered to be at elevated risk of trafficking because of risk indicators found in trafficking cases (e.g. homeless or runaway youth, workers in sectors that are characterized by hazardous activity or that involve low skill or migrant workers).

Why doesn't the report simply count cases of human trafficking in Texas that are in the criminal justice system?

Because human trafficking is an under-reported “hidden crime” whose victims are often hard to identify and reluctant to come forward, the risk-assessment approach expands our perspective beyond cases already in the law enforcement system by producing an estimate of expected levels of trafficking. The “iceberg” metaphor is used to convey the idea that reported cases of sex and labor trafficking are only a small fraction of the crime that is actually occurring. This expectation is based on empirically derived evidence that the risk of trafficking in an industry or community segment can be coupled with an assessment of the risk of victimization for an individual member of that segment.

Could there really be 313,000 victims of trafficking in Texas?

This initial conservative benchmark provides an opportunity for educating stakeholders and community members about the true nature of human trafficking in Texas. The perceived “invisibility” of human trafficking has led to many myths and misconceptions about the issue, including that it does not occur with high frequency or is not “our problem.” From interviews with victims, we know that in most instances, trafficking victims experience episodes of victimization and are not trapped in a trafficking situation for months or years at a time. The empirical grounding behind our estimation of 313,000 victims helps dispel those misconceptions and highlights how human trafficking intersects directly with other more visible forms of sexual violence, exploitation, and commerce in Texas.

Are there other community segments that could be included in the estimation of prevalence?

Yes. For the initial benchmarks, however, we identified only segments that are easily quantified and mutually exclusive. For instance, the number of adult sex trafficking victims is currently unknown because of a lack of data about the size of relevant at-risk population segments. In addition, we selected the highest risk segments we could find to be able to perform estimates in the most conservative way possible. Other labor-sector examples of hard-to-estimate populations would include domestic work, begging rings, and massage parlors.

What went into calculation of expected economic impacts incurred by both society and trafficking victims?

For sex trafficking victims, we used an estimate of lifetime impacts such as mental and physical health costs incurred by victims, burdens on the public health system, law enforcement expenses, consumption of shelter and associated services, and lost tax revenue. For labor trafficking victims, we used an annual estimate of lost wages.

Why should the prevalence numbers and economic impacts contained in the report be considered “benchmarks”?

Data and statistics on trafficking are limited and difficult to collect. Data presented here should be considered preliminary and will allow policymakers and community leaders to measure progress in their fight against trafficking in Texas, even if the scope of the crime expands in the future to include additional vulnerable population segments and economic sectors. Human trafficking is a complex crime that impacts a wide variety of survivors, traffickers, professionals, and communities. As each piece of the puzzle moves, we gain perspective on a new and different angle of the crime of human trafficking. Furthermore, elements of the crime are fluid and dynamic, resulting in continuous reconfiguration of the puzzle. This research attempts to gain better images of what the puzzle looks like when it is turned and when those pieces shift. As data related to our understanding of the economic impact and the scope of trafficking increase, so will the dimensions, descriptions, and understanding of the 3-D puzzle of trafficking as it operates in Texas.

What are some of the biggest challenges to collecting more information about the prevalence of human trafficking in Texas?

In addition to the learning presented thus far, we have also detailed some challenges to researching human trafficking, such as severely limited access to law enforcement data, victims continuing to slip through the cracks because identification is such a difficult issue to tackle, and the inability of professionals to quantify costs to provide care to victims and survivors of human trafficking. These challenges, among others, are not unique to Texas and will continue to guide our research activities. In other words, a key component of this work is to identify gaps and work toward better understanding *how* to fill those gaps with knowledge and understanding.

In light of these findings, what recommendations does the study contain on how to prevent human trafficking in Texas?

IV. Increase investigation and prosecution of traffickers. In general, there are several reasons that the rates of investigation and prosecution of human trafficking cases are low, including: 1) a lack of precedence and case law, 2) victim reluctance to testify, 3) a lack of institutional infrastructure, and 4) a lack of training for investigators and prosecutors on how to investigate and litigate human trafficking cases. The ultimate vision is for law enforcement to preempt strategies used by traffickers so that incidence rates of human trafficking decline. The first step toward this goal is to gain a better understanding of how to increase the success of law enforcement, including its role in the prosecution of trafficking cases. The research team is conducting a survey among prosecutors and

investigators of human trafficking cases to gain insights that improve outcomes on those cases. Our initial efforts focus on minor and youth sex trafficking because of the higher number of available cases.

- V. Identify more victims and increase our understanding of how they became victims. During phase 2, the Working Group and the research team will finalize a Screening Starter Pack containing a more in-depth, validated screening tool for professionals who treat victims. Such a screening tool would include a scaled assessment of risk and allow the development of better estimates of the most vulnerable, at-risk populations.
- VI. Expand our understanding of traffickers themselves. The methods and strategies used by traffickers, as well as their attempts to evade law enforcement, are dynamic and ever-changing; any attempt to pin down trafficker typologies must be open to continuous exploration and analysis. In this vein, the research will continue to review and refine the typologies of traffickers in operation in Texas.

Appendix B: Resources

Below are some useful resources for accessing policy, funding, training, and other human trafficking initiatives. This list is in no way exhaustive and inclusion on this list is not an endorsement of a specific organization or viewpoint. This list does not include social service providers in Texas and is not intended to be a directory of service providers. The intention of this list is strictly to provide additional resources for further learning.

The Abolition Seminar: www.abolitionseminar.org

Allies Against Slavery: www.alliesagainstsavery.org

The Attorney General of Texas: www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/cj/human-trafficking

Coalition of Immokalee Workers: www.ciw-online.org

Child Welfare Information Gateway through Health and Human Services Children's Bureau:
<https://capacity.childwelfare.gov/states/focus-areas/preventing-sex-trafficking/>

Fair Food Program: www.fairfoodprogram.org

Fair Trade USA: www.fairtradeusa.org

Free the Slaves: www.freetheslaves.net

GEMS Girls Education and Mentoring Services: www.gems-girls.org

Human Trafficking Data through Texas Christian University: www.humantraffickingdata.org

Human Trafficking Index through the Human Trafficking Center at the University of Denver:
<http://humantraffickingcenter.org/research/human-trafficking-index/>

Human Trafficking Knowledge Portal through United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC]: www.unodc.org/cld

The Human Trafficking Pro Bono Legal Center: www.htprobono.org

Historians Against Slavery: www.historiansagainstsavery.org

International Organization for Migration: Counter-Trafficking: www.iom.int

International Labour Organization: www.ilo.org

Made in a Free World: www.madeinafreeworld.com

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children [NCMEC]: www.missingkids.org

National Guestworker Alliance: www.guestworkeralliance.org

National Human Trafficking Hotline operated by Polaris: www.humantraffickinghotline.org

Polaris: www.polarisproject.org

Porn Harms Research through The National Center on Sexual Exploitation [NCOSE]:
www.pornharmsresearch.com

Responsible Sourcing Tool: www.responsiblesourcingtool.org

Sex + Money: A National Search for Human Worth: *Documentary*

Shared Hope International: www.sharedhope.org

Slavery Footprint: www.slaveryfootprint.org

Slavery Out of the Shadows: Spotlight on Human Trafficking: *Documentary*

Southern Poverty Law Center: www.splcenter.org

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA]: www.samhsa.gov
 (concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach)

The Texas Association for the Protection of Children [TexProtects]: www.texprotects.org

Texas Association Against Sexual Assault [TAASA]: <http://taasa.org/>

Trafficking Victim Identification Tool [TVIT] through VERA Institute of Justice: Currently an archived report; you can locate through any search engine.

Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2013: Title XII of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013

United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights:
<http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>

UNHCR (2008). Refugee Protection and Human Trafficking: www.unhcr.org/trafficking

UNICEF: www.unicef.org

University of North Carolina Human Trafficking Database:
<http://humantrafficking.unc.edu/resources/>

United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking: www.ungift.org

Urban Institute Human Trafficking Research Portfolio: www.urban.org/policy-centers/justice-policy-center/projects/human-trafficking-research-portfolio

U.S. Department of Labor, List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor:
www.dol.gov/ilab/reports/child-labor/list-of-goods

U.S. Department of State, Trafficking in Persons [TIP] Report:
www.state.gov/g/tip/rls/tiprpt/2015

Walk Free: www.walkfree.org

Appendix C: Definitions detailed in Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000

Federal Anti-Trafficking Laws: Summary from National Human Trafficking Hotline

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 is the first comprehensive federal law to address trafficking in persons. The law provides a three-pronged approach that includes prevention, protection, and prosecution. The TVPA was reauthorized through the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) of 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2013.

Under U.S. federal law, “severe forms of trafficking in persons” includes both sex trafficking and labor trafficking:

Sex trafficking is the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a person for the purposes of a commercial sex act, in which the commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such an act has not attained 18 years of age (22 USC § 7102).

Labor trafficking is the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purposes of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery, (22 USC § 7102).

Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(2) COERCION.—The term “coercion” means—

- (A) threats of serious harm to or physical restraint against any person;
- (B) any scheme, plan, or pattern intended to cause a person to believe that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm to or physical restraint against any person; or
- (C) the abuse or threatened abuse of the legal process.

(3) COMMERCIAL SEX ACT.—The term “commercial sex act” means any sex act on account of which anything of value is given to or received by any person.

(4) DEBT BONDAGE.—The term “debt bondage” means the status or condition of a debtor arising from a pledge by the debtor of his or her personal services or of those of a person under his or her control as a security for debt, if the value of those services as reasonably assessed is not applied toward the liquidation of the debt or the length and nature of those services are not respectively limited and defined.

(5) INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE.—The term “involuntary servitude” includes a condition of servitude induced by means of—

(A) any scheme, plan, or pattern intended to cause a person to believe that, if the person did not enter into or continue in such condition, that person or another person would suffer serious harm or physical restraint; or

(B) the abuse or threatened abuse of the legal process.

(8) SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term “severe forms of trafficking in persons” means—

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

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

(9) SEX TRAFFICKING.—The term “sex trafficking” means the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act.

(13) VICTIM OF A SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term “victim of a severe form of trafficking” means a person subject to an act or practice described in paragraph (8).

(14) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term “victim of trafficking” means a person subjected to an act or practice described in paragraph (8) or (9).

Appendix D: DPS Offense Codes Related to Human Trafficking

KIDNAPPING (1099)

10990001	KIDNAPPING
10990002	AGREEMENT TO ABDUCT FROM CUSTODY
10990003	AGG KIDNAPPING RELEASE VICTIM SAFEPLACE
10990004	AGG KIDNAPPING
10990007	AGG KIDNAPPING FOR RANSOM/REWARD
10990008	AGG KIDNAPPING FOR RANSOM/REWARD SAFE RELEASE
10990009	AGG KIDNAPPING USE AS SHIELD/HOSTAGE
10990010	AGG KIDNAPPING USE AS SHIELD/HOSTAGE SAFE RELEASE
10990011	AGG KIDNAPPING FACILITATE
10990012	AGG KIDNAPPING FACILITATE SAFE RELEASE
10990013	AGG KIDNAPPING BI/SEXUAL ABUSE
10990014	AGG KIDNAPPING BI/SEXUAL ABUSE SAFE RELEASE
10990015	AGG KIDNAPPING TERRORIZE
10990016	AGG KIDNAPPING TERRORIZE SAFE RELEASE
10990017	AGG KIDNAPPING INTERFERE PERFORMANCE
10990018	AGG KIDNAPPING INTERFERE PERFORMANCE SAFE RELEASE

SEXUAL ASSAULT (1199)

11990001	SEXUAL ASSAULT
11990002	SEXUAL ASSAULT CHILD
11990003	AGG SEXUAL ASSAULT
11990004	AGG SEXUAL ASSAULT CHILD
11990006	AGG SEXUAL ASSAULT OF ELDERLY/DISABLED PERSON
11990008	IMPROPER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATOR/STUDENT
11990009	SEXUAL ASSLT PROH/PURPORT SPOUSE
11990010	SEXUAL ASSLT PROH/PURPORT SPOUSE UNDER 14YOA
11990012	SEX ABUSE OF CHILD CONTINUOUS: VICTIM UNDER 14
11990013	SEXUAL CONT/INTERCOURSE W/PERSON TYC/ST FAC

SEX OFFENSES (36...)

36010001	INDECENCY W/CHILD SEXUAL CONTACT
36990002	PROH SEXUAL CONDUCT
36990003	FAIL TO REPORT AGG SEXUAL ASSLT OF CHILD
36990005	SEX OFFENDERS FAILURE TO COMPLY/CIVIL
36990011	PROH OWN/OPERATE/MANAGE BUSINESS BY SEX OFFENDER
36990012	FAILURE TO REPORT FELONY W/SBI OR DEATH RESULTS
36990013	INDECENCY W/A CHILD EXPOSES
36990014	SEXUAL PERFORM CHILD EMPLOY INDUCE/AUTHORIZE
36990015	SEXUAL PERFORM CHILD PRODUCE/DIRECT/PROMOTE
36990020	PROH SEXUAL CONDUCT WITH ANCESTOR/DESCENDANT

36990022 ONLINE SOLICIT OF A MINOR
 36990023 ONLINE SOLICITATION OF A MINOR UNDER 14
 36990024 ONLINE SOLICIT OF A MINOR SEXUAL CONDUCT
 36990025 SEXUAL PERF BY CHILD <14YRS EMPLOY/DIR/PROMO
 36990026 SEXUAL PERF BY CHILD <14 YRS PRODUCE/DIR/PROMO
 36990028 IMPROPER PHOTOGRAPHY OR VISUAL RECORDING
 36990029 IMPROPER PHOTO/VIDEO BATH/DRESS RM

OBSCENITY (37...)

37040001 POSS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY
 37040002 POSS W/INT TO PROMOTE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY
 37040007 POSS CERTAIN VIS MAT PREV CONV
 37040008 POSS CERTAIN VIS MAT 2+ CONV
 37050001 PROMOTE CERTAIN VIS MAT: HARASS/PREV CONV
 37050002 PROMOTE CERTAIN VIS MAT:1+ HARASS/2+ CONV
 37050003 OBSCENE WHOLESALE PROMOTION
 37990002 OBSCENE PROMOTE/PRODUCE/DIRECT
 37990003 TECHNICIAN INTENTIONALLY FAIL TO REPORT IMAGE
 37990004 SALE/DISTR/DISPLAY HARMFUL MATERIAL TO MINOR
 37990005 USES MINOR SELL/DISTR/DISPLAY HARMF MATERIAL

COMMERCIAL SEX OFFENSES (40...)

40020003 PROMOTE PROSTITUTION
 40020004 PROMOTE PROSTITUTION W/PREV CONV
 40020005 PROMOTE PROSTITUTION OF < 18 YOA PERSON
 40020006 AGG PROMOTION OF PROSTITUTION
 40020007 AGG PROMOTION OF PROSTITUTION PERSON/S < 18YOA
 40040007 COMPELLING PROSTITUTION UNDER AGE 18
 40040008 COMPELLING PROST BY FORCE/THREAT/FRAUD
 40040009 PROSTITUTION
 40040010 PROSTITUTION WITH ONE/TWO PREV CONVICT
 40040011 PROSTITUTION W/3RD OR MORE
 40040014 PROSTITUTION SOLICIT PERSON < 18 YOA
 40990001 ENFORCE MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY REGULATION
 40990002 EMPLOY HARMFUL TO CHILDREN
 40990003 EMPLOY HARMFUL TO CHILDREN < 14 YOA

SMUGGLING (58...)

