



501 3rd Street, NW · 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
T 202.467.4900 · F 202.467.4949
childrenslawcenter.org

Testimony Before the District of Columbia Council
Committee on the Judiciary & Public Safety
June 22, 2017

Public Hearing:
B22-255, the “Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Amendment Act of 2017”

Aubrey Edwards-Luce
Policy Attorney
Children’s Law Center

INTRODUCTION

Good morning Chairman Allen and members of the Committee. My name is Aubrey Edwards-Luce. I am a policy attorney at Children's Law Center.¹ I am testifying today on behalf of Children's Law Center, which fights so every DC child can grow up with a loving family, good health and a quality education. With 100 staff and hundreds of pro bono lawyers, Children's Law Center reaches 1 out of every 9 children in DC's poorest neighborhoods – more than 5,000 children and families each year. As a legal service provider that serves children and youth in foster care, many of Children's Law Center's clients are at an increased risk of being a victim of commercial sexual exploitation (CSEC) and child sex trafficking.

I appreciate this opportunity to testify about the Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Amendment Act of 2017 and the Sexual Assault Victims' Rights Amendment Act of 2017. My testimony today will focus on the Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Amendment Act of 2017 ("the Act").

As introduced, Children's Law Center opposes the Act's amendments to definitions of "abused" and "sexually abused" contained in D.C. Code § 16-2301, because we believe changing the definitions in this section of the D.C. Code could have unintended negative consequences. We urge instead, the Council amend D.C. Code § 4-1301.02 and clearly establish that all child victims of commercial and sexual exploitation are eligible for assistance from the Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA). Lastly,

Children’s Law Center recommends that the Act incorporate the language from federal definitions, instead of simply citing them. Citing to the federal definitions will subject the District’s definitions’ potential to future federal changes. Whereas, incorporating the language from those federal definitions will ensure that District lawmakers can craft a definition that best supports DC child victims of sex trafficking. As I will detail in my testimony, these proposed changes require victims be helped, put the District in compliance with the federal law and ensure that exploited youth and their caregivers are not deterred from seeking out the assistance of CFSA.

CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING IN DC

CSEC is a form of child abuse and neglect that harms too many children across the country and in the District. Child sex trafficking doesn’t always look like a child being abducted from his or her community. The majority of trafficked youth that we come in contact with have typically experienced a time of grooming by adults who show them special attention and provide for their material needs. After the adult gains the youth’s trust and makes the youth dependent on them, the adult begins exploiting the youth and using shame, guilt, or fear to keep the youth mentally, financially, emotionally, and physically entrapped. These grooming and exploitive interactions can occur on the internet, during a youth’s commute to school, or when the youth has run away from home.

Unfortunately, many CSEC-involved youth do not self-identify as trafficking victims. These vulnerable teenagers—many of whom report experiencing foster care, homelessness, sexual abuse and domestic violence, involvement in the juvenile justice system, drug abuse, mental illness, and gang participation²—do not always have the ability to recognize how they are being exploited. Regardless of their readiness to identify as such, federal law is clear that any minor under the age of 18 induced into commercial sex is a victim of sex trafficking—regardless of whether or not the trafficker used force, fraud, or coercion.³

It is very difficult to ascertain exactly how many youth are ensnared in this dangerous network. The numbers we have are from the National Human Trafficking Resource Center hotline and the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). The number of reported human trafficking cases involving DC minors was 23 cases in 2015 and 35 cases in 2016.⁴ During FY2016 the MPD referred a total of 43 CSEC cases (36 Black teenage girls and seven Hispanic teenage girls) to CFSA.⁵ However, every indication is that these reported numbers are a small fraction of the real number of victims.

While we do not have definitive data about the number of CSEC victims in DC, we do know that homeless youth are also at risk of being commercially and sexually exploited because lack of housing, shelter, and basic necessities is a top predictor for CSEC involvement. One expert who works with homeless youth in New York City stated that 70 to 80 percent of the youth they work with trade sex for money, food,

shelter, or drugs.⁶ In DC, there were 391 homeless youth under the age of 21 in FY2015.⁷ We also know that youth in foster care are at risk of becoming CSEC victims. We had 446 teenagers and young adults in foster care in DC in FY16.⁸ In addition, kids who run away are at high risk of becoming victims. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reported that, “1 in every 6 runaways reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children in 2016 were likely sex trafficking victims”.⁹ Based on calculations from MPD’s FY2015 Performance Oversight Report, 1,425 juveniles were reported missing in 2014.¹⁰ Given the high numbers of youth in these populations, it is safe to estimate that the real number of victims per year is in the hundreds.

