NCJRS
NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFERENCE SERVICE

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
BJA BJS NIJ OJJDP OVC SMART

The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title:	**Researcher-Survivor Formative Evaluation of San Francisco's Anti-Human Trafficking Task Forces: Analysis of San Francisco Police Department Incident Reports**
Author(s):	**Alexandra Lutnick, Minh Dang**
Document Number:	**254004**
Date Received:	**October 2019**
Award Number:	**2015-VF-GX-0107**

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

August 2018

Analysis of San Francisco Police Department Incident Reports

Prepared by
alexandra lutnick
Minh Dang

RTI International
351 California Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94104

RTI Project Number 0215039.000.001

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This project was funded by grant 2015-VF-GX-0107 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	**1**
Introduction	**7**
Methods	**8**
Findings	**11**
People selling sex	**11**
People buying sex	**18**
Third Parties	**24**
Human Trafficking	**25**
Discussion	**34**
Appendices	
A Data Extraction Form	**35**
B Elements that Indicate Human Trafficking	**42**

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Tables

Number		Page
1	Sample Characteristics of People Selling Sex	11
2	Associations between Personal Characteristics and Study Outcomes Among People Selling Sex	14
3	Associations between Time Period and Study Outcomes, Disaggregated by SVU Status, Among People Selling Sex	17
4	Sample Characteristics of People Buying Sex	18
5	Associations between Personal Characteristics and Study Outcomes Among People Buying Sex	20
6	Associations between Time Period and Study Outcomes, Disaggregated by SVU Status, Among People Buying Sex	22
7	Sample Characteristics of Third Parties	24
8	Incident Level Trafficking Details	26
9	Trafficking Concurrence by SVU Status	27
10	Trafficking Concurrence by SVU Status and Time Period	27
11	Associations between Incident-level Characteristics and Trafficking Outcomes for All Incidents	28
12	Associations between Time Period and Study Outcomes, Disaggregated by SVU status, For All Incidents	30
13	Associations between Incident-level Characteristics and Trafficking Outcomes for Incidents Involving People Who Sell Sex	31
14	Associations between Time Period and Study Outcomes, Disaggregated by SVU status, Among People Selling Sex	33

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A random sample of SFPD incident reports labeled as prostitution and/or human trafficking were selected for the years 2009, 2010, 2014 and 2015. The purpose of this timeframe was to examine trends prior to and after the 2011 inclusion of human trafficking cases in the Special Victims Unit (SVU). The SFPD provided the deidentified data

We created a data extraction form that was used with each SFPD incident report. This form captured the key items needed for the analysis and had both quantitative and qualitative variables. The questions we sought to answer were:

1) Among people who are selling sex:
   a. What individual-level characteristics are associated with whether someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation?
   b. Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   c. Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   d. Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?

2) Among people who are buying sex:
   a. What individual-level characteristics are associated with whether someone is arrested, someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation?
   b. Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   c. Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   d. Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?

3) Among all of the incident reports:
   a. What characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether an incident is correctly identified as trafficking?

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

b. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking?
c. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?

4) Among incidents that involved people selling sex:

a. What characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether an incident is correctly identified as trafficking?
b. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking?
c. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?
d. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?

We used descriptive statistics, including frequencies, to calculate the distribution of variables of the study population. We then used logistic regression with the clustered sandwich estimator to assess for associations between individual-level characteristics and the outcomes. We generated both unadjusted and adjusted odds rations for people selling sex and for people buying sex. Logistic regression models with the clustered sandwich estimator were also used to assess for associations between time period and study outcomes for SVU and non-SVU incidents. Variables that were moderately associated with the particular outcome under investigation in bivariate analysis ($p<0.2$) were included in the multivariable model. Variables were retained in the multivariable model if the p-value for the variable, or for any category of the variable was <0.2.

We also used these same modelling approaches to assess for associations between time period and whether an incident was screened for trafficking or correctly identified as trafficking for SVU and non-SVU incidents with logistic regression.

Due to the small number of people who were classified as third parties (N=70), we were not able to include them in the more detailed analysis.

1) Incidents Where People Are Selling Sex

Individual characteristics associated with whether someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation? When looking at being cited, people's whose race is listed as Black or Other both have a statistically significant decreased odds of being cited as compared to people who are White (46% and 69% reduction respectively). Transitional aged youth (18-24) have a statistically significant 37% decreased odds of being cited as compared to people under the age of 18. People who had a prior record had a statistically significant 77% reduction in odds of being cited as compared to those without a prior record.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

When looking at being booked, people whose race is listed as Black had a statistically significant 2x increased odds of being booked as compared to people who are White. Transitional aged youth and adults both had a statistically significant reduced odds of being booked (85% and 89% respectively) as compared to minors. Those with a prior record had a statistically significant 5.5x increased odds of being booked as compared to those without a record ($p<0.001$).

Looking at receiving a prostitution-related citation, people whose race is listed as Other had a statistically significant 78% reduction in odds of receiving such a citation as compared to people listed as White. People over the age of 24 had a statistically significant 6.8x increased odds of receiving a prostitution-related citation as compared to minors.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people are being cited, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 non-SVU incidents had a statistically significant 7.19x increased odds of being cited, while incidents involving SVU had a statistically significant 95% reduction in the odds of being cited.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people are being booked, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 non-SVU incidents had a statistically significant 89% reduction in the odds of being booked, while SVU incidents did not have a statistically significant association with whether someone was booked.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 non-SVU incidents had a statistically significant 75% reduction in the odds of receiving a prostitution-related citation, while SVU incidents had a statistically significant 99% reduction in the odds of receiving a prostitution-related citation.

2) Incidents Where People Are Buying Sex

Individual characteristics associated with whether someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation? The adjusted associations show that only statistically significant variable was whether someone had a prior record. For people who had a prior record they had both a statistically significant 63% reduction in the odds of being cited, and a 10.4x increased odds of being booked.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people are being cited, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone buying sex,

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 non-SVU incidents did not have a statistically significant association with whether someone was cited, while SVU incidents had a statistically significant 82% reduction in odds.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people are being booked, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone buying sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 both non-SVU and SVU incidents did not have a statistically significant association with whether someone was booked.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone buying sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 non-SVU incidents did not have a statistically significant association with whether someone received a prostitution-related citation, while SVU incidents had a statistically significant 90% reduction in the odds of receiving a prostitution-related citation.

3) Human Trafficking - All incidents

Characteristics Associated with Screened for Trafficking. The adjusted associations show that incidents that came about because of police action (defined as operations at massage establishments or hotels, through online communication (i.e. Backpage, Redbook), and actions related to the First Offender Prostitution Program) had a statistically significant 2.8x increased odds of being screened for trafficking. Incidents where the reporting officer was female had a statistically significant 96% reduction in the odds of being screened for trafficking.

Characteristics Associated with Correctly Identified as Trafficking. The adjusted associations show that those incidents that came about because of police action had a statistically significant 5.7x increased odds of being correctly identified as trafficking. Incidents where the reporting officer was female did not have a statistically significant association with correct identification of trafficking.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among all incidents, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10, non-SVU had a statistically significant 29.17x increased odds of being screened for trafficking, while SVU incidents had a statistically significant 4.85x increased odds of being screened for trafficking.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among all incidents, comparing

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

2014/2015 to 2009/10, non-SVU incidents had a statistically significant 8.5x increased odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking, while SVU incidents had a statistically significant 64% reduction in odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking.

