



**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-Ally Evaluation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking, Draft Final Summary Report**

**Author(s):**                   **Alexandra Lutnick, Minh Dang**

**Document Number:**   **254009**

**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.**

NIJ Grant Number 2015-VF-GX-0107  
RTI Project Number 0215039

# Researcher-Survivor-Ally Evaluation of the Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking

## Draft Final Summary Report

### August 2018

Prepared for

**National Institute of Justice**  
810 7<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Washington, DC 20531

Prepared by

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

**Minh Dang**  
MD Consulting

## *Acknowledgements*

The Researcher-Survivor-Ally Evaluation of the Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking 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.

The evaluation team extends our many thanks to those who contributed to this evaluation. In particular, the team thanks the participants and members of the Task Force, our Community Advisory Board members, our research assistants, and Barrot Lambdin for his assistance with statistical analysis.

## *Problem and Purpose*

In March 2013, then San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee launched the Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking. The purpose of the Task Force is to review current efforts to improve the City's response to human trafficking and identify gaps in services for survivors. Participants include representatives from social service organizations, law enforcement, community-based organizations, philanthropic and advocacy groups, and concerned citizens. This model, unlike many of the federally funded task forces is not specifically oriented to law enforcement responses to human trafficking. Instead, much of the work is led by social service providers. The Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) staffs the Task Force. To date, the Task Force has not received federal funding.

RTI International, in partnership with MD Consulting, conducted a researcher-survivor-ally participatory process evaluation of the Task Force. This study was unique and innovative in that the most integrated approach of community involvement was utilized. People who have experienced a severe form of human trafficking are represented at all levels of the research process, including that of co-principal investigator (co-PI), research assistants (Ras) and members of the Community Advisory Board (CAB).

The goals of our evaluation were to evaluate components of task force implementation through a comprehensive process evaluation and create a research infrastructure that supports the intellectual and career development of people who have experienced trafficking.

## *Research Design*

Over the course of the evaluation we engaged in multiple forms of data collection. We reviewed documents, including all available meeting minutes, reports and position papers developed by the committees, and the 2015 and 2016 annual report. We attended all general meetings and at least the first meeting of each committee for each year. Once a year we conducted key informant interviews with Task Force participants and members and administered the Levels of Collaboration Scale. Lastly, we conducted quantitative analysis of de-identified data provided by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the San Francisco District Attorney's Office (SFDA).

*Key Informant Interviews.* In the first two rounds of key informant interviews we used quota sampling to ensure representation of members from each committee, newer members, and long-standing members. For the first round in 2016, we interviewed 31 individuals from 25 agencies. In the second round (2017), we interviewed 34 individuals from 25 agencies. In the final round, 2018, we interviewed the Co-Chairs of each committee (4 individuals) and representatives from the Department on the Status of Women (2 individuals).

Each interview was audio recorded with permission from the participants. We took notes during the interviews and used the audio recordings afterwards to ensure the accuracy of information. In the last round, we had the recordings transcribed. We e-mailed interviewees the notes or transcripts and asked them to verify their accuracy. In some cases, interviewees requested changes. After making those changes we finalized the interview notes/transcripts.

*Levels of Collaboration Scale.* The Levels of Collaboration Scale was administered yearly. The six levels on the scale are (0) No interaction, (1) Networking, (2) Cooperation, (3) Coordination, (4) Coalition, and (5) Collaboration. For the first two administrations, organizations included on the scale attended at least 2 meetings during the time leading up to the administration of the scale. We created this inclusion criteria because attending at least two meetings is a minimum for collaboration to occur. For the last administration, only formal members of the Task Force were included. For the first round, of 44 listed agencies, 20 completed the scale (46%). In the second round, of 37 listed agencies, 19 completed the scale (51%). For the last administration of the scale, of 23 agencies included, sixteen completed the scale (70%).

*Peer Research Infrastructure.* We held a total of ten CAB Meetings between June 2016 and May 2018. Most CAB members identified as having experienced trafficking in the sex industry. Co-PI Dang identifies as a survivor of child sex trafficking. We also started with two peer- RAs. One RA left the project early because she needed full time employment. The other left the project in the second half of 2017 to pursue a PhD program. At that point, Co-PI Dang took on more project responsibilities. We

conducted in-depth interviews with CAB members to better understand their experience of the project and to solicit feedback about the project infrastructure.

*SFPD and SFDA Data.* 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, with the SFDA providing the prosecutorial outcomes for those incidents where someone received a citation.

### *Data Analysis*

For all but the SFPD data, the straightforward nature of the different data reviewed and collected allowed for simple descriptive methods to be used for analysis. For key informant interviews we summarized the interviews by question and then compared and contrasted responses across all interviewees. We used this same approach for the open-ended questions administered with the levels of collaboration scale. Responses to the quantitative levels of collaboration scale were dual entered into excel, compared to one another, and flagged for discrepancies for review and correction.