Many CSEC victims need medical and mental health services to address the long-lasting, complex trauma that often compromises their physical and emotional well-being. They often struggle with long-term physical and mental health problems, including fear and anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, drug abuse, depression, sexually transmitted diseases, and traumatic bonding with the trafficker.¹¹ If properly crafted, the Child Abuse and Sex Trafficking Amendment Act of 2017 can help provide services for CSEC victims who come in contact with the District’s child welfare agency.

FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS AND DC COMPLIANCE

In 2015, Congress passed the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act (JVTA) of 2015, which required that child victims of trafficking be considered victims of abuse and

neglect.¹² Specifically, JVT A amended the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), which is the federal legislation that provides funding to state child welfare agencies to prevent, assess, investigate and prosecute child abuse and neglect,¹³ and required state child welfare agencies to do the following by May 29, 2017:

- Create new procedures that identify and assess reports of children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking.
- Provide services to children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking.
- Report the number of children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking.¹⁴
- Amend their definitions so that children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking are considered victims of child abuse and neglect and sexual abuse regardless of whether the perpetrator is a parent, guardian, or custodian.

DC is not currently in compliance with this law. DC has created a new investigation and assessment procedure.¹⁵ However, this procedure fails to meet the federal requirement to provide services to all children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking, because it instructs CFSA staff to merely provide referrals when a child has been trafficked by a non-caregiver.¹⁶ CFSA's investigative, supportive, and

case management services are reserved for CSEC cases where the parent or legal guardian has trafficked the youth.¹⁷

In order to come into compliance with the JVT Act, the Mayor requested that the Act, and temporary and emergency versions of it, be introduced. The Council passed the emergency and temporary bills on May 2, 2017 and May 16, 2017, respectively.¹⁸ It is important to note that Councilmember Nadeau made multiple amendments to those bills. We are thankful for her efforts and urge that similar changes be made to the Act. Chairman Allen, you also supported these amendments, and we are hopeful you will support similar amendments here.

CHILDREN'S LAW CENTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ACT

Amend Title 4 Definitions Instead of Title 16 Definitions to Avoid Unintended Negative Consequences.

The D.C. Code contains two titles that mandate CFSA to provide services to children who are identified as "abused" or "neglected" in two different settings. D.C. Code Title 16, Chapter 23 ("Title 16") provides a definition of abuse and governs CFSA's actions within the context of court proceedings. The definitions of "abused"¹⁹ and "neglected"²⁰ in Title 16 are used by CFSA when the agency brings child abuse and neglect cases on behalf of children. The mandates in Title 16 are specific to CFSA's responsibilities to the court and as the legal custodian of children in foster care. D.C. Code Title 4, Chapter 13 ("Title 4") provides definitions of abused and neglected and

governs CFSA's actions within the context of public care. Although the definitions of abused or neglected contained in Title 4 cite to the definitions contained in Title 16,²¹ the actions mandated by Title 4 are specific to CFSA's functions as a public-service providing, investigation agency. Pursuant to Title 4, CFSA is responsible for:

- "Assessing child and family strengths and needs in response to reports of abuse and neglect"²²
- "Conducting a social service investigation of child abuse and neglect cases"²³
- "Offering appropriate, adequate, and when needed highly specialized, diagnostic and treatment services and resources to children and families when there has been a supported finding of abuse or neglect..."²⁴

The services that CFSA provides to victims varies by context. Under Title 16, CFSA is required to provide in-depth case management and support to children who have been commercially sexually exploited by a parent, guardian, or custodian when CFSA prevails in a child abuse and neglect case brought on the children's behalf.²⁵ Additionally, under CFSA policy, children who have been commercially sexually exploited by a parent, guardian, or custodian receive a joint investigation with CFSA and MPD, and a comprehensive set of referrals, including: referrals to a resource that specializes in the assessment and treatment of CSEC; referrals to mental health services; and referrals to trauma-informed medical care.²⁶