- 58990002 TRAFFICKING OF PERSON
- 58990004 TRAFFICKING A PERSON CAUSING DEATH
- 58990005 TRAFFIC OF PERSONS <18 PROST/FORCED LABOR
- 58990006 SMUGGLING OF PERSONS
- 58990007 SMUGGLING OF PERSONS: MONETARY GAIN
- 58990008 SMUGGLING OF PERSONS: SBI OR DEATH
- 58990009 TRAFFICKING OF PERSONS: CONTINUOUS
- 58990010 TRAFFICKING PERSON ENGAGE CONDUCT/SEXUAL
- 58990011 TRAFFICKING PERSON ENGAGE CONDUCT/SEX/BENEFIT
- 58990012 TRAFFICKING CHILD WITH INTENT FORCED LABOR
- 58990013 TRAFFICK A CHILD W/INTENT FORCED LABOR BENEFIT
- 58990014 TRAFFICKING CHILD ENGAGE CONDUCT/SEXUAL
- 58990015 TRAFFICKING CHILD ENGAGE CONDUCT/SEX/BENEFIT

CRIMES AGAINST PERSON (7099)

- 70990045 HARBORING RUNAWAY CHILD
- 70990052 UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT: EXPOSE TO SBI
- 70990058 UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT
- 70990059 UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT LESS THAN 17 YRS OF AGE
- 70990066 USE OF CHILD FOR SALES/SOLICITATION

MORALS – DECENCY CRIMES (7299)

- 72990005 ENTICING A CHILD
- 72990017 SALE OR PURCHASE OF CHILD
- 72990018 ADVERTISING PLACEMENT OF CHILD
- 72990019 ADVERTISING PLACEMENT OF CHILD W/PREV CONVICT
- 72990024 ENTICING A CHILD W/INT FELONY
- 72990031 SELL OR PURCHASE CHILD FOR SEXUAL PERFORMANCE

Appendix E: Secondary Sources in Support of Victimization Rate

Youth Involvement in Sex Trade – Swaner, Labriola, Rempel, Walker, Spadafore (2016)

Total sample size n= 949 from national study (six sites)

At some point in their lives: 80% met legal definition of trafficking*

**had a pimp or, in most cases, because they were < 18 yo when they first traded sex*

At time of interview: 32% met legal definition of trafficking

Dallas participants, n=78; 88% respondents had been arrested for a crime; 19% had been arrested for prostitution in the last year; Eligibility of participants, age range 13-24 years

The BELL Measure of Homeless/Street Youth – McDonald, A. R., & Laser Maira, J. A. (2016)

Total sample size n=101 from Colorado study (three suburban shelters across the Colorado front-range).

Includes youth ages 12-24 years: 28% acknowledged involvement in commercial sex*

**trading/selling sex as primary source of support, exchange of sex for a favor for a partner, trading/selling sex money, clothes, food, drugs, phones, or electronics*

Risk factors for trading sex among homeless young adults - Kimberly A. Tyler (2009)

Total sample size: n=151

Homeless GLB population: 29.2% who traded sex n=24

Homeless male: 11.5% who traded sex n=96

Homeless female: 20% who traded sex n=55

Homeless and have been sexually abused: 21.1% who traded sex n=71

Prevalence and correlates of survival sex among runaway and homeless youth – Greene, Ennett, & Ringwalt (1999)

Prevalence and correlates of survival sex among runaway and homeless youth

Street male: 28.2 %

Shelter male: 11.1 %

Street female: 26.3%

Shelter female: 8.3 %

Overall survival sex among shelter and street youth was 27.5%.

Associations between childhood maltreatment and sex work in a cohort of drug-using youth - Stoltz, J.-A. M., Shannon, K., Kerr, T., Zhang, R., Montaner, J. S., & Wood, E. (2007)

"Between September 2005 and June 2006, 361 street-involved youth were recruited into the ARYS cohort. The mean age of the sample was 22 (Interquartile range 20.3-24.1); 106 (29%) were female, and 86 (24%) were Aboriginal."

"Eighty-four (23%) of the participants reported trading sex for money or gifts at least once in their lives."

Hepatitis B and C infections among homeless adolescents – Beech, Myers, & Beech (2002)

“Thirty-six percent of homeless youth indicated exchanging sex for food, shelter, or drugs.”

A risk comparison of homeless youth involved in prostitution and homeless youth not involved – Yates et al. (1991)

“Of these youth, 153 (25%) revealed to their health care providers that they were involved in prostitution at the time of visit.”

Aggravated and sexual assaults among homeless and runaway adolescents – Terrell (1997)

Total sample: 240

“Thirty-six point six percent (male and female) of homeless youth were propositioned for sexual favors.”


“Twenty point seven percent (male and female) of homeless youth were sexually assaulted.”

Appendix F: Gaps Analysis

Summary

During the summer of 2016, the Texas Slavery Mapping Project research team collaborated with the Child Sex Trafficking Team (CSTT) from the Office of the Governor's Criminal Justice Department to research the support systems available to victims and survivors of child sex trafficking. Themes arose from discussions that spanned across service systems. The Social Ecological Model (SEM) provides a framework for understanding the way in which the themes impact the overall processes of service provision. In particular, three levels of the SEM will be used to present the information: 1) Macro – policy and infrastructure, 2) Mezzo – service providers, organizations, and social institutions, 3) Micro – the individual. Themes provide a more comprehensive explanation of the infrastructure of services available to victims.

As this was a mixed-methods project, with both focus groups and individual surveys, a deeper analysis is necessary to assess depths and perspectives of all responses provided. This is a brief analysis of primary findings. Further analyses of all data will continue in order to fully assess respondents' perceptions.



Purpose

The focus groups expanded our knowledge about professional stakeholders' perceived gaps in services that are currently available to child victims of human trafficking and exploitation. Discussion focused on challenges in investigating and prosecuting cases, emergency placement or housing challenges, geographic hot spots of trafficking (if known), and regional differences in services and identified challenges in providing services. Professionals working in the field of human trafficking identified gaps so that the CSTT can establish a request for grant applicants to fill identified gaps across the state. The Texas Slavery Mapping Project research team analyzed data collected from the focus groups to assess gaps in services and provide recommendations to the Office of the Governor around two primary research questions: What are perceived gaps in services? Where should services be placed across the state?

Participants/Methodology

Dates, locations, and number of participants is as follows.

DATE	CITY	LOCATION	PARTICIPANTS
June 17	Austin	Governor's Office	19
June 27 AM	Austin	Capitol Extension	21
June 27 PM	Austin	Capitol Extension	41
June 30	Austin	Center for Child Protection	26
n=			107

Regions represented: San Antonio, Amarillo/Lubbock, Rio Grande Valley, Corpus Christi, El Paso, Houston, Dallas, Austin, and other.

Service providers present: State/federal association, health/medical provider, law enforcement/criminal justice, NGO/direct service provider, and other.

Research Questions

In order to stimulate a more detailed, empirically grounded discussion, respondents were sent a set of background questions regarding their professional experience in working with victims prior to attending the focus group. The background questions focused on direct service provision to clients. Participants were asked to submit their responses before attending focus groups in part to allow the research team to review the range of responses, but also to allow participating organizations to gather those data ahead of time. Nearly one-third of the responses were returned before the focus groups occurred. Participants were asked about specific data points, as well as reflection on services to victims. Participants were informed that, for the purpose of this discussion, a "victim" referred to a child who is trafficked who is served by their agency. The following are sample questions.