*Peer Research Infrastructure.* All but one CAB meeting was audio recorded, with detailed notes taken to capture the contents of the discussions. We utilized a participatory analysis process for the meeting notes and the interview transcripts. Co-PI Dang and one of the CAB members developed a coding scheme for the data. Co-PI Dang then coded all the transcripts and notes, with Co-PI Lutnick and the CAB member reviewing the final coding. Co-PI Dang presented findings to CAB members and asked for their responses and interpretations, and then shared her interpretations of the data allowing CAB members to verify or challenge interpretations.

*SFPD and SFDA 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 answers we sought to answer were: Among all incident reports: What characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether an incident is correctly identified as trafficking? Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened

for trafficking, and for whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking or not trafficking related?

Among incidents that involved people selling sex: What characteristics are associated with whether an incident is screened for trafficking, and for whether an incident is correctly identified as trafficking? Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are screened for trafficking, and for 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. 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  $p < 0.2$ . 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.

A total of 1441 people were listed on the SFPD incident reports. Out of those 1441 people, 64% received a citation ( $n=924$ ). We provided the SFDA's office with the incident report numbers and other identifying info connected to cases where at least one person received a citation. The SFDA's office then provided us with the prosecutorial outcomes for all individuals for whom they had information ( $N=816$ ). We used descriptive statistics and frequencies to analyze these data.

## *Findings*

### *Key Informant Interviews/Task Force Meeting Observations and Minutes Review*

Task Force Meetings. The Task Force is comprised of General Meetings, and then meetings for its committees (Adult, Youth, Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact). Although there is an Executive

Committee, it does not meet with any regularity. As needed, working groups are established both within and outside of committees.

Over the course of the evaluation, the Task Force made significant process-oriented improvements. These included, but were not limited to, developing and implementing membership and voting guidelines, restructuring the committees, appointing Co-chairs for the committees, more consistently sending out meeting minutes, establishing the Youth Advisory Board, and continuing conversations about how to meaningfully increase the participation of impacted community members. The Youth Committee restructured its meeting format to spend most of the time working towards their established goals. This was an effective response to the reality that very few Task Force participants were spending time outside of meetings on Task Force related activities. The Task Force lacks unification around philosophical principles that guide the work. Consequently, tensions between certain groups (such as law enforcement and social services) remain. Similarly, power differentials among the participants (funders, potential funders, those being funded) sometimes inhibit open conversations and critiques of proposed plans.

[Capacity](#). The Task Force is staffed by one 50% FTE position, and a part-time Fellow, both from the DOSW. All other work is done primarily on a volunteer basis by participating agencies and members. As such, it is remarkable what the Task Force has been able to achieve.

[The Role of the Mayor's Office](#). Although this is called the Mayor's Task Force, representatives from the Mayor's Office were largely absent throughout the evaluation project. The association with the Mayor's office provides an elevated platform and legitimizes the work. The Task Force would benefit from more consistent attendance by a high-level representative of the Mayor's Office.

[Strategic Planning](#). The Task Force held two strategic planning sessions during the evaluation, one in 2016 and one in 2017. Both sessions had their limitations, largely attributable to the facilitators, but many Task Force participants found them to be helpful.

[Annual Report](#). The Task Force is one of the few in the nation that collects data on an annual basis from participating agencies, perhaps the only one if we excluded ECM task forces. Each iteration of the report

improves upon its predecessors with advancements in working towards an unduplicated count, inclusion of data about prosecuted trafficking cases, as well as consistent use of inclusion and exclusion criteria. When agencies continue to struggle to submit valid data, conversations are held to explore how to overcome that challenge. Some of the challenges consistent over the evaluation period included limited participation among agencies that could report data, inconsistent data reporting among agencies that do provide data, and inaccurate data reporting.

*Levels of Collaboration Scale.* This task force is not set up for consensus decision making which on this scale is what characterizes collaboration. Similarly, with the diversity of agencies, it is unlikely that they all will belong to one system, so some agencies will never work together. What is more achievable and realistic is aiming for coordination (3) or coalition (4). Although we calculated median scores of collaboration at the general Task Force level (median =1), it is at the committee level that most of the in-depth work occurs. Therefore, it is more important to look at the median score of collaboration at this level (See Table 1).

These findings show that it is only the Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact Committee that has reached the level of coordination. Both the Adult and Youth Committees are at the level of cooperation (2). Within committees though, many agencies have reached, and in some cases exceeded, the level of coordination. This is a significant improvement since the beginning of this evaluation.

*San Francisco Police Department.* For the data reported below, findings were significant at  $p < 0.05$  level.