4) Human Trafficking - Incidents Involving Someone Selling Sex

Characteristics Associated with Screened for Trafficking. The adjusted associations show that among incidents that involved someone selling sex, police action (4.2x increased odds), the reporting officer being female (90% reduction in odds), condoms being mentioned (54% reduction in odds), the person having a prior record (53% reduction in odds), and being dressed in a manner that police consider to be indicative of prostitution (2x increased odds of screening) were all significantly associated with whether or not someone was screened for trafficking.

Characteristics Associated with Correctly Identified as Trafficking. The adjusted associations show that among incidents that involved someone selling sex, police action (2.1x increased odds), the reporting officer being female (78% reduction in odds), condoms being mentioned (58% reduction in odds), the person having a prior record (47% reduction in odds), and being dressed in a manner that police consider to be indicative of prostitution (1.9x increased odds of correct identification) were all significantly associated with whether or not the incident was correctly identified as trafficking.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 non-SVU incidents had a statistically significant 49.3x increased odds of being screened for trafficking, while SVU incidents had a statistically significant 7.2x increased odds of being screened for trafficking.

Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking, after adjusting for potential confounders? Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10 non-SVU incidents had a statistically significant 25.6x increased odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking, while SVU incidents did not have a statistically significant association with correctly identifying a case as trafficking.

Third Parties

Due to the limited number of third parties represented in these data (N=70), we were not able to do analyses beyond simple frequencies.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Discussion

Among incidents where people are selling sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/2010, non-SVU incidents have increased odds for citing someone, a reduction in odds for booking someone, and a decreased in odds for issuing someone a prostitution-related citation. SVU incidents have decreased odds of citing someone, no statistically significant change in bookings, and a reduction in odds for issuing someone a prostitution-related citation. Compared to people listed as White, those who were identified as Black or Other have decreased odds of being cited, but those listed as Black have increased odds of being booked. This racial disparity deserves further attention.

Among incidents where people are buying sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/2010, non-SVU incidents did not have a statistically significant change in citations, bookings, or prostitution-related citations. Incidents involving SVU had a reduction in odds of someone being cited, no association with whether someone was booked, and a reduction in odds of someone receiving a prostitution-related citation. For all incidents across the years, those with prior records had a reduction in odds of being cited, but a significant increase in the odds of being booked.

Overall, the SFPD is doing a better job of screening for and correctly identifying a case as trafficking when comparing data from 2014/2015 to 2009/2010. The one notable discrepancy is among incidents involving SVU. Although the SVU is doing a better job of screening for trafficking, across all incidents its odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking is significantly reduced in 2014/2015. This is largely the result of SVU labeling massage establishment inspections and operations targeting men purchasing sex as human trafficking incidents. The accuracy of the SFPD's data would improve tremendously if SVU only used the incident code for human trafficking for those incidents where human trafficking was established. If the focus was just among incidents where people were selling sex SVU did not see a change in odds of correctly identifying trafficking.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

INTRODUCTION

The questions we sought to answer in this project were:

1) Among people who are selling sex:
   a. What individual-level characteristics are associated with whether someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation?
   b. Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   c. Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   d. Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?

2) Among people who are buying sex:
   a. What individual-level characteristics are associated with whether someone is arrested, someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation?
   b. Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being cited by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   c. Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are being booked by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?
   d. Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by non-SVU police districts? Is time period associated with whether people are receiving a prostitution-related citation by SVU? Are these associations different from each other?

3) Among all of the incident reports:
   a. What characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether an incident is correctly identified as trafficking?
   b. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking?
   c. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?

4) Among incidents that involved people selling sex:
   a. What characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether an incident is correctly identified as trafficking?

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

b. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking?
c. Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?

METHODS

We selected a random sample of case files for prostitution and human trafficking related offenses from the years 2009 (n= 293), 2010 (n=296), 2014 (n=207) and 2015 (n=193) were selected. The purpose of this timeframe is it allowed for the examination of trends prior to and after the 2011 inclusion of human trafficking cases in the Special Victims Unit. Prior to 2011 these cases would be included in the work of VICE. The case files included juveniles and adults. The sample size for each year was calculated using the total number of prostitution and human trafficking offenses, and a 95% confidence interval. All cases labeled human trafficking were purposively included.

We created a data extraction form (see Appendix A) that was used with each incident report. This form captures the key items needed for the analysis and has both quantitative and qualitative variables.

Key Variable Definitions

SVU. An incident was characterized as involving SVU if either SVU or VICE was noted as a Police District associated with the incident.

Human Trafficking. To assess whether an incident was human trafficking, we cross-referenced the facts of the narrative against our "Elements that Indicate Trafficking" list (see Appendix B). When an incident report did not contain sufficient information to make the determination, we coded the response to whether we believed the incident to be human trafficking as "don't know." In most of the cases where "don't know" was used it was because the incident report did not mention anyone being screened for trafficking.

Prostitution Related Citation. A citation was considered prostitution related if it included any of the following offenses: Forced labor or services; Human trafficking for purposes of pimping, child pornography, or extortion; Causing a minor to engage in commercial sex; Pimping; Pandering; Creating and maintaining public nuisance; Soliciting or engaging in lewd acts in public or in a place within public view; Soliciting acts of prostitution; Loitering for prostitution; Escort service license/regulation; Supervising or aiding a prostitute; Felony pandering; Keeping a house of ill-fame

Police Action. An incident was defined as resulting from police action when it was police-initiated operations at massage establishments or hotels, through online communication (i.e. Backpage, Redbook), and actions related to the First Offender Prostitution Program.

Female Officer. An incident where the reporting officer's biological sex was female.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Correctly Identified as Trafficking. An incident was considered correctly identified if (a) it was labeled with the incident code for human trafficking and after reviewing the narrative it contained at least one item from the "Elements that Indicate Trafficking" list; or, (b) it was not labeled with the incident code for human trafficking and after reviewing the narrative it did not contain any items from the "Elements that Indicate Trafficking" list

Dressed as a Prostitute. When the incident report narrative included language indicating that the officer felt the person's manner of dress was indicative of prostitution.

Prior Record in SF. This was determined by whether the incident report included information about whether the person had a prior arrest record in San Francisco. Information included data entered into the field SFNO on the incident report, as well as reading the written narrative.

Prior Record outside of SF. This was determined by whether the incident report included information about whether the person had a prior arrest record outside of San Francisco. Information included date entered into the CII field, the FBI field, as well as reading the written narrative.

Third Party. Someone engaged in any of the following: *a*) pimping—the act of directly or indirectly receiving earnings garnered through prostitution or asking for or receiving money in exchange for soliciting to trade sex; (*b*) pandering—the facilitation or provision of someone to be used for prostitution, including inducing, encouraging, or forcing someone to engage in prostitution; (*c*) keeping or residing in a house of prostitution; (*d*) leasing a house of prostitution; (*e*) procuring someone to travel for purposes of prostitution; (*f*) sending a minor to or permitting a minor to enter a house of prostitution; and (*g*) taking a person against his or her will for prostitution.

Ten percent of all the reports were coded by two people to explore the reliability of the data extraction. We resolved discrepancies or inconsistencies through consensus discussions. The same colleague reviewed the final analysis and did not raise any issues.

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at RTI International.

Statistical Analyses

Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, were calculated to describe the distribution of variables of the study population. To assess for associations between individual-level characteristics and the study outcomes of being cited, booked and prostitution related citation, we used logistic regression with the clustered sandwich estimator. First, we generated unadjusted odds ratios, 95% confidence intervals (CI) and p-values from bivariate logistic regression models. Next, we included all individual-level variables into a

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

full logistic regression model to generate adjusted odds ratios, 95% CI and p-values. We used this same modelling approach for people who were selling sex and for people who were buying sex.