In contrast, CFSA only offers a referral to MPD and one referral to a community-based resource that specializes in the assessment and treatment of CSEC to those children who have be commercially sexually exploited by **someone other than** a parent, guardian, or custodian.²⁷ This limited response can, in part, be explained by the fact that nearly all the definitions of abuse and neglect contained in Title 16 (to which Title 4 currently cites) only identifies abused and neglected children as children whose parents, guardians, or custodians are in some way culpable for the abuse or neglect.²⁸

The JVTA amendments require CFSA to treat all trafficked children as abused children, regardless of their relationship to the trafficker. CFSA's limited response to children who have be commercially sexually exploited by someone other than a parent, guardian, or custodian is not in compliance with the new federal requirements. Therefore, the Act needs to ensure that the definitions of "abused" and "neglected child" allow CFSA to identify and provide services to all children who have been commercially and sexually exploited. Because it is currently CFSA's policy to refrain from offering investigative or specialized diagnostic services to youth who are trafficked by a non-caregiver, the Act should clearly communicate that all child victims are eligible for these services.

Currently, the Act proposes to amend the definitions of "abused" and "neglected child" in D.C. Code §16-2301. Amending Title 16's definitions of abuse to include children who have be commercially sexually exploited by someone other than a parent,

guardian, or custodian would allow CFSA to bring child abuse and neglect court cases against **a parent** on behalf of those children, even if the parent was seeking services to prevent the trafficking.^{29,30} Children's Law Center is concerned that the risk of court involvement would deter non-culpable parents from seeking out services and referrals from CFSA. Additionally, youth may not disclose that they are being trafficked by a non-caregiver, if their caregivers could be unfairly brought into the court system.

Additionally, Children's Law Center is concerned that changing the definitions in Title 16 could have the unintended consequence of bringing non-caregivers into child abuse and neglect cases. Child abuse and neglect cases are structured to remedy the risk of harm that parents or caregivers pose to the welfare of the child. CFSA expects parents to make a case plan and engage in services that will help keep the child healthy and safe, such as parenting classes, family therapy, or substance abuse treatment. Judges in the child abuse and neglect court are able intervene into the private lives of these parents and caregivers and order them to participate in services after CFSA sufficiently proves that the child is abused or neglected because the parent or caregiver failed to provide some type of parental care or attention. The child abuse and neglect court is not designed to have jurisdiction over non-caregivers. These ordered services are unsuitable for non-caregivers who have exploited children, and the courts are not prepared to have culpable non-caregivers participate in these sensitive matters. If such a change were contemplated, key stakeholders would need to be engaged in a much

more thoughtful and lengthy discussion. We understand that the Act was not drafted with the intent to bring non-caregivers into the child abuse and neglect court system, but the proposed amendment to Title 16 could make this unintended consequence a reality. By solely amending Title 4, the Council will make it clear that the definitional change is not intended to broaden the types of court cases that CFSA can bring on behalf of children.

In addition to the definition changes made by Councilmember Nadeau, the enacted emergency and temporary legislations include an amendment to D.C. Code § 4-1301.02(1), which adds a subparagraph that reads: “Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as preventing or intending to prevent sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking in persons from being considered a form of sexual abuse for purposes of D.C. Official Code § 16-2301(32).” Children’s Law Center supports the addition of this language and recommends that it be additionally amended to conclude with the following phrase: “where the child is abused by his or her parent, guardian, or custodian.” This additional phrase will make it clear that the changes to the definitions in Title 4 do not enable CFSA to bring neglect court cases where children are not being exploited by their parent, guardian, or custodian.

Insert Federal Definitions, Instead of Citing to Federal Definitions

Lastly, Children’s Law Center recommends that the Act insert the federal definitions of “sex trafficking” and “severe forms of trafficking in persons”, instead of

citing to those federal definitions. Children’s Law Center is concerned that citing to the federal law will place the determination of the service eligibility upon the federal definition, which the Council has no ability to amend, and which Congress could amend in manner contrary to the best interests of the District’s child victims. For example, Congress could remove “recruitment” from the definition of “sex trafficking” and, while CFSA would remain in compliance with federal requirements, victims of child sex trafficking could experience delays in services as the agency reassess their eligibility.

To provide a concrete example, the enacted temporary legislations reads:

“(ii) Sexual abuse, which shall include sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking in persons as those terms are defined in section 103(10) and (9)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, approved October 28,2000 (14 Stat. 1469;22 U.S.C. § 7102(10) and (9XA)).”

