



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 Prosecutorial** 

**Outcomes for San Francisco Police** 

**Department Prostitution and/or Human** 

**Trafficking Incident Reports** 

Author(s): Alexandra Lutnick, Minh Dang

**Document Number: 254005** 

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 Prosecutorial Outcomes for San Francisco Police Department Prostitution and/or Human Trafficking Incident Reports

Prepared by alexandra lutnick Minh Dang

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



RTI Project Number 0215039

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.

## **Contents**

		Page
Int	roduction	1
Met	thods	1
Fine	dings	3
	People selling sex	3
	People buying sex	4
	Third Parties	5
	Human Trafficking	6
Dis	cussion	7
۸	Appendices Data Extraction Form	0
A B	Data Extraction Form SFDA Disposition Codes	9 16
C	Elements that Indicate Human Trafficking	18

## **Tables**

Numb	oer er e	Page
1	Referrals to Neighborhood Court, People Selling Sex	3
2	Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Selling Sex	3
3	Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Selling Sex	3
4	Referrals to Neighborhood Court, People Buying Sex	4
5	Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Buying Sex	4
6	Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Buying Sex	5
7	Referrals to Neighborhood Court, Third Parties	5
8	Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, Third Parties	6
9	Referrals to Neighborhood Court, Human Trafficking Incidents	6
10	Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, Human Trafficking Incidents	7

RTI International conducted an analysis of a random sample of SFPD incident reports labeled as prostitution and/or human trafficking 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. To more fully understand these incidents, we conducted a separate analysis of the prosecutorial outcomes for those incidents that resulted in someone being cited and/or booked.

The questions we sought to answer were:

- 1) What are the prosecutorial outcomes for cases where:
  - a. Someone selling sex received a citation?
  - b. Someone buying sex received a citation?
  - c. A third party received a citation?
- 2) What are the prosecutorial outcomes for cases that involved human trafficking?

#### **METHODS**

The analysis of the SFPD data included 989 incident reports across the years 2009, 2010, 2014, and 2015. We created a data extraction form (see Appendix A) that was used with each SFPD incident report. A total of 1441 people were listed on those 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). This report shares the findings about the outcome of those 816 citations.

The SFDA's office provided the following information about the 108 missing prosecutorial outcomes (personal communication, M. McKee). Before the implementation of the Neighborhood Court System, if someone was referred directly to the First Offender Prostitution Program that information would be in the SFPD's records, not in the Court or DA's case management systems. Another possible explanation is that somehow the citations were lost, and the DA's office does not have any records about them.

Due to the straightforward nature of this analysis we used descriptive statistics and frequencies.

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

#### **Key Variable Definitions**

All variables for this analysis were dichotomous, meaning the response options were limited to yes or no. See Appendix B for the detailed descriptions of DA disposition codes. The groupings of the various codes described below was created in consultation with the SFDA's office.

Neighborhood Court. If a person was referred to neighborhood court.

<u>Successful Completion of Neighborhood Court.</u> If the person was referred to neighborhood court AND if one of the following disposition codes were noted: 18 (for the years 2009/2010), 29 (for the years 2014/2015), 84.

<u>Discharge</u>. If one of the following disposition codes were noted: 19, 20, 21, 24, 27, 29, 31, 33, 84

<u>Dismissal</u>. If one of the following disposition codes were noted: 39, 40, 44, 49, 65, 68

Police Discharge. If one of the following disposition codes were noted:9, 16, 50

Diversion. If one of the following disposition codes were noted: 52, 75

Conviction. If one of the following disposition codes were noted: 181, 190, 191, 193

Other Action. If one of the following disposition codes were noted: 36, 72, 83, 85, 95

Certified to Juvenile Court. If the following disposition code was noted: 48

<u>Finding – Not Guilty</u>. If the following disposition code was noted: 152

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.

Human Trafficking. This variable is from the data extraction form used with the SFPD data. To assess whether an incident was human trafficking, we cross-referenced the facts of the narrative in the SFPD Incident Report against our "Elements that Indicate Trafficking" list (see Appendix C). 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.