To assess for associations between time period and study outcomes for SVU and non-SVU incidents, logistic regression models with the clustered sandwich estimator were used. The associations between time period and study outcomes for SVU and non-SVU incidents were also statistically compared by including time period, SVU and an interaction between time period and SVU in the model. With this modelling approach, we first generated unadjusted odds ratios with corresponding 95% CI and p-values. Next, we considered which variables to adjust for in adjusted models. Variables that were moderately associated with the particular outcome under investigation in bivariate analysis ($p<0.2$) were included in the multivariable model. Variables were retained in the multivariable model if the p-value for the variable, or for any category of the variable was <0.2.

We also used these same modelling approaches to assess for associations between time period and whether an incident was screened for trafficking or correctly identified as trafficking for SVU and non-SVU incidents with logistic regression. The associations between time period and screened for trafficking or correctly identified as trafficking for SVU and non-SVU were also statistically compared by including time period, SVU and an interaction between time period and SVU in the model. With this modelling approach, we first generated unadjusted odds ratios with corresponding 95% CI and p-values. Next, we considered which variables to adjust for in adjusted models, using the same approach as outlined above. This approach was done for all incidents and for all incidents that involved someone selling sex.

We also assessed for relationships between incident characteristics and whether an incident was screened for trafficking or correctly identified as trafficking. First, we generated unadjusted odds ratios, 95% confidence intervals (CI) and p-values from bivariate logistic regression models. Next, we included all individual-level variables into a full logistic regression model to generate adjusted odds ratios, 95% CI and p-values. This was done separately for all incidents and only incidents involving people who sell sex.

We wanted to explore in more detail whether among third parties if time period and/or SVU status was associated with them being cited, booked, or receiving a prostitution-related citation. We also wanted to include confounding variables in that analysis. Due to the small number of people who were classified as third parties (N=70), we were not able to include them in the more detailed analysis. Instead we used frequencies to describe that group.

All statistical analyses were performed using Stata v15.1 (College Station, TX).

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Findings

People Selling Sex

Table one presents demographic information about people who were selling sex. The table presents the overall frequencies, and then the frequencies by year groupings (2009/2010 and 2014/2015).

Table 1: Sample Characteristics of People Selling Sex (N=621)

	All Years	2009/2010 (n=408)	2014/2015 (n=213)
Age Range	12-62	12-62	14-49
Median Age	24	24	22
Minor at time of incident	5%	4%	5%
RACE			
Black	47%	45%	52%
Hispanic	9%	7%	14%
Asian	8%	6%	10%
White	33%	40%	21%
Unknown	2%	2%	1%
Other	1%	1%	0%
Missing	0%	0%	1%
SEX			
Female	98%	97%	98%
Male	2%	3%	2%
RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS			
San Francisco	38%	48%	19%
Other CA City	54%	47%	69%
Other US State	5%	4%	7%
Other Country	0%	0%	0%
Missing	3%	1%	6%
CONDOMS MENTIONED			
Yes	36%	51%	6%
No	63%	49%	91%
Missing	1%	0%	3%
PRIOR RECORD IN SF			
Yes	51%	63%	28%
No	42%	35%	54%
Missing	7%	2%	17%

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

	All Years	2009/2010 (n=408)	2014/2015 (n=213)
PRIOR RECORD OUTSIDE OF SF			
Yes	52%	56%	43%
No	40%	41%	39%
Missing	8%	3%	17%
SEXUAL CONTACT WITH OFFICER			
Yes	2%	2%	1%
No	96%	96%	95%
Missing	2%	2%	4%
DESCRIPTIONS OF SEXUALIZED CLOTHING OR COMMUNICATION			
Yes	22%	11%	44%
No	77%	89%	52%
Missing	1%	0%	4%
HOW PERSON CLASSIFIED			
Suspect	1%	0%	3%
Detained	2%	0%	5%
Victim	7%	2%	17%
Cited	49%	48%	52%
Booked	38%	48%	19%
Missing	2%	1%	3%
THIRD PARTY INVOLVEMENT			
Yes	8%	4%	15%
No	16%	4%	38%
Suspected	4%	2%	8%
Missing	73%	90%	39%
RESOLUTION OF INCIDENT			
Cited	49%	48%	50%
Found (in cases of juveniles)	1%	0%	1%
Booked	38%	49%	19%
Released	5%	1%	11%
Case Open	5%	1%	14%
Other	2%	1%	3%

a) What characteristics are associated with whether someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation?

Table 2 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted associations for personal characteristics.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

When looking at being cited, people's whose race is listed as Black or Other both have a statistically significant decreased odds of being cited as compared to people who are White (46% ($p=0.003$) and 69% ($p=0.001$) reduction respectively). Transitional aged youth (18-24) also have a statistically significant decreased odds of being cited (37% reduction) as compared to people under the age of 18 ($p=0.018$). Those people who had a prior record had a statistically significant 77% reduction in odds of being cited as compared to those without a prior record ($p<0.001$).

When looking at being booked, people whose race is listed as Black had a statistically significant 2 times increased odds of being booked as compared to people who are White ($p=0.001$). Transitional aged youth and adults both had a statistically significant reduced odds of being booked (85% ($p=0.018$) and 89% respectively($p=0.006$)) as compared to minors. Those with a prior record had a statistically significant 5.5 times increased odds of being booked as compared to those without a record ($p<0.001$).

Looking at receiving a prostitution-related citation, people whose race is listed as Other had a statistically significant 78% reduction in odds of receiving such a citation as compared to people listed as White ($p=0.002$). People over the age of 24 had a statistically significant 6.8 times increased odds of receiving a prostitution-related citation as compared to minors ($p=0.001$).

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 2: Associations between Personal Characteristics and Study Outcomes among People Selling Sex

Unadjusted Associations

	Cited			Booked			Prostitution-related Citation		
	OR	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Race/Ethnicity									
White	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Hispanic	0.671	[0.361,1.248]	0.207	1.241	[0.654,2.358]	0.509	0.31	[0.126,0.766]	0.011
Black	0.516	[0.358,0.743]	<0.001	1.769	[1.212,2.583]	0.003	0.767	[0.416,1.415]	0.396
Other	0.448	[0.254,0.791]	0.006	1.179	[0.650,2.140]	0.587	0.247	[0.115,0.529]	<0.001
Sex									
Male	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Female	0.592	[0.212,1.656]	0.318	1.446	[0.494,4.231]	0.501	0.397	[0.051,3.074]	0.376
Age									
<18 yo	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
18-<=24	24.749	[3.299,185.646]	0.002	0.503	[0.224,1.130]	0.096	7.371	[3.147,17.265]	<0.001
>24	35.774	[4.766,268.531]	0.001	0.439	[0.195,0.985]	0.046	13.423	[5.350,33.676]	<0.001
Prior									
No	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Yes	0.297	[0.194,0.456]	<0.001	4.71	[2.909,7.628]	<0.001	1.817	[0.824,4.004]	0.139

If ".", the variable was dropped from the model because it predicted the outcome perfectly.