### 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 Reports 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 (See Table 2), comparing 2014/2015 to 2009/10, non-SVU and SVU incidents had statistically significant increased odds of being screened for trafficking (29.17x and 4.85x respectively).

*Is time period and/or SVU status associated with whether incidents are correctly identified as trafficking, after adjusting for potential confounders?* Among all incidents (see Table 2), comparing 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.

### **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 (see Table 3), 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 (see Table 3), 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.

*San Francisco District Attorney's Office Data.* Of the 816 people who received citations, 28 were people who were connected to a human trafficking incident. The SFDA's office had prosecutorial outcome data for 10 of those 28 people. This means 1% of the people who received citations were connected to a human trafficking incident. None of these citations were referred to Neighborhood Court. Table 4 provides a detailed account of the 10 citations related to trafficking incidents. All of the trafficking incidents were connected to the sex industry. Forty percent of the citations were connected to the person selling sex. Three of these people were under 18 and therefore victims of trafficking. The other person shared that she was engaged because of threats against her and her family. Two of these cases were discharged, one was dismissed, and the other was certified to Juvenile Court. Half of the citations were connected to third parties. Three were discharged, and two resulted in convictions. In one incident, it was the person buying sex who was cited. That case was discharged because further investigation was necessary.

*Peer Research Infrastructure.* CAB members' identification with the term "Survivor of Human Trafficking" is not discrete or stagnant. Only two people identified with this entire phrase and raised no issues about any part of the phrase. People who do not identify with the term said that it is because the

phrase is inaccurate to their experience, that there are public misconceptions about the term, or expect negative consequences when identifying themselves as a survivor of human trafficking.

CAB members found their experience on the project to be positive overall. They largely attributed this to the Co-PIs making the project relevant to their interests and responsive to their feedback. They also named that the Co-PIs showed respect through listening, and by valuing survivors' professional identities as demonstrated by the stipend they received for each meeting. CAB members found the experience educational and that over the course of the project it resulted in a caring community. They also stated that it was important that the project was co-led by a survivor. The experience was not without challenges, namely scheduling child care and finding the work more triggering of past trauma than expected.

In the final months of the project, CAB members initiated the development of two publications: *Tips for Survivor Leaders Working in the Anti-Trafficking Movement*, and *Tips for Anti-Trafficking Professionals When Working with Survivor Leaders*. These two publications are pragmatic outputs that has already had immediate impact on the anti-trafficking field. One professor will be incorporating the Tip Sheets into her curriculum, and several anti-trafficking professionals stated they would share them with their colleagues.

Throughout the project, professional development was inherent in the introduction of research processes to CAB members. RAs received additional professional training through one-on-one supervision and mentoring from Co-PI Lutnick. CAB members received annual professional development funds. These funds were used for child care during CAB meetings, development of a professional website, payment of school fees, attending retreats relevant to their work, as well as items needed for their professional work. We were able to support two CAB members in attending the Freedom Network Conference in Denver, Colorado. One CAB member took on a strong role in data analysis of the interviews conducted with CAB members. Co-PI Lutnick provided ongoing support for Co-PI Dang primarily related to how to navigate research project responsibilities, trauma activations, and her transition to a PhD program.

## *Implications for Policy and Practice*

*Task Force Process.* This Task Force is led primarily by social service agencies. Consequently, it has been able to implement important service needs such as a 24-hour response to youth involved in the sex trade, as well as City and County of San Francisco policies. This highlights one of the strengths of a non-ECM model. However, the Task Force does not receive any federal funding to support its efforts. The only financial support for the operation of the Task Force is in the form of the 50% FTE position and the part-time Fellow, both from the DOSW. As the Task Force continues its work, participants and members feel like they are being asked to take on more work without financial compensation and support for those efforts. Similarly, as the Task Force continues to grow, and develops more specific, measurable goals, it will become increasingly more difficult to sustain the work. Although the Task Force has accomplished quite a bit with this limited financial support, going forward it is going to need to find additional financial support. It would benefit from another 50% FTE position, and also financial support for those taking on more active roles such as Co-Chairs or working group leads. Similarly, financial and technical assistance support is needed to increase the number of agencies submitting data for the annual report, as well as to support the submission of complete and accurate data. With meetings open to the public, an orientation for new attendees is needed. Such an orientation would address the values of the Task Force, its historical work, current structure and goals, as well as past efforts that were not successful. For continuity purposes, the Task Force would be best served if agencies had designated people who participated and ensured a transfer of knowledge when a new person attends the meetings. The best use of strategic planning retreats will be to focus on developing goals that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant/realistic, and timely (SMART). Likewise, clear timelines with assigned point people will help move the Task Force towards goal achievement. Finally, it is helpful to have a strategic planning facilitator who has some working knowledge of trafficking, but is not so immersed in the work that they project their own agenda onto the planning work.