#### **FINDINGS**

# 1) What are the prosecutorial outcomes for cases where someone selling sex received a citation?

Of the 816 people who received citations, 474 were people who were selling sex (58%). Among those 474 people, 36% were referred to Neighborhood Court (see Table 1), with more of these citations referred to neighborhood court for the latter period.

**Table 1: Referrals to Neighborhood Court, People Selling Sex** 

	Non-SVU		SI	/U	Total
	2009/2010	2014/2015	2009/2010	2014/2015	
	(n=226)	(n=94)	(n=144)	(n=10)	
Yes	38	61	63	9	171
No	188	33	81	1	303

Of the incidents referred to Neighborhood Court, 60% were successfully completed, and 39% were discharged (See Table 2). Of those cases that were discharged, 94% were discharged for bundling. The SFDA stopped bundling cases in July 2016.

Table 2: Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Selling Sex (n=171)

	Non-SVU			SVU			Total
	2009/2010 2014/2015		2009/2010	2014/2015			
	(n=38)	(n=61)		(n=63)	(n=9)		
Successful Completion of							
Neighborhood Court	26	9		63	5		103
Discharge	12	50		0	4		66
Other Action	0	1		0	0		1
Missing	0	1		0	0		1

Table 3: Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Selling Sex (n=303)

	Non	Non-SVU			/U	Total
	2009/2010	2014/2015		2009/2010	2014/2015	
	(n=188)	(n=33)		(n=81)	(n=1)	
Discharge	98	26		64	1	189
Dismissal	72	2		6	0	80
Police Discharge	1	0		0	0	1
Other Action	6	5		7	0	17
Diversion	5	1		3	0	9
Conviction	5	0		1	0	6
Certified to Juvenile						
Court	1	0		0	0	1

For people selling sex whose citations were not referred to neighborhood courts, 62% were discharged, and 26% were dismissed (See Table 3 above). The bulk of dismissals occurred in the earlier time period of 2009/2010, and 81% of them were dismissed because no complaint was filed. Of those that were discharged, 85% of the time it was because further investigation was needed (data not shown).

## 2) What are the prosecutorial outcomes for cases where someone buying sex received a citation?

Of the 816 people who received citations, 319 were people who were buying sex (39%). Among those 319 people, 48% were referred to Neighborhood Court (see Table 4). Nearly all of the SVU involved incidents in 2014/2015 were referred to Neighborhood Court, a notable increase from the 27% referred in the early time period.

**Table 4: Referrals to Neighborhood Court, People Buying Sex** 

	Non-SVU			SI	/U	Total
	2009/2010	2014/2015		2009/2010	2014/2015	
	(n=38)	(n=23)		(n=180)	(n=78)	
Yes	12	15		49	77	153
No	26	8		131	1	166

Of the incidents referred to Neighborhood Court, 86% were successfully completed, and 14% were discharged (See Table 5). Of those cases that were discharged, 62% were because they required further investigation, and 33% were discharged for bundling (data not shown). The SFDA stopped bundling cases in July 2016.

Table 5: Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Buying Sex (n=153)

	Non-SVU			SVU			Total
	2009/2010 2014/2015 (n=12) (n=15)			2009/2010 (n=49)	2014/2015 (n=77)		
Successful Completion of Neighborhood Court	9	13		44	65		131
Discharge	2	2		5	12		21
Missing	1	0		0	0		1

For people buying sex whose citations were not referred to neighborhood courts, 81% were discharged, and 10% were dismissed (See Table 6). All of the dismissals occurred in the

earlier time period of 2009/2010, with 50% of them dismissed in the interest of justice, and 38% dismissed because no complaint was filed. Of those that were discharged, 52% of the time they were dismissed in the interest of justice, and 39% of the time it was because further investigation was needed (data not shown).