Adjusted Associations

	Cited			Booked			Prostitution-related Citation		
	aOR	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**aOR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**aOR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Race/Ethnicity									
White	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Hispanic	0.548	[0.280,1.072]	0.079	1.73	[0.875,3.421]	0.115	0.529	[0.173,1.617]	0.264
Black	0.541	[0.360,0.812]	0.003	1.979	[1.305,3.001]	0.001	1.207	[0.510,2.857]	0.669
Other	0.314	[0.155,0.635]	0.001	1.682	[0.852,3.320]	0.134	0.218	[0.082,0.576]	0.002
Sex									
Male	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		.	.	.
Female	0.622	[0.209,1.853]	0.394	0.964	[0.322,2.884]	0.947	.	.	.
Age									
<18 yo	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
18-<=24	0.63	[0.430,0.923]	0.018	0.146	[0.029,0.721]	0.018	3.459	[0.924,12.944]	0.065
>24	1	[1.000,1.000]	.	0.107	[0.022,0.520]	0.006	6.789	[1.575,29.258]	0.01
Prior									
No	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Yes	0.229	[0.144,0.367]	<0.001	5.548	[3.367,9.141]	<0.001	1.515	[0.672,3.418]	0.317

If ".", the variable was dropped from the model because it predicted the outcome perfectly.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

b) Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people who are selling sex are being cited?

Table 3 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item.

Among people who were selling sex, incidents not involving SVU in 2014/15 had a statistically significant 7.19 times increased odds of being cited ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among people who were selling sex, incidents involving SVU in 2014/15 had a statistically significant 95% reduction in the odds of being cited ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Our observed adjusted associations between time period and bookings were significantly different between non-SVU and SVU incidents ($p<0.001$), in that significant increases were observed among non-SVU incidents and significant reductions were observed among SVU incidents.

c) Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people who are selling sex are being booked?

Table 3 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item of interest.

Among people who were selling sex, incidents not involving SVU in 2014/15 had a statistically significant 89% reduction of being booked ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among people who were selling sex, incidents involving SVU in 2014/15 did not have a significant reduction in the odds of being booked ($p=0.241$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Our observed adjusted associations between time period and bookings were significantly different between non-SVU and SVU incidents ($p<0.001$), in that significant reductions were observed among non-SVU incidents, but we did not observe significant reductions among SVU incidents.

d) Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people who are selling sex are receiving a prostitution-related citation?

Table 3 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item of interest.

Among people who were selling sex, incidents not involving SVU in 2014/15 had a statistically significant 75% reduction in the odds of receiving a prostitution-related citation ($p= 0.007$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among people who were selling sex, incidents involving SVU in 2014/15 had a statistically significant 99% reduction in the odds of being cited ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Our observed associations between time period and citations were significantly different between non-SVU and SVU incidents ($p<0.001$), in that significant reductions were observed among both non-SVU and SVU incidents.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 3: Association between time period and study outcomes, disaggregated by SVU status, among people selling sex

	Unadjusted Associations							Adjusted Associations						
	Cited and Released							Cited and Released						
	Non-SVU			SVU				Non-SVU			SVU			
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	p-value for interaction	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	p-value for interaction
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	5.251	[3.298,8.360]	<0.001	0.058	[0.023,0.145]	<0.001	<0.001	7.188	[4.082,12.658]	<0.001	0.046	[0.014,0.149]	<0.001	<0.001
	Booked							Booked						
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	0.138	[0.085,0.224]	<0.001	0.416	[0.113,1.533]	0.187	0.119	0.113	[0.062,0.206]	<0.001	0.392	[0.082,1.878]	0.241	<0.001
	Prostitution-related Citation							Prostitution-related Citation						
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	0.257	[0.119,0.555]	0.001	0.009	[0.003,0.030]	<0.001	<0.001	0.245	[0.089,0.679]	0.007	0.005	[0.001,0.044]	<0.001	<0.001

*p-value for interaction: tests whether the effect estimate comparing 14/15 to 09/10 is different between non-svu and svu units; OR = Odds Ratio; aOR= adjusted Odds Ratio; CI=Confidence Interval

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

People Buying Sex

Table 4 presents demographic information about people who were selling sex. The table presents the overall frequencies, and then the frequencies by year groupings (2009/2010 and 2014/2015).

Table 4: Sample Characteristics of People Buying Sex (N=373)

	All Years	2009/2010 (n=223)	2014/2015 (n=150)
Age Range	17-82	17-82	17-79
Median Age	34	34	33
Minor at time of incident	1%	1%	1%
RACE			
Black	9%	8%	11%
Hispanic	47%	56%	33%
Asian	13%	8%	21%
White	24%	22%	27%
Unknown	3%	3%	5%
Other	3%	4%	1%
Missing	1%	0%	1%
SEX			
Female	1%	0%	1%
Male	99%	100%	99%
RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS			
San Francisco	65%	68%	61%
Other CA City	30%	30%	30%
Other US State	2%	1%	3%
Other Country	1%	1%	1%
Missing	2%	1%	4%
CONDOMS MENTIONED			
Yes	3%	3%	2%
No	97%	96%	98%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
PRIOR RECORD IN SF			
Yes	22%	24%	19%
No	76%	75%	79%
Missing	1%	1%	3%

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

	All Years	2009/2010 (n=223)	2014/2015 (n=150)
PRIOR RECORD OUTSIDE OF SF			
Yes	28%	30%	25%
No	70%	69%	72%
Missing	2%	1%	3%
SEXUAL CONTACT WITH OFFICER			
Yes	0%	0%	0%
No	100%	99%	100%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
DESCRIPTIONS OF SEXUALIZED COMMUNICATION			
Yes	11%	4%	21%
No	89%	95%	79%
Missing	1%	0%	0%
HOW PERSON CLASSIFIED			
Suspect	4%	1%	8%
Detained	2%	1%	3%
Victim	0%	0%	0%
Cited	88%	91%	83%
Booked	5%	6%	5%
Missing	1%	0%	1%
RESOLUTION OF INCIDENT			
Cited	89%	92%	85%
Exceptional Clearance	0%	0%	1%
Booked	6%	6%	5%
Released	4%	1%	8%
Case Open	0%	0%	1%
Other	1%	0%	1%

a) What characteristics are associated with whether someone is cited, booked, or receives a prostitution-related citation?

Table 5 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted associations for personal characteristics.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5: Associations between Personal Characteristics and Study Outcomes among People Buying Sex

Unadjusted Associations

	Cited			Booked			Prostitution-related Citation		
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value
Race/Ethnicity									
White	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Hispanic	1.271	[0.585,2.762]	0.544	1.025	[0.370,2.841]	0.963	0.31	[0.068,1.422]	0.132
Black	1.169	[0.348,3.921]	0.801	1.339	[0.314,5.703]	0.693	0.368	[0.050,2.731]	0.328
Other	2.688	[0.826,8.745]	0.1	1	[1.000,1.000]	.	0.536	[0.087,3.309]	0.502
Sex									
Male	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Female	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Age									
<18 yo	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
18-<=24	3	[0.269,33.497]	0.372	0.16	[0.012,2.164]	0.168	50	[5.568,449.034]	<0.001
>24	2.066	[0.224,19.084]	0.522	0.242	[0.026,2.290]	0.216	40	[6.766,236.488]	<0.001
Prior									
No	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Yes	0.368	[0.183,0.740]	0.005	9.453	[3.099,28.837]	<0.001	3.746	[0.836,16.783]	0.084

If ".", the variable was dropped from the model because it predicted the outcome perfectly.