Sex trafficking, according to the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, “means the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act.”³¹ The same federal law defines severe forms of trafficking in person as “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;...”³² Children’s Law Center suggests that the following specific subsection be added to the Act’s definition of “abused”:

“(ii) A child who has been recruited, harbored, transported, provided, obtained, patronized, or solicited for the purpose of a commercial sex act, as defined by D.C. Code § 22-1831 (4); or

“(iii) A child who has been recruited, harbored, transported, provided, obtained, patronized, or solicited for the purpose of a commercial sex act by force, fraud, or coercion as defined by D.C. Code § 22-1831.”

In the event that the Council concludes that legal sufficiency requires a citation to the TVPA, then Children’s Law Center recommends that the Act be amended to include the citation, as well as the language provided above.

Furthermore, we urge the Council to insert the federal language and cite to D.C. Code as necessary, because some of the relevant DC definitions are broader than their federal counterparts and these differences could cause confusion. For example, the D.C. Code’s definitions of “coercion” and “commercial sex act” are even more progressive than the federal definitions of “coercion”³³ and “commercial sex act”.³⁴ By citing to a more narrow definition of these terms, it will be possible that a youth that is promised something of value, in exchange for a sex act, would be a victim under DC criminal law but would not be eligible for CFSA services as a victim of sex trafficking. This inconsistency is likely to cause confusion, especially in instances where CFSA and MPD conduct joint investigations.

MANDATORY REPORTING & SAVRAA

Councilwoman Nadeau amended the temporary and emergency legislations to include sections that changed the definitions that the mandatory reporting law refers to. Under the enacted temporary legislation, mandated reporters are required to report to MPD or CFSA, if they know or have reasonable cause to suspect that a child they work with has been or is at immediate risk of being abused or neglected as defined in D.C. Code § 4-1301.02(15A).³⁵

Given that a similar amendment is likely to be made to the permanent legislation, Children's Law Center has assessed this potential amendment in light of the mandatory reporting exceptions contained in the proposed Sexual Assault Victims' Rights Amendment Act (SAVRAA) of 2017, which is also being considered today.³⁶ SAVRAA proposes to create a sexual assault victims advocate for youth victims between the ages of 12 and 17. The bill amends D.C. Code § 14-321(b) to create an exemption for advocates for youth victims from the mandatory reporting requirement of D.C. Code § 4-1321.02, except in the following instances:

- Where the child victim is under the age of 12;
- Where the child victim has a significant relationship with the alleged perpetrator; or
- Where there are more four or more years between the ages of child victim and the alleged perpetrator.

Children’s Law Center supports the proposed exceptions to the mandatory reporting exemption contained in SAVRAA. Furthermore, instances of CSEC and child sex trafficking, where a caregiver is culpable, are likely to fall under the significant relationship exception; therefore, the advocate would be mandated to report these instances. We believe the mandatory reporting exemptions are likely to encourage youth to disclose their victimization and resulting needs. Given the large issue of underreporting, it is very important that youth have the ability to be transparent with their advocate. Additionally, this exemption will not forbid an advocate from reporting victimizations, such as commercial sexual exploitation, to CFSA. Rather, the bill allows youth to participate in the decision to report to CFSA and allows the advocate the latitude to share confidential information to protect a child or someone else from a substantial risk of imminent and serious physical injury.³⁷ For these reasons, Children’s Law Center supports the exceptions and exemptions found in SAVRAA.

CONCLUSION

Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering any questions.

¹Children’s Law Center fights so every child in DC can grow up with a loving family, good health and a quality education. Judges, pediatricians and families turn to us to be the voice for children who are abused or neglected, who aren’t learning in school, or who have health problems that can’t be solved by medicine alone. With 100 staff and hundreds of pro bono lawyers, we reach 1 out of every 9 children in DC’s poorest neighborhoods – more than 5,000 children and families each year. And, we multiply this impact by advocating for city-wide solutions that benefit all children.

² E. Hines & J. Hochman, *Sex Trafficking of Minors in New York: Increasing Prevention and Collective Action*, New York Women’s Foundation (2012), available at: http://nywf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/NYWF_Sex-Trafficking-of-Minors.pdf.

³ Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000. Public Law 106-386 [H.R. 3244]. 28 October 2000. Section 103(9).

⁴ National Human Trafficking Hotline. *District of Columbia*. Retrieved from <https://humantraffickinghotline.org/state/district-columbia>.

⁵ MPD FY16 Performance Oversight Responses, Q57.

⁶ E. Hines & J. Hochman, *Sex Trafficking of Minors in New York: Increasing Prevention and Collective Action*, New York Women’s Foundation (2012), available at: http://nywf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/NYWF_Sex-Trafficking-of-Minors.pdf.

⁷ Interagency Council on Homelessness. *Solid Foundations DC: Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Youth Homelessness*. (2017), p. 14, available at https://ich.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ich/page_content/attachments/Solid%20Foundations%20DC%20web%201.3.pdf.

⁸ Calculated from CFSA FY17 Responses to Proposed Budget Oversight Pre-Hearing Questions, Q58.

⁹ National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. *Child Sex Trafficking*. Retrieved from <http://www.missingkids.org/lin6>; It is important to note that MPD is not required to report cases to the National Center for Missing and Exploited children until the child has been missing for 30 days. B20-0714 - Sex Trafficking of Children Prevention Amendment Act of 2014. Retrieved from <http://vsconfronts.org/workspace/attachments/dc-fact-sheet-final-version-5.15.15-.pdf>.

¹⁰ MPD FY15 Performance Oversight Responses, Q66.

¹¹ Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families. *Guidance to States and Services on Addressing Human Trafficking of Children and Youth in the United States*. Retrieved from https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/cb/acyf_human_trafficking_guidance.pdf.

¹² Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114-22 129 Stat. 227, 263-64. “IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4), **a child shall be considered a victim of ‘child abuse and neglect’ and of ‘sexual abuse’ if the child is identified, by a State or local agency employee of the State or locality involved, as being a victim of sex trafficking** (as defined in paragraph (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) **or a victim of severe forms of trafficking in persons** described in paragraph (9)(A) of that section.” Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114-22 129 Stat. 227, at 264 (emphasis added).

¹³ Child Welfare Information Gateway, “About CAPTA: A Legislative History.” <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/factsheets/about/>.

¹⁴ CFSA has historically reported the number of children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking in its Performance Oversight Reports and is, therefore, in compliance with this requirement.

¹⁵ On January 9, 2017, DC’s child welfare agency, CFSA, released an Administrative Issuance, titled “Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking Identification and Response”. This document presents CFSA’s procedure for identifying and assessing reports CSEC. See CFSA. “Administrative Issuance: Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking Identification and Response,” <https://cfsa.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/cfsa/publication/attachments/AI%20-%20Sex%20Trafficking%20Identification%20and%20Response%20%28final%202017%29docx.pdf>.

¹⁶ The most recent Administrative Issuance regarding CSEC, instructs CFSA social workers to refer CSEC-involved youth whose parent or legal guardian is not the alleged perpetrator...”to designated community resources specializing in commercial sexual exploitation/sex trafficking assessment and intervention, runaway and homeless youth programs, and other identified resources and services.” CFSA. (Jan. 9, 2017). *Administrative Issuance CFSA-17-1*. Retrieved from

[https://cfsa.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/AI%20-%20Sex%20Trafficking%20Identification%20and%20Response%20\(final%202017\)docx.pdf](https://cfsa.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/AI%20-%20Sex%20Trafficking%20Identification%20and%20Response%20(final%202017)docx.pdf).

¹⁷ CFSA FY15 Performance Oversight Responses, Q43(i) Attachment, 2.

¹⁸ See “The Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Emergency Amendment Act of 2017” and “The Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Temporary Amendment Act of 2017”.

¹⁹ D.C. Code § 16-2301(23) reads as follows:

“(23)(A) The term “abused”, when used with reference to a child, means:

- (i) infliction of physical or mental injury upon a child;
- (ii) sexual abuse or exploitation of a child; or
- (iii) negligent treatment or maltreatment of a child.”