1. How many child sex trafficking victims does your agency serve, confirm, or interact with per year?
2. How are victims identified (details about screening and identification tools, if applicable)?
3. What are your gaps in services, investigations, and prosecutions?
4. What is the estimated unit cost per victim per day used for budget planning?

Focus groups opened with presentations and the purpose of the groups. Facilitators presented topics to be reviewed, as well as research questions and information regarding the mapping project in a PowerPoint presentation before group discussion. Groups were guided by a discussion framework ranging in topics and themes. The following are sample questions and a discussion guide.

1. Regional differences – Talk “globally”; goal is to understand some geographic priorities
 - Segmented view of what you’re seeing around the state
 - Differences in what?
 - Intensity of the problem – victims
 - Typologies of victims – people tell us where vulnerable populations are; indications of “hotspots” of different segments by region. Who is the victim?
 - Identification – how do you identify victims?
 - Resources - move to understanding gaps
2. Gaps in services - walk people through the resources and services delivered by organization
 - a. What are you trying to do differently for human trafficking victims? E.g., how does service delivery to a runaway child who might be at low risk of human trafficking differ, if at all, to a runaway child?
 - As people say “it depends,” for example, a runaway child is at higher risk of trafficking if s/he was abused at home
 - b. Cost of services?
 - Unit cost/day /victim to provide holistic services?
 - What’s included? What’s not included?
 - What should the cost be based on what we know is or isn’t included? This could be due to length of time of services or what is offered and *which* services are offered
 - Flipchart – an example of unit cost/day/victim

Findings Overview

Overall, groups stated that reliable and confirmable data were the biggest gaps in knowing, understanding, and responding to human trafficking in Texas. Housing and shelter (addressed in

macro) was the most discussed issue, with differing perspectives voiced about the types of shelter needed, the location of shelters (urban vs. rural), and the services provided.

Misidentification of victims was the most prevalent theme across several issues faced by service providers. Regarding victim typology, respondents primarily voiced concerns about victims from foster care systems and familial trafficking, though those types were not said to be the most commonly seen in cases. Although certain types of victims have more uniform sets of needs, respondents couldn't say how they customize services for different types of victims.

Themes that arose during the discussion span several levels of system services. In particular, topics touched on the macro, mezzo, and micro levels of the Social Ecological Model (SEM) and will be presented as such in this report.

Macro-level findings

Macro-level themes address the needs of systems. These issues are affected by local, state, or national policies, as well as funding and resources. The themes that most frequently arose were misidentification of victims, funding and availability of services, and housing and shelter.

Misidentification of victims

Not identifying human trafficking as a form of interpersonal violence was seen as problematic as it is connected to other forms of violence and may be part of a cycle of violence for both victim and perpetrator. A feature of the cycle of interpersonal violence is that not only are victims misidentified, but so are offenders. Respondents anecdotally mentioned a series of domestic violence offenders who were involved in trafficking cases, but that the criminal justice system did not have information systems capable of connecting disparate but related pieces of evidence.

The law enforcement response can affect how victims are (mis)identified depending on how resources and focus are placed. Police and sheriff departments may create a human trafficking unit, but its focus might not span all kinds of trafficking. Examples given were if pimps who regularly traffic girls or have a usual set of victims might be investigated, while the larger massage parlor or store front trafficking may be the focus of an organized crime unit. Similarly, human trafficking units might only investigate smaller cases due to limited resources.

Criminalization of victims is another issue in the law enforcement response. Given that victims of sex trafficking are usually exploited in illicit terms or conditions, there is an increased chance that victims enter legal systems through a criminal act. In first engaging with law enforcement, victims are suspected of illegal activity.

Funding and availability of services

When working with child victims, available service provision is dependent on who is the trafficker. It is often assumed that Child Protective Services (CPS) will get involved on all cases of child endangerment, but they only have jurisdiction in cases of familial trafficking, where the trafficker is a parent or caregiver. CPS does not have jurisdiction over cases where the child's trafficker is a pimp, stranger, or someone outside of the family. In such cases, the victim is impacted by which services are available through other organizations or systems.

In instances where services are not available due to location, lack of funding, immigration status, or non-trafficking specific options, victims are often moved and their long-term care suffers. Service providers state that even when case management is available, victims may not stay in the location of identification and rescue. If a victim is moved out-of-county, to a rural area, or even out of state then the work, effort, rapport, and service initiation is void.

Respondents mentioned a lack of funding but a real need for forensic services including forensic exams and interviews. It was suggested that a well-trained forensic interviewer record such interviews in order to train others, such as is done with child sexual assault victims. A lack of testing, treatment, and care of sexually transmitted infections was also mentioned.

Housing and shelter

Perhaps the more immediate need addressed was housing for victims. Respondents mentioned little to no availability of short-term "safe houses" for victims of trafficking overall, and for child sex trafficking victims in particular. Once identified, victims do not have an initial place to go where they will be safe and where service providers can follow up with long-term care. For the few safe houses in existence in Texas, sustainability is an issue; the services are not helpful if the organizations close down. Respondents stated that this might be due to funding, as they stated that most availability of federal funding is for adults, not children.

Shelters and services meant for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault are increasingly seeing emergency placements, but those facilities often have little understanding of the situations or best practices in working with victims of trafficking, and very little support for servicing child sex trafficking victims in particular. Similarly, victims of child sex trafficking who are also foster kids, kids leaving the juvenile criminal justice system, or kids who have been arrested, often face confounded issues of shelter placement and a lack of funding for proper housing.

Though this need was mentioned often, specifics and priorities for the components of housing were lacking in discussion from respondents. Services offered at safe houses or shelters were discussed generally, but suggestions for which services or how they were offered at shelters were not given. Respondents did not have a general consensus on whether shelters should or should not be locked down.

Mezzo-level findings

Mezzo-level themes address the needs of the respondents, who were legal, medical, and social service providers. These issues deal with understanding victim needs and the development of services that impact the service provision processes and organizations. The themes that arose most often were training and burnout of the workforce.

Training

Several of the aforementioned themes addressed the need for training on how those issues affect service provision and impact victims. Overall, respondents felt that uniform training was lacking. Specifics and examples given were the following.

- Training for prosecution, especially for juvenile justice cases, is rare. Respondents stated that kids in the system tend to be stigmatized and may not have a standard face of victimology saying, “Delinquent youth don’t have the face of what prosecutors think of as a good witness.” Standard training for prosecution is needed on a statewide level and should, perhaps, even be mandatory. Judges also need to be included in uniform training and coordinated efforts in assisting victims.
- Healthcare professionals receive a lot of training and may be familiar with sexual assault, but not other types of violence; they may not understand the subtle indicators of sex trafficking. Without such training, opportunities for identification and effective care are slipping by.
- On top of uniform training, a centralized referral process is needed. There is a lack of coordinated efforts and a strong, established system of care and services.
- Service providers discussed hearing indicators of labor trafficking among potential sex trafficking victims. The need for and the importance of understanding broader exploitation and the intersection of sex and labor trafficking were addressed. Examples given were travelling sales crews being exploited for both labor and commercial sex.