Adjusted Associations

	Cited			Booked			Prostitution-related Citation		
	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value
Race/Ethnicity									
White	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Hispanic	0.991	[0.427,2.301]	0.984	1.621	[0.555,4.732]	0.377	0.23	[0.028,1.879]	0.17
Black	1.061	[0.308,3.651]	0.926	1.347	[0.295,6.150]	0.7	0.18	[0.016,2.081]	0.17
Other	2.799	[0.735,10.655]	0.131	.	.	.	0.593	[0.056,6.331]	0.665
Sex									
Male	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Female	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Age									
<18 yo	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
18-<=24	3.928	[0.236,65.477]	0.341	0.132	[0.001,13.121]	0.388	32.334	[1.595,655.491]	0.024
>24	3.604	[0.247,52.532]	0.348	0.112	[0.001,9.404]	0.333	21.932	[1.346,357.282]	0.03
Prior									
No	1	(ref)		1	(ref)		1	(ref)	
Yes	0.374	[0.177,0.793]	0.01	10.929	[3.526,33.877]	<0.001	3.712	[0.992,13.894]	0.051

If ".", the variable was dropped from the model because it predicted the outcome perfectly.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The adjusted associations show that only statistically significant variable was whether someone had a prior record. For people who had a prior record they had both a statistically significant 63% reduction in the odds of being cited, and a 10.4 times increased odds of being booked, as compared to those without a prior record.

b) Is time period and/or SVU associated with whether people who are buying sex are being cited?

Table 6 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item.

Among people who were buying sex, incidents not involving SVU in 2014/15 did not have a statistically significant association with being cited (p=0.239), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among people who were buying sex, incidents involving SVU in 2014/15 had a statistically significant 82% reduction in the odds of being cited (p=0.001), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Our observed adjusted associations between time period and bookings were significantly different between non-SVU and SVU incidents (p=0.002), in that no significant change was observed among non-SVU incidents and significant reductions were observed among SVU incidents.

c) Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people who are buying sex are being booked?

Table 6 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item.

Among people who were buying sex, incidents not involving SVU in 2014/15 did not have a statistically significant association with being booked (p=0.158), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among people who were buying sex, incidents involving SVU in 2014/15 did not have a statistically significant association with being booked (p=0.613), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Our observed adjusted associations between time period and bookings were not significantly different between non-SVU and SVU incidents (p=0.216), in that no significant change was observed among non-SVU or SVU incidents.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 6: Association between time period and study outcomes, disaggregated by SVU status, among people buying sex

	Cited and Released							Cited and Released						
	Non-SVU			SVU			p-value for interaction	Non-SVU			SVU			p-value for interaction
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value		aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	2.11	[0.716,6.215]	0.176	0.179	[0.063,0.508]	0.001	0.001	2.095	[0.612,7.178]	0.239	0.179	[0.063,0.511]	0.001	0.002
	Booked							Booked						
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	0.281	[0.079,0.992]	0.049	1.676	[0.331,8.488]	0.533	0.088	0.384	[0.101,1.451]	0.158	1.54	[0.289,8.220]	0.613	0.216
	Prostitution-related Citation							Prostitution-related Citation						
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	0.567	[0.124,2.592]	0.464	0.1	[0.022,0.460]	0.003	0.114	0.385	[0.067,2.202]	0.283	0.098	[0.019,0.522]	0.006	0.269

*p-value for interaction: tests whether the effect estimate from comparing 14/15 to 09/10 is different between non-svu and svu units; OR=Odds Ratio; aOR = adjusted Odds Ratio; CI=Confidence Interval

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

d) Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether people who are buying sex are receiving a prostitution-related citation?

Table 6 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item of interest.

Among people who were buying sex, incidents not involving SVU in 2014/15 did not have a statistically significant association with receiving a prostitution-related citation (p= 0.283), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among people who were buying sex, incidents involving SVU in 2014/15 had a statistically significant 90% reduction in the odds of receiving a prostitution-related citation (p=0.006), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Our observed associations between time period and citations were not significantly different between non-SVU and SVU incidents (p=0.269).

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Third Parties

Table 7 presents demographic information about people who were selling sex. The table presents the overall frequencies, and then the frequencies by year groupings (2009/2010 and 2014/2015). Because of the small number in this group, we were not able to do more in-depth statistical analysis

Table 7: Sample Characteristics of Third Parties (N=70)

	All Years	2009/2010 (n=20)	2014/2015 (n=50)
Age Range	18-62	20-55	18-62
Median Age	28	28	29
Minor at time of incident	0%	0%	0%
RACE			
Black	69%	65%	70%
Hispanic	14%	15%	14%
Asian	7%	15%	4%
White	3%	0%	4%
Unknown	3%	5%	2%
Other	1%	0%	2%
Missing	3%	0%	4%
SEX			
Female	11%	20%	8%
Male	87%	80%	90%
Missing	2%	0%	2%
RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS			
San Francisco	31%	65%	18%
Other CA City	33%	15%	40%
Other US State	1%	0%	2%
Other Country	0%	0%	0%
Missing	34%	20%	40%
CONDOMS MENTIONED			
Yes	7%	20%	2%
No	47%	40%	50%
Missing	46%	40%	48%
PRIOR RECORD IN SF			
Yes	37%	40%	36%
No	24%	30%	22%
Missing	39%	30%	42%

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

	All Years	2009/2010 (n=20)	2014/2015 (n=50)
PRIOR RECORD OUTSIDE OF SF			
Yes	46%	40%	48%
No	16%	25%	12%
Missing	39%	35%	40%
DESCRIPTIONS OF SEXUALIZED COMMUNICATION			
Yes	4%	5%	4%
No	46%	60%	40%
Missing	50%	35%	56%
HOW PERSON CLASSIFIED			
Suspect	49%	40%	52%
Detained	1%	0%	2%
Cited	3%	5%	2%
Booked	40%	50%	36%
Missing	7%	5%	8%
RESOLUTION OF INCIDENT			
Cited	3%	5%	2%
Booked	40%	50%	36%
Case Open	53%	45%	56%
Other	4%	0%	6%
Relationship to Person of Interest			
Parent/guardian	0%	0%	0%
Foster Parent	0%	0%	0%
Acquaintance/peer	16%	40%	6%
Friend	4%	0%	6%
Intimate Partner	13%	25%	8%
Stranger	13%	0%	18%
Pimp	17%	0%	24%
Other	9%	20%	4%
Missing	29%	15%	34%

Human Trafficking

Table 8 shows the frequencies for reports being labeled by the SFPD with the incident code for human trafficking, if someone was screened for trafficking, and if the case actually involved elements indicative of trafficking. The table also reports the frequency for how often the designation of whether or not an incident involved a trafficking offense was correctly identified. Across all years, incidents were correctly identified 40% of the time. For

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

2009/2010 the correct designation occurred 37% of the time, and for 2014/2015 it was 43% of the time.

TABLE 8: Incident Level Trafficking Details

	All Years (n=948)	2009/2010 (n=569)	2014/2015 (n=379)
Report Labeled as Trafficking			
Yes	15%	2%	35%
No	85%	98%	65%
Mention of Screening for Trafficking			
Yes	17%	4%	37%
No	83%	96%	63%
Believe the Incident to be Trafficking			
Yes	4%	4%	5%
No	48%	37%	64%
Don't Know	48%	59%	31%
Trafficking Designation Concurrence			
Labeled Yes/Believed Yes	2%	1%	4%
Labeled Yes/Believed No	10%	1%	25%
Labeled Yes/Believed Don't Know	3%	1%	7%
Labeled No/Believed Yes	2%	3%	1%
Labeled No/Believed No	38%	36%	39%
Labeled No/Believed Don't Know	45%	58%	25%

Tables 9 and 10 show the frequencies for correct trafficking designation by SVU status, as well as SVU Status by time period. Across all time periods, incidents involving SVU correctly identified whether or not an incident involved a trafficking offense 54% of the time. Looking only at incidents where SVU was involved, for the earlier time period of 2009/2010, incidents had the correct trafficking designation 58% of the time. For the later time period of 2014/2015 the correct designation occurred 47% of the time