Table 6: Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, People Buying Sex (n=166)

	Non-SVU			SVU			Total
	2009/2010	2014/2015		2009/2010	2014/2015		
	(n=26)	(n=8)		(n=131)	(n=1)		
Discharge	16	8		111	0		135
Dismissal	6	0		10	0		16
Other Action	1	0		0	0		1
Diversion	1	0		6	0		7
Conviction	2	0		3	1		6
Finding - Not Guilty	0	0		1	0		1

## 3) What are the prosecutorial outcomes for cases where a third party received a citation?

Of the 816 people who received citations, 23 were people who were third parties (3%). Among those 23 people, 1% was referred to Neighborhood Court (see Table 7), with none of these being referred in the latter time period. Of the 3 referrals to Neighborhood Court in 2009/2010, all were successfully completed (data not shown)

**Table 7: Referrals to Neighborhood Court, Third Parties** 

	Non-SVU		SI	VU		Total
	2009/2010	2014/2015	2009/2010	2014/2015		
	(n=12)	(n=7)	(n=4)	(n=0)		
Yes	3	0	0	0		3
No	9	7	4	0		20

For third parties whose citations were not referred to neighborhood courts, 45% were discharged, and 30% were convicted (See Table 8). Of those that were discharged, 33% of the time it was because further investigation was needed, and 44% of the time it was because of lack of evidence (data not shown). Five of the six convictions resulted in County Jail Sentences, with the other conviction resulting in a State Prison sentence.

Table 8: Non-Neighborhood Court Outcomes, Third Parties (n=20)

	Non-SVU		SVU		Total
	2009/2010 2014/201		2009/2010	2014/2015	
	(n=9)	5 (n=7)	(n=4)	(n=0)	
Discharge	4	4	1	0	9
Dismissal	2	0	0	0	2
Other Action	1	1	1	0	3
Conviction	2	2	2	0	6

# 4) What are the prosecutorial outcomes for cases that involved human trafficking?

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 (see Table 9).

**Table 9: Referrals to Neighborhood Court, Human Trafficking Incidents** 

		Non-SVU		Non-SVU SVU				Total
		2009/2010 (n=7)	2014/2015 (n=2)		2009/2010 (n=1)	2014/2015 (n=0)		
Yes	0	0	0		0	0	0	
No	10	7	2		1	0	10	

Table 10 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.

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

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

#### **Discussion**

Of the 816 people who received citations, 474 were people who were selling sex (58%), 319 were people who were buying sex (39%), and 23 were people who were third parties (3%). Slightly more than one-third of the people selling sex were referred to Neighborhood Court, for those buying it was nearly one-half, and only 1% of third parties were referred. People were overwhelmingly successful in completing the Neighborhood Court Program (60% people selling sex; 86% people buying sex; 100% third parties). For those cases not referred to the Neighborhood Court system, the vast majority were either discharged or dismissed.

It was very rare for these citations to result in criminal proceedings, particularly among those who were selling or buying sex. Among people selling sex, 6 of the 474 people experienced criminal proceedings, and all of those resulted in convictions. For people buying sex, 6 of the 319 people faced criminal proceedings, with all but one of those resulting in a conviction. It was more common to see third party incidents result in criminal proceedings. Overwhelmingly, these people were engaged in pimping and human trafficking. Six of the 23 people cited (26%) experienced criminal proceedings and all were convicted. Five of the six convictions resulted in County Jail Sentences, with the other conviction resulting in a State Prison sentence.

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.

Whether or not incidents were connected to the neighborhood court system, similarities exist about the reasons why they were dismissed or discharged. Dismissals occurred primarily because either no complaint was filed (as in the cases of people selling or buying sex), or they were dismissed in the interest of justice. Cases were discharged largely because further investigation was needed, and, in cases involving third parties because of a lack of evidence.