²⁰ D.C. Code § 16-2301(9)(A) reads as follows: The term “neglected child” means a child:

(i) who has been abandoned or abused by his or her parent, guardian, or custodian, or whose parent, guardian, or custodian has failed to make reasonable efforts to prevent the infliction of abuse upon the child. For the purposes of this sub-subparagraph, the term “reasonable efforts” includes filing a petition for civil protection from intrafamily violence pursuant to section 16-1003;

(ii) who is without proper parental care or control, subsistence, education as required by law, or other care or control necessary for his or her physical, mental, or emotional health, and the deprivation is not due to the lack of financial means of his or her parent, guardian, or custodian;

(iii) whose parent, guardian, or custodian is unable to discharge his or her responsibilities to and for the child because of incarceration, hospitalization, or other physical or mental incapacity;

(iv) whose parent, guardian, or custodian refuses or is unable to assume the responsibility for the child's care, control, or subsistence and the person or institution which is providing for the child states an intention to discontinue such care;

(v) who is in imminent danger of being abused and another child living in the same household or under the care of the same parent, guardian, or custodian has been abused;

(vi) who has received negligent treatment or maltreatment from his or her parent, guardian, or custodian;

(vii) who has resided in a hospital located in the District of Columbia for at least 10 calendar days following the birth of the child, despite a medical determination that the child is ready for discharge from the hospital, and the parent, guardian, or custodian of the child has not taken any action or made any effort to maintain a parental, guardianship, or custodial relationship or contact with the child;

(viii) who is born addicted or dependent on a controlled substance or has a significant presence of a controlled substance in his or her system at birth;

(ix) in whose body there is a controlled substance as a direct and foreseeable consequence of the acts or omissions of the child's parent, guardian, or custodian; or

(x) who is regularly exposed to illegal drug-related activity in the home.

²¹ D.C. Code § 4-1301.02 reads: “For the purposes of this subchapter: (1) “Abused”, when used in reference to a child, shall have the same meaning as is provided in § 16-2301(23)...(15A) “Neglected child” shall have the same meaning as is provided in § 16-2301(9).”

²² D.C. Code § 4-1303.01a(b)(3A).

²³ D.C. Code § 4-1303.01a(b)(5).

²⁴ D.C. Code § 4-1303.01a(b)(7).

²⁵ See, for example D.C. Codes § 16-2319. Note also, that a court is likely to find that a child whose parent is complicit in the sex-trafficking is a neglected child under D.C. Code § 16-2301 (9)(A)(i). A court is likely to find that a child whose parent is inexcusable unaware of the sex-trafficking of the child is a neglected child under D.C. Code § 16-2301 (9)(A)(ii).

²⁶ See, CFSA, “Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking identification and Response,” at 3-4. <https://cfsa.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/cfsa/publication/attachments/AI%20-%20Sex%20Trafficking%20Identification%20and%20Response%20%28final%202017%29docx.pdf>.

²⁷ See, CFSA, “Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking identification and Response,” at 4. <https://cfsa.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/cfsa/publication/attachments/AI%20-%20Sex%20Trafficking%20Identification%20and%20Response%20%28final%202017%29docx.pdf>.

²⁸ See, D.C. Code §§ 16-2301(9)(A)(i)-(x), (23)(B), (24), (25). Only the three following sections do not directly reference the term “parent, custodian, or guardian”: D.C. Code § 16-2301(23A), (32), and (33). Note, however, that “parent, custodian, and guardian” are linked to these sections by D.C. Code § 16-2301(9)(A)(i).

²⁹ D.C. Code § 11-1101(a)(13): “(a) In general. -- The Family Court of the District of Columbia shall be assigned and have original jurisdiction over -- ...

(13) proceedings in which a child, as defined in section 16-2301, is alleged to be delinquent, neglected, or in need of supervision;”

³⁰ Additionally the Children’s Law Center opposes an amendment to Title 16 because multiple other titles and chapters refer to its definitions of “abuse” and “neglect.” For example, see D.C. Code § 38-2561.03 and D.C. Code § 4-203.01.

³¹ See, 22 U.S.C.A. § 7102(10).

³² See, 22 U.S.C.A. § 7102(9)(A).

³³ 22 U.S.C. 7102(3). “(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.”

³⁴ 22 U.S.C. 7102(4). “The term “commercial sex act” means any sex act on account of which anything of value is given to or received by any person.”

³⁵ See, the “Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Emergency Amendment Act of 2017.”

³⁶ See, the “Sexual Assault Victims’ Rights Amendment Act (SAVRAA) of 2017.”

³⁷ Cite to proposed B22-022 14-321 (b)(1)(D).