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE 9: Trafficking Concurrence by SVU Status

	SVU Status	
	SVU (n=557)	**Non-SVU (n=391)**
Trafficking Designation Concurrence		
Labeled Yes/Believed Yes	1%	3%
Labeled Yes/Believed No	17%	1%
Labeled Yes/Believed Don't Know	4%	2%
Labeled No/Believed Yes	1%	5%
Labeled No/Believed No	53%	16%
Labeled No/Believed Don't Know	24%	74%

TABLE 10: Trafficking Concurrence by SVU Status and Time Period

	SVU by Time Period (N=557)	
	2009/2010 (n=332)	**2014/2015 (n=225)**
Trafficking Designation Concurrence		
Labeled Yes/Believed Yes	0%	3%
Labeled Yes/Believed No	1%	40%
Labeled Yes/Believed Don't Know	1%	9%
Labeled No/Believed Yes	1%	0%
Labeled No/Believed No	58%	44%
Labeled No/Believed Don't Know	39%	3%

All Incidents

a) **For all incidents, what characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether an incident is correctly identified as trafficking?**

Table 11 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted associations for characteristics associated with screening and characteristics associated with correctly identifying whether an incident involves human trafficking.

Screening for Trafficking

The adjusted associations show that both police action and the reporting officer being female are both have a statistically significant association with whether an incident was screened for trafficking. Those incidents that came about because of police initiated operations at massage establishments or hotels, through online communication (i.e.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Backpage, Redbook), and actions related to the First Offender Prostitution Program had a statistically significant 2.8 times increased odds of being screened for trafficking (P=<0.001). Incidents where the reporting officer was female had a statistically significant 96% reduction in the odds of being screened for trafficking (p<0.001).

Table 11: Associations between Incident-level Characteristics and Trafficking Outcomes for All Incidents

Unadjusted Associations

	Screened for Trafficking			Correctly Identified as Trafficking		
	OR	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Police Action	1.881	[1.328,2.664]	<0.001	5.57	[4.176,7.429]	<0.001
Female Officer	0.05	[0.018,0.137]	<0.001	1.634	[1.225,2.178]	0.001

Adjusted Associations

	Screened for Trafficking			Correctly Identified as Trafficking		
	aOR	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**aOR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Police Action	2.77	[1.917,4.003]	<0.001	5.683	[4.214,7.666]	<0.001
Female Officer	0.038	[0.014,0.103]	<0.001	1.099	[0.800,1.510]	0.561

Correctly Identified as Trafficking

The adjusted associations show that police action has a statistically significant association with whether an incident was correctly identified as trafficking. Those incidents that came about because of police initiated operations at massage establishments or hotels, through online communication (i.e. Backpage, Redbook), and actions related to the First Offender Prostitution Program had a statistically significant 5.7 times increased odds of being correctly identified as trafficking (P=<0.001). Incidents where the reporting officer was female did not have a statistically significant association with correct identification of trafficking (p=0.561).

b) For all incidents, is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking?

Table 12 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item.

Among all incidents, non-SVU incidents in 2014/2015 had a statistically significant 29.17 times increased odds of being screened for trafficking (p<0.001), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among all incidents, SVU incidents in 2014/2015 had a statistically significant 4.85 times increased odds of being screened for trafficking (p<0.001), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Our observed adjusted associations between time period and screening for trafficking were significantly different ($p=0.022$) in that both non-SVU and SVU incidents saw increases in screening for trafficking comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/2010.

c) For all incidents, is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?

Table 12 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item.

Among all incidents, non-SVU incidents in 2014/2015 had a statistically significant 8.50 times increased odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among all incidents, SVU incidents in 2014/2015 had a statistically significant 64% reduction in odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders.

Our observed adjusted associations between time period and correct identification of trafficking were significantly different ($p<0.001$) in that non-SVU saw an increase in correct identification while SVU incidents saw a decrease comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/2010.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 12: Association between time period and study outcomes, disaggregated by SVU status

	Screened for Trafficking, all incidents							Screened for Trafficking						
	Non-SVU			SVU				Non-SVU			SVU			
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	p-value for interaction	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	p-value for interaction
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	30.216	[9.174,99.521]	<0.001	12.355	[7.248,21.062]	<0.001	0.18	29.166	[8.686,97.930]	<0.001	4.85	[2.665,8.827]	<0.001	0.022
	Correctly Identified as Trafficking, all incidents							Correctly Identified as Trafficking						
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	8.117	[4.438,14.844]	<0.001	0.645	[0.459,0.907]	0.012	<0.001	8.501	[4.417,16.365]	<0.001	0.355	[0.214,0.588]	<0.001	<0.001

*p-value for interaction: tests whether the effect estimate from comparing 14/15 to 09/10 is different between non-svu and svu units; OR=Odds Ratio; aOR = adjusted Odds Ratio; CI=Confidence Interval

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Incidents Involving Someone Selling Sex

a) **For incidents that involved someone selling sex, what characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether or not an incident is correctly identified as trafficking?**

Table 13 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted associations for characteristics associated with screening and characteristics associated with correctly identifying whether incidents that involved someone selling sex were correctly identified as human trafficking.

Table 13: Associations between Incident-level Characteristics and Trafficking Outcomes for Incidents Involving People who Sell Sex

Unadjusted Associations

	Screened for Trafficking			Correctly Identified as Trafficking		
	OR	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Police Action	2.414	[1.498,3.888]	<0.001	1.271	[0.734,2.199]	0.392
Female Officer	0.103	[0.037,0.287]	<0.001	0.175	[0.069,0.444]	<0.0001
Minor	1.789	[0.774,4.137]	0.174	2.801	[1.236,6.346]	0.014
Person of Color	2.217	[1.303,3.772]	0.003	1.865	[1.062,3.274]	0.03
Female	1.429	[0.319,6.398]	0.641	1.113	[0.248,4.998]	0.889
Non-SF resident	1.4	[0.863,2.272]	0.173	1.782	[1.027,3.091]	0.04
Condoms Mentioned	0.348	[0.201,0.603]	<0.001	0.382	[0.210,0.694]	0.002
Prior Record	0.328	[0.200,0.539]	<0.001	0.418	[0.243,0.721]	0.002
Dressed as Prostitute	2.72	[1.673,4.421]	<0.001	2.78	[1.646,4.696]	<0.0001

Adjusted Associations

	Screened for Trafficking			Correctly Identified as Trafficking		
	aOR	**95% CI**	**p-value**	**aOR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Police Action	4.174	[2.115,8.237]	<0.001	2.106	[1.035,4.285]	0.04
Female Officer	0.087	[0.028,0.267]	<0.001	0.222	[0.080,0.617]	0.004
Minor	0.625	[0.076,5.116]	0.661	0.739	[0.091,5.986]	0.777
Person of Color	1.633	[0.875,3.047]	0.123	1.353	[0.710,2.578]	0.358
Female	1.445	[0.262,7.955]	0.673	0.882	[0.167,4.673]	0.883
Non-SF resident	0.754	[0.415,1.368]	0.352	1.161	[0.612,2.199]	0.648
Condoms Mentioned	0.461	[0.240,0.884]	0.02	0.423	[0.209,0.854]	0.016
Prior Record	0.465	[0.258,0.838]	0.011	0.533	[0.288,0.988]	0.046
Dressed as Prostitute	2.032	[1.095,3.768]	0.025	1.903	[1.005,3.605]	0.048

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Screening for Trafficking

The adjusted associations show that among incidents that involved someone selling sex, police action (4.2 times increased odds of screening, $p<0.001$), the reporting officer being female (90% reduction in odds of screening, $p<0.001$), condoms being mentioned (54% reduction in odds of screening, $p=0.02$), the person having a prior record (53% reduction in odds of screening, $p=0.011$), and being dressed in a manner that police consider to be indicative of prostitution (2.0 times increased odds of screening, $p=0.025$) were all significantly associated with whether or not someone was screened for trafficking.