Burnout and the workforce

A theme arising from metadata was burnout of the workforce, which was, though not explicitly addressed, discussed in terms of secondary trauma. Members of the research team stated hearing indicators of secondary trauma, burnout, and the need to retain a competent and experienced workforce. Respondents indicated being traumatized by the work and, as a result, professionals leaving the field. In other cases, respondents shared about working in their field, but may not have realized their own secondary trauma in connection with their cases. In sharing, respondents indicated having difficulty in screening all types of victims of human trafficking and being able to define them, while providing competent services and being able to evaluate those services. Recruiting competent professionals, retaining an experienced workforce, and identification of

secondary trauma and burnout are necessary in order to care for service providers, while providing the best care for victims.

Micro-level findings

Micro-level themes address the needs of victims. These are issues that impact the individual. The theme which most arose was victim-centered approaches in the service provision processes.

Victim-centered approaches

Discussion of services revealed general agreement that victim assistance and service processes need to be more trauma-informed and culturally grounded. The victims and their needs, which are not limited to the trafficking experience, should be at the center of these processes and solutions. The following are some examples mentioned of this lack of trauma-informed and culturally grounded care.

- Child sexual abuse separate from the sex trafficking experience is often seen as a causal relationship. Service providers stated that there is a correlation with their clients, but do not see it as causation. They stated, however, that there is a causal relationship between running away and being trafficked, since traffickers seek out vulnerable kids in the streets.
- Gaps exist across the life span and among different communities since developmental stages, gender, and sexual orientation may relate to resources that are available and stigmas that may apply. Without considering how these factors intersect and impact the client during the service processes, providers risk doing more harm.
- Translation continues to be an issue in service provision, especially with law enforcement, since they generally do not have the ability to fund a translation service or are responding to an emergency/crisis with limited time.

Gaps in service provision collectively contribute to the vulnerability and recidivism of victims and negatively affect their rescue and recovery processes.

Implications for Research

While the CSTT has identified initial priorities to build capacity, more research and analysis is necessary to continue to learn about the unmet needs of victims and service providers. There are 36 sets of responses to the background questions that were sent by invited participants. The human trafficking research team will continue reviewing and coding the data for a more detailed analysis of emerging themes. Also, the large size of the focus groups complicated a streamlined discussion and analysis of the results. Additional analysis of the responses to background questions may help clarify the findings covered in this report. For instance, further analysis of housing and shelter needs are necessary as we have learned that shelter is a need. But an

appropriate shelter for trafficking victims must be more than a safe house in order to fully offer effective and long-term care for victims. Continuation of the discussion with participants is also necessary in order to follow-up on the themes discussed here and those that will arise from the responses to the background questions. Field visits with respondents in different regions of Texas will be planned for more in-depth and mixed-methods surveys in order to address this need.

Appendix G: Research on Minor and Youth Sex Trafficking

Typologies	Title	Population Size from Data	Population being Described	Research to support connection to human trafficking
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	Child Maltreatment Annual Report	252,773	Children who received an investigation for maltreatment in Texas	Knight, S. (2002). CHILDREN ABUSED THROUGH PROSTITUTION. <i>Emergency Nurse</i> , 10(4), 27.
Child Abuse/Maltreatment		290,471	Children, alleged victims in CPS care	
Child Abuse/Maltreatment		65,334	Child Victims	
Child Abuse/Maltreatment		5,591	Child Victims with an alcohol abuse caregiver risk factor	Countryman-Roswurm and Bolin (2014) http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10560-014-0336-6
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	NCA CAC National Statistics	165,703	Number of children served at Children's Advocacy Centers January - June	Countryman-Roswurm and Bolin (2014) http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10560-014-0336-6
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	NCA CAC National Statistics	110,454	Children reported sexual abuse	Shively, M., McLaughlin, K., Durchslag, R., McDonough, H., Hunt, D., Kliorys, D., Nobo, C., Olsho, L., Davis, S., Collins, S., Houlihan, C., SAGE, Pfeffer, R., Corsi, J., & Mauch, D. (2010). "Developing a National Action Plan for Eliminating Sex Trafficking: Final Report." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	NCA CAC National Statistics	32,511	Children reported physical abuse	Knight, S. (2002). Children abused through prostitution. <i>Emergency Nurse</i> , 10(4), 27-30. doi:10.7748/en2002.07.10.4.27.c1069
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	NCA CAC National Statistics	15,135	Children served at a CAC in Texas	
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	NCA CAC National Statistics	11,317	Children with reported sexual abuse in Texas	
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	Sexual Violence Report	14,367	Teens ages 15 to 19 who sought medical treatment at a hospital for sexual assault	Knight, S. (2002). Children abused through prostitution. <i>Emergency Nurse</i> , 10(4), 27-30. doi:10.7748/en2002.07.10.4.27.c1069
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	CPS: Alleged and Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	66,572	Confirmed victims	
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	CPS: Alleged and Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	206,519	Unconfirmed victims	
Child Abuse/Maltreatment	Confirmed Allegations of Child Abuse/Neglect by Type of Abuse	5,563	Confirmed allegations of sexual abuse	Reid, J. A., & Piquero, A. R. (2013, December 22). Age-graded risks for commercial sexual exploitation of male and female youth. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 29(9), 1747-1777. doi:10.1177/0886260513511535

Child Abuse/Maltreatment	Confirmed Allegations of Child Abuse/Neglect by Type of Abuse	51,197	Confirmed allegations of neglectful supervision	Reid, J. A., & Piquero, A. R. (2013, December 22). Age-graded risks for commercial sexual exploitation of male and female youth. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 29(9), 1747-1777. doi:10.1177/0886260513511535
Foster Youth	CPS: Children in Foster Care During Fiscal Year	31,176	Children in foster care	Edberg, M. C., Gies, S. V., Cohen, M. I., & May-Slater, S. (2014). TRAJECTORIES OF INVOLVEMENT IN COMMERCIAL SEX EXPLOITATION AND DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING OF GIRLS AND YOUNG WOMEN: SELECTED QUALITATIVE RESULTS FROM AN EVALUATION STUDY. <i>Journal Of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research</i> , 9(2), 89-110.
Foster Youth	Child Maltreatment Annual Report	17,357	Children entering foster care	Edberg, M. C., Gies, S. V., Cohen, M. I., & May-Slater, S. (2014). TRAJECTORIES OF INVOLVEMENT IN COMMERCIAL SEX EXPLOITATION AND DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING OF GIRLS AND YOUNG WOMEN: SELECTED QUALITATIVE RESULTS FROM AN EVALUATION STUDY. <i>Journal Of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research</i> , 9(2), 89-110.
Foster Youth	Child Maltreatment Annual Report	16,420	Children exiting foster care	
Foster Youth	Numbers of Children In Foster Care on September 30th, by State FY 2005–FY 2014	30,358	Children in foster care in Texas	
Foster Youth	Annual Reports and Data Books	290,471	Children, Alleged Victims	Edberg, M. C., Gies, S. V., Cohen, M. I., & May-Slater, S. (2014). TRAJECTORIES OF INVOLVEMENT IN COMMERCIAL SEX EXPLOITATION AND DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING OF GIRLS AND YOUNG WOMEN: SELECTED QUALITATIVE RESULTS FROM AN EVALUATION STUDY. <i>Journal Of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research</i> , 9(2), 89-110.
Foster Youth	Annual Reports and Data Books	40,318	Confirmed risk assessment finding of completed child abuse/neglect investigations	Edberg, M. C., Gies, S. V., Cohen, M. I., & May-Slater, S. (2014). TRAJECTORIES OF INVOLVEMENT IN COMMERCIAL SEX EXPLOITATION AND DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING OF GIRLS AND YOUNG WOMEN: SELECTED QUALITATIVE RESULTS FROM AN EVALUATION STUDY. <i>Journal Of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research</i> , 9(2), 89-110.
Foster Youth	Annual Reports and Data Books	16,378	TOTAL CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE	
Foster Youth	Annual Reports and Data Books	21,969	Risk Indicated of Completed Child Abuse/Neglect Investigations	Walker, Kate. (2013). California Child Welfare Council. . Ending the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children: A Call for Multi-System Collaboration in California. Available at: http://www.chhs.ca.gov/Child%20Welfare/Ending%20CSEC%20-%20A%20Call%20for%20Multi-System%20Collaboration%20in%20CA%20-%20February%202013.pdf
Foster Youth	The Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS)	415,129	Children in foster care in 2014	
Foster Youth	The Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS)	60,898	Number of children waiting to be adopted whose parental rights (for all living parents) were terminated	Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2015). Child welfare and human trafficking. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Children's Bureau.
Foster Youth	The Adoption and	364,746	Number of children who	

	Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS)		entered foster care during 2014	
Foster Youth	The Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS)	4,544	Children in foster care whose most recent placement setting is "Runaway"	Finkelstein, M., Warnsley, M., Curry, D., & Miranda, D. (2004). Youth who chronically AWOL from foster care: Why they run, where they go, and what can be done (Rep.). Retrieved http://archive.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/Foster_AWOLs.pdf
Foster Youth	Archive of Regional Statistical Information About Children in DFPS Care	1,668	Foster children living in residential treatment facilities in Texas in 2016	Walker, Kate. (2013). California Child Welfare Council. . Ending the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children: A Call for Multi-System Collaboration in California. Available at: http://www.chhs.ca.gov/Child%20Welfare/Ending%20CSEC%20-%20A%20Call%20for%20Multi-System%20Collaboration%20in%20CA%20-%20February%202013.pdf
Foster Youth	Archive of Regional Statistical Information About Children in DFPS Care	765	Foster children living in an emergency shelter in Texas in 2016	
Foster Youth	Archive of Regional Statistical Information About Children in DFPS Care	28	Foster children living in Independent living status in Texas in 2016	
Foster Youth	Numbers of Children Entering Foster Care by State	17,357	Numbers of children entering Foster Care in Texas in 2014	Linda a. Smith et al., Shared Hope Int'l, The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America's Prostituted Children 4 (2009), available at http://sharedhope.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/SHI_National_Report_on_DMST_2009.pdf
Foster Youth	Numbers of Children Exiting Foster Care by State	16,420	Number of children exiting foster care in Texas in 2014	
Foster Youth	Foster Care FY2003-FY2011 Entries, Exits, and Numbers of Children In Care on the Last Day of Each Federal Fiscal Year	16,903	Number of children entering foster care in Texas in 2011	
Foster Youth	Foster Care FY2003-FY2011 Entries, Exits, and Numbers of children In Care on the Last Day of Each Federal Fiscal Year	15,717	Number of children exiting foster care in Texas in 2011	
Foster Youth	Intercountry Adoption Statistics	392	Total adoptions in Texas in 2015.	

Foster Youth	Children in Foster Care	30,427	Number of children in foster care in 2015.	
Foster Youth	2015 Annual Report and Data Book	24,097	Number of youth who received services for at risk youth	
Homeless	The Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress	1,416	Homeless unaccompanied youth under 25 in Texas	Chester, H., Lummert, N., & Mullooly, A. (2015). Child victims of human trafficking: Outcomes and service adaptation within the U.S. unaccompanied refugee minor programs (Rep.).
Homeless	The Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress	797	Sheltered homeless unaccompanied youth under 25 in Texas	Halcon, L. L., & Lifson, A. R. (2004, February). Prevalence and predictors of sexual risks among homeless youth. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i> , 33(1), 71-80.
Homeless	The Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress	619	Unsheltered homeless youth in Texas	Halcon, L. L., & Lifson, A. R. (2004, February). Prevalence and predictors of sexual risks among homeless youth. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i> , 33(1), 71-80.
Homeless	2015 Point-In-Time Count	932	Children experiencing homelessness in Texas	Ferguson, K. M., Bender, K., Thompson, S., Xie, B., & Pollio, D. (2011). Correlates of street-survival behaviors in homeless young adults in four U.S. Cities. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i> , 81(3), 401-409. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01108.x
Homeless	2015 Point-In-Time Count	4,197	People experiencing homelessness in Texas	
Homeless	How Many Homeless Youth Are In America?	1.3 - 1.7 million	Youth experience one night of homelessness	Solorio, M. R., Rosenthal, D., Milburn, N. G., Weiss, R. E., Batterham, P. J., Gandara, M., & Rotheram-Borus, M. (2008, September 23). Predictors of sexual risk behaviors among newly homeless youth: A longitudinal study. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i> , 42, 401-409. doi:10.1037/e456032008-004
Homeless	How Many Homeless Youth Are In America?	550,000	Youth being homeless for a week or longer	Solorio, M. R., Rosenthal, D., Milburn, N. G., Weiss, R. E., Batterham, P. J., Gandara, M., & Rotheram-Borus, M. (2008, September 23). Predictors of sexual risk behaviors among newly homeless youth: A longitudinal study. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i> , 42, 401-409. doi:10.1037/e456032008-004
Homeless	NISMART	1,682,900	Runaway or throwaway episodes nationally	
Homeless	NISMART	285,400	children who were victims of a sexual assault	
Homeless	America's Youngest Outcasts: A Report Card on Child Homelessness	2,483,539	Children homeless annually in the U.S.	Ferguson, K. M., Bender, K., Thompson, S., Xie, B., & Pollio, D. (2011). Correlates of street-survival behaviors in homeless young adults in four U.S. Cities. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i> , 81(3), 401-409. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01108.x
Homeless	America's Youngest Outcasts: A Report Card on Child Homelessness	190,018	Homeless children in Texas 2012-13.	
Homeless	The State of Homelessness in America	36,907	Homeless unaccompanied youth and children in the U.S.	Ferguson, K. M., Bender, K., Thompson, S., Xie, B., & Pollio, D. (2011). Correlates of street-survival behaviors in homeless young adults in four U.S. Cities. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i> , 81(3), 401-409. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01108.x

Homeless	The State of Homelessness in America	1,416	Homeless unaccompanied children and youth in 2015	
Homeless	The State of Homelessness in America	586	Homeless unsheltered children and youth in 2015	
Homeless	Prevalence and Correlates of Survival Sex Among Runaway and Homeless Youth	28% of Street youths and 10% of shelter youths	Homeless youth	Ferguson, K. M., Bender, K., Thompson, S., Xie, B., & Pollio, D. (2011). Correlates of street-survival behaviors in homeless young adults in four U.S. Cities. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i> , 81(3), 401-409. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01108.x
Homeless	High-risk behaviors among male street youth in Hollywood, California	27.1% of male street youth	Homeless male youth in California	
Juvenile Justice	Community Juvenile Justice Appropriations, Riders and Special Diversion Programs	27,729	Juveniles ended their probation or deferred prosecution supervision	Salisbury, E. J., Dabney, J. D., & Russell, K. (2014). Diverting Victims of Commercial Sexual Exploitation From Juvenile Detention: Development of the InterCSECT Screening Protocol. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 30(7), 1247-1276. doi:10.1177/0886260514539846
Juvenile Justice	Community Juvenile Justice Appropriations, Riders and Special Diversion Programs	30,056	Juveniles began deferred prosecution/probation	Hammer, H., Finkelhor, D., Sedlak, A. J., & Porcellini, L. E. (2002, October). National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children: National Estimates of Missing Children: Selected Trends, 1988-1999. <i>PsycEXTRA Dataset</i> . doi:10.1037/e401072005-001
Juvenile Justice	Community Juvenile Justice Appropriations, Riders and Special Diversion Programs	62,535	Formal referrals to juvenile probation depts	
LGBTQ	Surviving the Streets of New York: Experiences of LGBTQ Youth, YMSM, and YWSW Engaged in Survival Sex		Homeless LGBTQ youth engaged in commercial sex in New York City	
Runaway	Crisis Hotline and Online Service Statistics	4,080	calls to the National Runaway Safeline from Texas	
Runaway	Key Facts	11,800	Endangered runaways reported to NCMEC	
Runaway	NCIC Missing Person	634,908	Records entered of missing persons	Hammer, H., Finkelhor, D., Sedlak, A. J., & Porcellini, L. E. (2002, October). National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children: National Estimates of Missing Children: Selected Trends, 1988-1999. <i>PsycEXTRA Dataset</i> .