*Levels of Collaboration.* For the Task Force to continue to increase the levels of collaboration it would benefit from attending to certain items. Strong collaborations are built open common values.

Conversations are needed that truly explore where there is value alignment and divergence, and then based on the areas of alignment create goals. Continued efforts are needed for increasing the meaningful involvement of people who have experienced trafficking, as well as other groups who are notably absent from most Task Force meetings (people of color, queer community members, young people, members from youth leadership organizations, and recent immigrants). Lastly, the Task Force would benefit from thinking about how best to support consistent and strong leadership.

**SFPD data.** 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.

**SFDA data.** The DA's office was able to provide prosecutorial outcomes for 10 citations related to trafficking incidents. All of the trafficking incidents were connected to the sex industry. Three of the four people selling sex who were cited were under the age of eighteen. These citations happened prior to the change of California's Prostitution Penal Code to prohibit the arrest of minors for prostitution. One of these cases was certified to Juvenile Court, with the others being discharged or dismissed. Half of the citations were connected to third parties. Forty percent resulted in convictions. The others were discharged either because of a lack of evidence, the need for further investigation, or because the complainant withdrew the complaint.

**Peer Research Infrastructure.** Going forward, projects that involve people who have experienced trafficking will want to build in time for general education on research (i.e. Research 101). Due to limited previous exposure to research, it wasn't until the end of this project that members began to grasp the

research question and processes. CAB members wanted to take on additional project work but could only do so if paid and/or able to step away from child care duties. Stipends that account for child care costs and meeting preparation time are crucial. Although the Co-PIs had some capacity to provide emotional support for the peer-researchers, we recommend that future projects include external support structures as well. At different points each peer member of the team, including the Co-PI, could have benefitted from more support around the ways in which this work triggered past trauma. Lastly, future studies are needed that examine peer-researchers' participation on well-being. Future work is needed to explore in more detail the benefits and challenges of peer involvement as it relates to trafficking research.

**TABLE 1: Median Level of Collaboration Score by Subcommittees**

	2016	2017	2018
<b>Youth</b>	4 (n=8)	2 (n=13)	2 (n= 16)
<b>Adult</b>	2 (n=10)	2 (n=7)	2.5 (n=7)
<b>Sex Work</b>	3 (n=7)	3 (n=6)	3 (n = 7)

**Table 2: Association between time period and study outcomes, disaggregated by SVU status, for all incidents**

	Screened for Trafficking							Screened for Trafficking*						
	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	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							Correctly Identified as Trafficking						
	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	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; \* adjusted for whether officer was female \*\* adjusted for whether whether officer was female and whether the incident involved police action; Variables considered as founders: whether officer was female and whether the incident involved police action

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

	Screened for Trafficking							Screened for Trafficking*						
	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	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							Correctly Identified as Trafficking*						
	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	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; \* adjusted for whether the officer was female; Variables considered as potential confounders: whether the officer was female, whether the incident involved police action, whether the incident involved a minor, whether the incident involved a person of color, whether the incident involved a female, whether the incident involved a non-SF resident; whether a condom was mentioned in the report, whether anyone involved in the incident had a prior record; whether the officer perceived anyone to be dressed as a prostitute

**Table 4: Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, Human Trafficking Incidents (n=10)**

<b>Who Cited</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Human Trafficking Details</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Person Selling Sex	2009	Person selling sex was 13	Dismissal – No Complaint Filed
Person Selling Sex	2009	Although person initially agreeing to sell sex, when she said she wanted to stop threats against her family made her fear for her safety and she continued to sell sex.	Discharge – Lack of Evidence
Third Party	2009	Male who was pimping/trafficking the person in the above case.	Discharge – Further Investigation Necessary
Third Party	2009	Male who was pimping/trafficking someone under the age of 18.	Conviction – County Jail
Person Selling Sex	2009	Person selling sex was 12.	Discharge – Further Investigation Necessary
Third Party	2010	Female who was pimping/trafficking someone under the age of 18	Conviction – County Jail with Probation
Third Party	2010	Male who was pimping/trafficking an adult. The person selling sex was giving all the money to him, said he was violent with her, and She was tired of him always telling her what to do	Discharge – Complainant Withdrew Complaint
Person Selling Sex	2010	Person selling sex under 18. It was 3 days before 18th birthday	Certified to Juvenile Court
Third Party	2014	Male who was pimping/trafficking an adult, and forcing her to sell sex. The person selling sex said he took all the money she made, and sometimes threatened her and/or physically assaulted her to make her go work.	Discharge – Lack of Evidence
Person Buying Sex	2014	Person selling sex was 15. Pimp said if she left him he would kill her. She feared for her life	Discharge – Further Investigation Necessary