Correctly Identified as Trafficking

The adjusted associations show that among incidents that involved someone selling sex, police action (2.1 times increased odds of correct identification, $p=0.04$), the reporting officer being female (78% reduction in odds of correct identification, $p=0.004$), condoms being mentioned (58% reduction in odds of correct identification, $p=0.016$), the person having a prior record (47% reduction in odds of correct identification, $p=0.046$), and being dressed in a manner that police consider to be indicative of prostitution (1.9 times increased odds of correct identification, $p=0.048$) were all significantly associated with whether or not the incident was correctly identified as trafficking.

b) For incidents that involved someone selling sex, is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking?

Table 14 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item.

Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, non-SVU incidents in 2014/2015 had a statistically significant 49.30 times increased odds of being screened for trafficking ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, SVU incidents in 2014/2015 had a statistically significant 7.22 times increased odds of being screened for trafficking ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders.

Our observed adjusted associations between time period and screening for trafficking were not significant ($p=0.065$)

c) For incidents that involved someone selling sex, is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?

Table 14 shows both the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for this item.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 14: Association between time period and study outcomes, disaggregated by SVU status, among people selling sex

	Screened for Trafficking, all incidents							Screened for Trafficking						
	Non-SVU			SVU				Non-SVU			SVU			
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	p-value for interaction	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	p-value for interaction
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	47.284	[11.166,200.224]	<0.001	18.386	[8.101,41.727]	<0.001	0.265	49.299	[11.123,218.497]	<0.001	7.22	[2.871,18.153]	<0.001	0.065
	Correctly Identified as Trafficking, all incidents							Correctly Identified as Trafficking						
2009/10	1	(ref)		1	(ref)			1	(ref)		1	(ref)		
2014/15	27.125	[9.435,77.985]	<0.001	4.533	[1.958,10.498]	<0.001	0.009	25.56	[8.625,75.744]	<0.001	1.896	[0.747,4.816]	0.178	0.004

*p-value for interaction: tests whether the effect estimate from comparing 14/15 to 09/10 is different between non-svu and svu units; OR=Odds Ratio; aOR = adjusted Odds Ratio; CI=Confidence Interval

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, non-SVU incidents in 2014/2015 had a statistically significant 25.56 times increased odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking ($p<0.001$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders. Among incidents that involved someone selling sex, SVU incidents did not have a statistically significant association with correctly identifying a case as trafficking ($p=0.178$), as compared to incidents in 2009/10, after adjusting for potential confounders.

Our observed adjusted associations between time period and correct identification of trafficking were significantly different ($p=0.004$) in that non-SVU saw an increase in correct identification while SVU incidents saw no change when comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/2010.

Discussion

Among incidents where people are selling sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/2010, non-SVU incidents have increased odds for citing someone, a reduction in odds for booking someone, and a decreased in odds for issuing someone a prostitution-related citation. SVU incidents have decreased odds of citing someone, no statistically significant change in bookings, and a reduction in odds for issuing someone a prostitution-related citation. Compared to people listed as White, those who were identified as Black or Other have decreased odds of being cited, but those listed as Black have increased odds of being booked. This racial disparity deserves further attention.

Among incidents where people are buying sex, comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/2010, neither non-SVU did not have a statistically significant change in citations, bookings, or prostitution-related citations. Incidents involving SVU had a reduction in odds of someone being cited, no association with whether someone was booked, and a reduction in odds of someone receiving a prostitution-related citation. For all incidents across the years, those with prior records had a reduction in odds of being cited, but a significant increase in the odds of being booked.

Overall, the SFPD is doing a better job of screening for and correctly identifying a case as trafficking when comparing data from 2014/2015 to 2009/2010. The one notable discrepancy is among incidents involving SVU. Although the SVU is doing a better job of screening for trafficking, across all incidents its odds of correctly identifying a case as trafficking is significantly reduced in 2014/2015. This is largely the result of SVU labeling massage establishment inspections and operations targeting men purchasing sex as human trafficking incidents. The accuracy of the SFPD's data would improve tremendously if SVU only used the incident code for human trafficking for those incidents where human trafficking was established. If the focus was just among incidents where people were selling sex SVU did not see a change in odds of correctly identifying trafficking.

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Appendix A

Data Extraction Form

Incident Report Review Sheet

(If more than 1 person mentioned in report who is selling sex, buying sex, and/or is a 3rd party, complete multiple forms)

Anytime data is missing, write 99 in the corresponding section and use F3 key in Blaise.

Incident Number: _____ **ID #s associated with the report: _____**

Incident Date *(month/day/year)***: _____** **Time of incident: _____**

Address of incident *(address or cross street)***: _____**

Police District: _Select all that apply_____ Supplemental Report Only: yes no

Incident Code(s): _Select all that apply___ **Crime/Clearance Number:** _Select only one_

A. Incident Information		
A1. How did the incident come to the attention of law enforcement? (Select all that apply) a. Tip/report(Yes/No): specify Type: __citizen; __CBO; __ hotline; __other, explain: _____ b. Police action(Yes/No) – Specify type (Select all that apply) Type: ____Street ____Massage establishment inspection ____FOPP ____Backpage ____Redbook ____Hotel ____Other online (specify_____) c. Other Police entrapment/set-up(Yes/No), explain: _____ d. Police action based on overarching complaints(Yes/No) e. Ongoing investigation(Yes/No), type:_____ f. Other(Yes/No), explain:_____		
A2. Reporting Officer Name:	A3. Officer Sexr: F M	A4. Reporting Officer Badge #:
A5. Other Officials Involved? Yes No **If NO, skip to A8**		
A6. Number of other police officers:	A7. Number of non-police:	
A8. Decoy Involved?*(circle one)* Yes No **If NO, skip to A10** A9. Gender of Decoy:*(circle one)* F M		
A10. Interpreter Involved: Yes No **If NO, skip to A11** **A10a.** If yes, who was the interpreter (circle all that apply): Reporting officer Another police officer Civilian Language Line Other (specify):_____		
A11. Brief summary of incident:		

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

A12. Check location(s) where incident occurred:

___Internet-based ___ Strip Club ___Massage Establishment
___Modeling Agency ___Hotel ___Residence
___Street ___Other (specify) _____

A13. Did incident report label as human trafficking: Yes No

A14. Any mention of person/people being screened for trafficking: Yes No

A15. Believe the incident to be human trafficking: Yes No Don't Know

A15a. If yes, types of trafficking (mark all that apply):

Sex Industry Other Industry (specify_____)

A15b. If yes or don't know, explain reason for this determination:

[See "Elements that indicate human trafficking" guidance document for examples]

A16. Other notes about Incident report:

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

B. Person of Interest (Person involved in selling sex) - - Allow up to 7 different Sec B pages

Unique ID#: _____

B1. Age: (0-99)

B2. Minor at time of incident:
____Yes
____No

B3. Race:
___B(lack)
___H(ispanic)
___A(sian)
___W(hite)
___U(nknown)
___ Other (specify:_____)

B4. Biological Sex:
___Female
___Male

B5. Gender:
___transwoman
___ciswoman
___transman
___cisman

B6. Residential Address:
___San Francisco
___California City outside of SF (specify:_____)
___Other US Sate (Specify:_____)
___Other Country (Specify:_____)