				doi:10.1037/e401072005-001
Runaway	NCIC Missing Person	300,044	Missing persons coded as Runaways	Hammer, H., Finkelhor, D., Sedlak, A. J., & Porcellini, L. E. (2002, October). National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children: National Estimates of Missing Children: Selected Trends, 1988-1999. PsycEXTRA Dataset. doi:10.1037/e401072005-001
Runaway	Child Victims of Stereotypical Kidnappings Known to Law Enforcement in 2011	105	children who were victims of stereotypical kidnappings	Hammer, H., Finkelhor, D., Sedlak, A. J., & Porcellini, L. E. (2002, October). National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children: National Estimates of Missing Children: Selected Trends, 1988-1999. PsycEXTRA Dataset. doi:10.1037/e401072005-001
Typologies	Child Welfare Information Gateway	*	*	
Typologies	Youth Involvement in the Sex Trade	4,457-20,994	Prevalence estimates for underage youth in the sex trade	
Typologies	Youth Involvement in the Sex Trade	434-2,044	Texas prevalence estimates for underage youth in the sex trade	
Typologies	Youth Involvement in the Sex Trade	13	Average age of first sexual experience	
Typologies	Youth Involvement in the Sex Trade	15	Average age they left home	
Typologies	Youth Involvement in the Sex Trade	16	Average age first sold sex	
Typologies	Youth Involvement in the Sex Trade	\$190	Average amount charged at last customer	
Typologies	Youth Involvement in the Sex Trade	96	Prostitution arrests in Texas in 2009	
Unauthorized Population	Profile of the Unauthorized Population: Texas	834,000	U.S. citizen children with unauthorized immigrant parents in Texas from 2009-2013	
Unauthorized Population	Profile of the Unauthorized Population: Texas	81,000	Unauthorized child population ages 3 to 12	
Unauthorized Population	Profile of the Unauthorized Population: Texas	73,000	Enrolled in school	
Unauthorized Population	Profile of the Unauthorized Population: Texas	8,000	Not enrolled in school	

Appendix H: Research on Labor Trafficking

Category	Title	Population Size from Data	Population being Described
Border	Border Crossing/Entry Data: Query Detailed Statistics	38,313,972	Number of personal vehicle passengers crossing the Texas Mexico borders through Texas ports from January-July
Cleaning Services	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 37-2012 Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	66,400	Maids and housekeeping cleaners in Texas
Cleaning Services	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 37-2011 Janitors and Cleaners, Except Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	167,210	Janitors and cleaners in Texas
Construction	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 47-2061 Construction Laborers	101,250	Construction laborers in Texas
Drop-out	Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools, 2012-13	192	Immigrant dropouts from Texas public schools grades 9-12
Drop-out	Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools, 2012-13	1,462	English language learner dropouts from Texas public schools grades 9-12
Drop-out	Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools, 2012-13	34,696	Students who dropped out of school grades 7-12 in 2012-13
Drop-out	Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools, 2012-13	22,856	Students who dropped out of school who were economically disadvantaged in 2012-13
Farmworkers	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 45-2092 Farmworkers and Laborers, Crop, Nursery, and Greenhouse	5,850	Farmworkers and laborers, crop, nursery, and greenhouse workers in Texas
Farmworkers	Migrant Labor Housing Facilities in Texas: A Report on the Quantity, Availability, Need, and Quality of Migrant Labor Housing in the State	132,034	Migrant farmworkers in Texas
Farmworkers	The National Agricultural Workers Survey		
Farmworkers	Summary by Tenure of Principal Operator and by Operators on Farm	965	Number of farms with 5 or more operators on the farm
Farmworkers	Summary by Legal Status For Tax Purposes	11,736	farms registered under state law out of 16,660 total farms in Texas
Forced Labour	Profits and Poverty: The Economics of Forced Labour	20.9 million	Forced labourers
Forced Labour	Profits and Poverty: The Economics of Forced Labour	18.7 million	Individuals exploited in the private economy, by individuals or enterprises
Forced Labour	Profits and Poverty: The Economics of Forced Labour	4.5 million	Victims of forced sexual exploitation
Forced Labour	Profits and Poverty: The Economics of Forced Labour	14.2 million	Victims of forced labour exploitation
Forced Labour	Profits and Poverty: The Economics of Forced Labour	2.2 million	Victims of state-imposed forms of forced labour (prisons or military forces)
Forced Labour	Profits and Poverty: The Economics of Forced Labour	1 million	Number of forced labour exploitation victims in developed economies & EU
Kitchen Workers in Restaurants	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 35-2014 Cooks, Restaurant	91,470	Cooks in Texas
Kitchen Workers in Restaurants	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 35-9021 Dishwashers	36,910	Dishwashers in Texas
Kitchen Workers in Restaurants	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 35-2021 Food Preparation	62,010	Food prep workers in Texas

	Workers		
Labor Visas	Office of Foreign Labor Certification Annual Report 2014	2,511	H2A Visa positions verified in Texas
Landscaping and Groundskeeping Workers	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 37-3011 Landscaping and Groundskeeping Workers	63,050	Landscaping and groundskeeping workers in Texas
Migrant farmworkers	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Demographics	362,724	Number of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their dependents in Texas
Nail Salon Workers	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: 39-5092 Manicurists and Pedicurists	2,310	Manicurists and pedicurists in Texas
Nonimmigrant visas	Immigrant and Nonimmigrant Visas Issued at Foreign Service Posts: Fiscal Years 2011-2015	10,891,745	Nonimmigrant visas issued in 2015
Nonimmigrant visas	Immigrant and Nonimmigrant Visas Issued at Foreign Service Posts: Fiscal Years 2011-2015	10,909	Ambassador, public minister, career diplomat, consul, and immediate family visas issued in 2015
Nonimmigrant visas	Immigrant and Nonimmigrant Visas Issued at Foreign Service Posts: Fiscal Years 2011-2015	1,203,876	B1/B2/Border Crossing Cards issued at foreign service posts in 2015
T-Visas and U-Visas	Number of I-918 Petitions for U Nonimmigrant Status	10,026	Number of I-918 petitions for U nonimmigrant status that were approved victims of criminal activities
T-Visas and U-Visas	Number of I-918 Petitions for U Nonimmigrant Status	2,715	Number of I-918 petitions for U nonimmigrant status that were denied victims of criminal activities
T-Visas and U-Visas	Number of I-918 Petitions for U Nonimmigrant Status	7,662	Number of I-918 petitions for U nonimmigrant status that were approved for family members
T-Visas and U-Visas	Number of I-918 Petitions for U Nonimmigrant Status	1,965	Number of I-918 petitions for U nonimmigrant status that were denied for family members
T-Visas and U-Visas	Number of I-914 Applications for T Nonimmigrant Status	811	Number of I-914 applications for T nonimmigrany status for victims of trafficking Oct 2014-June 2015
Undocumented Immigrants	Profile of the Unauthorized Population: Texas	222,000	Unauthorized immigrant families below 50% of the poverty level
Undocumented Immigrants	Profile of the Unauthorized Population: Texas	226,000	Civilian employed construction workers ages 16 and older

Appendix I: Hierarchy of Information Needs: Victims



Modeled after DIKW Pyramid, Zeleny & Ackoff

Suspicion of Victimization (Screening)

- a. New cases – Brief intake or screening tool that can be utilized before employing a more in-depth screener.
- b. Historical cases – Assessment might be made based on contextual clues included in the structured fields of case management system or narrative notes.