B7. Form of ID provided:
___ CA Driver's License
___CA State ID
___Other State Driver's License
___Other State ID card
___Non-US ID (Specify country of: origin_____)
___No ID provided

B8. False ID given to LE:
___Yes
___No

Condoms:

B9a. Mentioned in report
____yes
____no

B9b. Seized as evidence
___yes
___no

B10. Cell phone searched:
____yes, with permission
____yes, without permission
____seized as evidence
____no

B11. Prior record in SF:
___yes
___no

B12. Prior record outside of SF:
___yes
___no

B13. Presenting Demeanor: (Select all that apply)
___Positive demeanor (respectful; responsive; accommodating)
___ Negative demeanor (disrespectful; aggressive; resistant)
___ Person was crying

B14. Sexual Contact with Officer:
__ yes (specify:__400 chars___)
__ no

B15. Descriptions/photos of sexualized clothing or communication:
___yes (specify: _____)
___no

B16. How person classified on report: (select only one)
___ Suspect ____Detained ___ Victim ___Cited ___Booked

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

B17. Third Party Involvement	If yes:	
___yes ___no - - - - - : **Skip to B18** ___suspected: **Skip to B18**	B17a. Share Info about 3rd party ___yes ___no	B17b. Willing to prosecute 3rd party: ___yes ___no

B18. Violation(s)/Charges (if none, mark No Charges): (Select all that apply)

B19. Resolution of incident:

___cited	___exceptional clearance	___found (in cases of juveniles/youth)
___booked	___unfounded	___ released
___none	___diverted	___ other: specify _____

C. Person of Interest (Person involved in buying sex) - - Allow up to 7 different Sec C pages

Unique ID#: _____

C1. Age: (0-99) C2. Minor at time of incident: _____Yes _____No	C3. Race: ___B(lack) ___H(ispanic) ___A(sian) ___W(hite) ___U(nknown) ___ Other (specify:_____)	C4. Biological Sex: ___Female ___Male C5. Gender: ___transwoman ___ciswoman ___transman ___cisman

C6. Residential Address: ___San Francisco ___California City outside of SF (specify:_____) ___Other US Sate (Specify:_____) ___Other Country (Specify:_____) C7. Form of ID provided: ___ CA Driver's License ___CA State ID ___Other State Driver's License ___Other State ID card ___Non-US ID (Specify country of: origin_____) ___No ID provided	C8. False ID given to LE: ___Yes ___No

Condoms: C9a. Mentioned in report _____yes _____no C10. Cell phone searched: _____yes, with permission _____yes, without permission _____seized as evidence _____no	C9b. Seized as evidence ___yes ___no	C11. Prior record in SF: ___yes ___no C12. Prior record outside of SF: ___yes ___no

C13. Presenting Demeanor: (Select all that apply)	C14. Sexual Contact with Officer:
___Positive demeanor (respectful; responsive; accommodating) ___ Negative demeanor (disrespectful; aggressive; resistant) ___ Person was crying	__ yes (specify:__400 chars___) __ no

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

C15. Descriptions/photos of sexualized clothing or communication:
___yes (specify: _____)
___no

C16. How person classified on report: (select only one)
___ Suspect ____Detained ___ Victim ___Cited ___Booked

C17c. Was person actually selling NOT buying:	C17d. Referred to Neighborhood Court:	C17e. Referred to FOPP:
___yes ___no	___yes ___no	___yes ___no

C18. Violation(s)/Charges (if none, mark No Charges):

C19. Resolution of incident:

___cited	___exceptional clearance	___released
___booked	___unfounded	___ other: specify _____
___none	___diverted	

D. Information about 3rd party - - Allow up to 7 different Sec D pages

Unique ID#: _____

D0. Identity of person confirmed:	D1. Age: (0-99) D2. Minor at time of incident:	D3. Race:	D4. Biological Sex:
___Yes ___No	____Yes ____No	___B(lack) ___H(ispanic) ___A(sian) ___W(hite) ___U(nknown) ___Other (specify:_____)	___Female ___Male D5. Gender: ___transwoman ___ciswoman ___transman ___cisman

D6. Residential Address:
___San Francisco
___California City outside of SF (specify:_____)
___Other US Sate (Specify:_____)
___Other Country (Specify:_____)

D7. Form of ID provided:
___ CA Driver's License
___CA State ID
___Other State Driver's License
___Other State ID card
___Non-US ID (Specify country of: origin_____)
___No ID provided

D8. False ID given to LE:
___Yes
___No

Condoms:

D9a. Mentioned in report	D9b. Seized as evidence
____yes ____no	___yes ___no

D10. Cell phone searched:
____yes, with permission
____yes, without permission

D11. Prior record in SF:
___yes
___no

D12. Prior record outside of SF:
___yes
___no

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

____seized as evidence ____no	

D13. Presenting Demeanor: (Select all that apply)
___Positive demeanor (respectful; responsive; accommodating)
___ Negative demeanor (disrespectful; aggressive; resistant)
___ Person was crying

D15. Descriptions/photos of sexualized clothing or communication:
___yes (specify: _____)
___no

D16. How person classified on report: (select only one)
___ Suspect ____Detained ___ Victim ___Cited ___Booked

D18. Violation(s)/Charges (if none, mark No Charges):

D20. Relationship to Person of Interest:
___Parent/guardian ___Foster parent ___Acquaintance/peer ___Friend
___Intimate partner ___Stranger ___Pimp ___Other, specify _____

D19. Resolution of incident:
___cited ___exceptional clearance ___released
___booked ___unfounded ___ other: specify _____
___none ___diverted

Police Districts:

1 = Central
2 = Southern
3 = Bayview
4 = Mission
5 = Park
6 = Richmond
7 = Ingleside
8 = Taraval
9 = Tenderloin
10 = Northern
11 = Vice
12 = SVU

Crime/Clearance Number

0
1 allegation unfounded
2 juvenile admonished
3 juvenile diverted
4 juvenile cited
5 juvenile booked
6 adult booked
7 adult cited

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

8 prosecuted by outside agency
9 prosecuted for lesser offense
10 DA refuses to prosecute
11 Complainant refuses to prosecute
12 not prosecuted
13 exceptional clearance
14 psychopathic case
15 juvenile clearance
16 person located

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Appendix B

Elements that Indicate Human Trafficking

- Threatened or actual physical or nonphysical (psychological, financial or reputational) harm which compels person to perform or continue to perform labor to avoid harm
- Use or threatened use of law to exert pressure on another person to perform labor
- Demeaning and demoralizing the person (verbal abuse, humiliation)
- Disorienting and depriving person of alternatives (isolation, restricted communications, manipulation of debts, monitoring/surveillance)
- Diminishing resistance and debilitating (substandard living conditions, deny food, water, medical care, weaken with drugs or alcohol)
- Deceiving about consequences (overstate risks of leaving, overstate rewards of staying, feigning power/ties to authorities or hit men/gangs)
- Dominating, intimidating and controlling (abuse, atmosphere of violence, displaying weapons, rules and punishments)
- Knowingly recruited, enticed, harbored, transported, provided, obtained, or maintained a person for purposes of a commercial sex act (presence of a pimp)
- Knowingly benefitted, financially or by receiving something of value, from participating in above venture
- Knew [or recklessly disregarded] that force, fraud, or coercion would be used to cause the person to engage in commercial sex acts
- Person involved in commercial sex <18
- Past involvement of suspect or victim in human trafficking incidents

This resource was prepared by the author(s) using Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.