Identification – Confirmation or more detailed characterization of victimization (Screening)

- a. New cases – Trafficking screening tool that collects standardized data on victims; forensic interview by trained professional.
- b. Historical cases – Assessment might come from referrals made for services, involvement of LE, etc.

Demographics

- a. Age, gender identity, sexual orientation
- b.. Educational background
- c.. Country of origin
- d. Some measure or measures of socioeconomics
- e. Location of family home or home where they last received care

History of Victimization

- a. Events, circumstances, choices, attitudes
- b. Relationship to perpetrator
- c. Length of time

Needs

- a. Interest in and/or desire for services, including short-term aid associated with trauma, as well as services to aid in escape and recovery.

Appendix J: IDVSA History

IDVSA and Human Trafficking

IDVSA's involvement in human trafficking was an organic progression. There is a tendency to silo violence into separate and distinct categories, but the strategies employed by traffickers are very similar to those of perpetrators of interpersonal violence (IPV). So it should come as no surprise that IDVSA's research focus on IPV and work with immigrant populations would naturally lead the organization to a more active role in the area of human trafficking, both in terms of community engagement and in formal research.

Community Engagement

Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking and Allies Against Slavery.

The first known case of human trafficking in Austin occurred in 2003 and involved three immigrant girls from Mexico forced into prostitution. The city's response to that first case highlighted a lack of community resources available for human trafficking victims, as well as the need for better collaboration between social service agencies and law enforcement.

In response, community leaders led an effort to bring multi-disciplinary professionals together around the issue of human trafficking. This group included IDVSA staff members Drs. Noël Busch-Armendariz and Laurie Cook Heffron, and would eventually become the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking (CTCAHT). In 2004, CTCAHT was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime. Refugee Services of Texas became the Chair of the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking and acted as a subcontractor responsible for providing services to victims of human trafficking. IDVSA staff regularly attended monthly meetings and were heavily involved in coalition efforts.

For several years after its formation, concerned citizens would contact the coalition inquiring as to how they could assist in the community's efforts against human trafficking. Continued interest and engagement by community organizations, faith groups, and university students led to a new grassroots effort in 2010.

Spearheaded by a number of coalition members including Dr. Laurie Cook Heffron, a monthly community advocacy group on human trafficking was launched, only this time meetings were open to anyone in the general public. These first unstructured meetings would later evolve into the non-profit, Allies Against Slavery. Initially envisioned as the fundraising and implementation arm of the coalition, Allies has become a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization with advocacy, education and activism programs throughout the community.

Expert Witness Training

Multiple IDVSA staff members have experience providing written and oral testimony as expert witnesses in cases involving interpersonal violence, including human trafficking. Beginning in 2004, IDVSA started providing trainings to the larger community around expert witness testimony. IDVSA provides education for prosecutors in Texas and across the country on domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and how to utilize experts on these topics. To social workers, counselors, or similar professionals IDVSA offers training that includes the role of an expert witness, qualifying as an expert witness, and tips to improve oral and written testimony. In 2015, IDVSA added an additional training program for social work professionals providing testimony in immigration cases.

Academic Efforts – Research and Educational Initiatives

At the same time IDVSA was helping shape the community's response to human trafficking, the Institute also began to broaden its research efforts to include a more focused look at the subject. This included a program evaluation of services and CTCOHT coalition operation for Refugee Services of Texas, as part of a direct grant RST received from the Office of Victims of Crime in 2006. This research effort gathered information from service providers and law enforcement professionals, as well as victims of human trafficking around barriers, services needed, services used, and coalition operations. *Survivors Speak Out* was a phase II effort that took a more in-depth look at the services available to victims of human trafficking at RST.

In 2008, IDVSA published *Human Trafficking in Texas: A Statewide Evaluation of Existing Laws and Social Services*. The study was funded by the Office of the Attorney General and the Health and Human Services Commission, and assessed current laws and services and unmet needs.

IDVSA has also conducted a literature review and analysis of information from prosecuted cases to explore and better understand typologies of traffickers. In *Understanding Human Trafficking: Development of Typologies of Traffickers, Phase I and Phase II*, the Institute developed four working typologies of traffickers. While these working typologies can be useful to those involved in prevention or prosecution of these crimes, they stressed the dynamic nature of the methods employed by traffickers, which calls for continued investigation into this field.

In 2009, IDVSA staff member Karen Kalergis published *A Passionate Practice*, which was an in-depth look at three different women involved in service provision to commercially sexually exploited teenagers. It discusses their personal experiences working in the field of commercial sexual exploitation of children and compares it to the early days of working in the area of domestic violence.

In addition to these publications, IDVSA has assisted in the creation and teaching of a University of Texas at Austin signature course on human trafficking for undergraduate students, and has supported student thesis work that intersects with human trafficking. Dr. Cook Heffron's dissertation research looked at the larger issue of violence against migrating women, including a look at human trafficking within this population. IDVSA developed a research fellow program in 2011, offering research fellow positions in human trafficking for undergraduate and graduate students. Drs. Busch-Armendariz and Cook Heffron are currently working on a multi-disciplinary textbook on human trafficking.

Appendix K: Human Trafficking and Transnational Organized Crime Section

In January 2016, the Office of the Texas Attorney General established the Human Trafficking and Transnational Organized Crime Section (HTTOC). The new section is led by Assistant Attorney General Kirsta Melton, an experienced prosecutor with an extensive background in combatting human trafficking. The HTTOC section will help investigate and prosecute human trafficking cases across the state, as well as contribute training resources and help increase awareness. The section consists of three prosecutors, four investigators, a crime analyst, and a victim advocate. As released in the December 2016 Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force Report to the Texas Legislature, the section has been involved in launching initiatives and providing prosecutorial support for jurisdictions across the state. You can review the full report at https://texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/agency/20162911_htr_fin.pdf.

- Since January 2016, HTTOC prosecutors have conducted over 60 human trafficking trainings for over 7,000 individuals around the state, including, but not limited to, judges, law enforcement, education professionals, children aging out of foster care, trucking industry representatives, the public, attorneys, and medical personnel.
- HTTOC is currently assisting multiple other law enforcement agencies and district attorneys on trafficking cases and pursuing cases independently generated, including a complex multi-jurisdiction human trafficking and organized crime investigation
- In July 2016, HTTOC prosecutors, in partnership with the Nueces County District Attorney's Office, successfully prosecuted the first human trafficking case in Corpus Christi at the county level that resulted in a 40-year sentence.
- In early October, HTTOC, in partnership with the state of California, participated in the arrest of the CEO of backpage.com, one of the largest purveyors of adult sex ads in the United States. HTTOC also executed a search warrant on Backpage.com and initiated a criminal investigation into the company's conduct related to money laundering, human trafficking and organized crime.
- At the announcement of the HTTOC, the OAG launched its "I Am Not for Sale" campaign, a positive public awareness campaign focused on reminding people about the inherent worth and humanity of all people. Social media, editorial submissions, informational brochures, and interviews with print and television media have all served to advance the OAG's goal of an informed and empowered public within the past year.
- The HTTOC section will host the first statewide human trafficking conference for prosecutors in the fall of 2017.