#### 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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: <u>Select all that apply</u> Supplemental Report Only: yes no Incident Code(s): <u>Select all that apply</u> Crime/Clearance Number: <u>Select only one</u> **Incident Information** Α. A1. How did the incident come to the attention of law enforcement? (Select all that apply) a. Tip/report(Yes/No): specify b. Police action(Yes/No) – Specify type (Select all that apply) Type: \_\_citizen; Type: \_\_\_\_Street \_\_CBO; Massage establishment inspection \_\_ hotline; **FOPP** \_\_other, explain: \_\_\_\_ \_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: A4. Reporting Officer Badge #: F M 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:

A12. Check location(s) wher	e incident occurred:	
Internet-based	Strip Club	Massage Establishment
Modeling Agency	Hotel	Residence
Street	Other (specify)	
A13. Did incident report labe	el as human trafficking: Yes	No
_	-	
A14. Any mention of person.	people being screened for traffic	cking: Yes No
A15. Believe the incident to A15a. If yes, types of traff. Sex Industr	ficking (mark all that apply):	No Don't Know)
•	w, explain reason for this determe human trafficking" guidance de	
A16. Other notes about Incide	ent report:	

R Parson of Interest (Parson	n involved in <mark>selling</mark> sex) Allow u	n to 7 different Sec R nages	
Unique ID#:	i mvolved in sening sex) Anow u	p to 7 unierent Sec 13 pages	
B1. Age: (0-99)	B3. Race:	B4. Biological Sex:	
,	B(lack)	Female	
	H(ispanic)	Male	
	A(sian)	B5. Gender:	
B2. Minor at time of incident:	W(hite)	transwoman	
Yes	U(nknown)	ciswoman	
No	Other (specify:)	transman	
		cisman	
B6. Residential Address:		B8. False ID given to LE:	
San Francisco		Yes	
California City outside of S	F (specify:)	No	
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 countred)  No ID provided  Condoms:  B9a. Mentioned in report  yes  no  B10. Cell phone searched:		B11. Prior record in SF:yesno B12. Prior record outside of SF:	
yes, with permission		yes	
yes, without permission		no	
seized as evidence			
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 sexu	alized clothing or communication:	
	yes (specify:	)	
	no		
B16. How person classified on I	report: (select only one)		
Suspect Detained	Victim Cited Booked		

B17. Third Party Involvement	If yes:		
yes	B17a. Share Info about 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	B17b. Willing to prosecute 3 <sup>rd</sup> party:	
	yesyes		
suspected: Skip to B18	no	<del></del> ·	
suspected: skip to bis	110	no	
B18. Violation(s)/Charges (if no	one, mark No Charges): (Select all th	at apply)	
B19. Resolution of incident:	3 , ,		
cited	exceptional clearance	found (in cases of juveniles/youth)	
booked	unfounded	released	
none		other: specify	
C. Person of Interest (Person	n involved in <mark>buying</mark> sex) All	ow up to 7 different Sec C pages	
Unique ID#:	in myorved in buying sex)	ow up to runnerent see o pages	
C1. Age: (0-99)	C3. Race:	C4. Biological Sex:	
C1. Agc. (0 95)	B(lack)	Female	
	H(ispanic)	Male	
	A(sian)	C5. Gender:	
C2 Name at time of incident.	` ,		
C2. Minor at time of incident:	W(hite)	transwoman	
Yes	U(nknown)	ciswoman	
No	Other (specify:)	transman	
		cisman	
C6. Residential Address:		C8. False ID given to LE:	
San Francisco		Yes	
California City outside of S	SF (specify:)	No	
Other US Sate (Specify:	)		
Other Country (Specify:	)		
C7. Form of ID provided:			
CA Driver's License			
CA State ID			
Other State Driver's Licens	se		
Other State ID card			
Non-US ID (Specify countr	y of: origin)		
No ID provided			
Condoms:		C11. Prior record in SF:	
C9a. Mentioned in report	C9b. Seized as evidence	yes	
yes	yes	no	
no	, oo		
C10. Cell phone searched:		C12. Prior record outside of SF:	
yes, with permission		yes	
yes, without permission	1	no	
seized as evidence	•		
no			
	elect all that apply)	C14. Sexual Contact with Officer:	
Positive demeanor (respectful; responsive; accommodating) yes (specify: <u>400 chars</u> ) Negative demeanor (disrespectful; aggressive; resistant) no			
	espectiui, aggressive; resistant)	no	
Person was crying			

C15. Descriptions/photos of sexualized clothing or communication:					
yes (specify:)					
	no				
C16. How person classifie	ed on report: (select only one)				
SuspectDet	ained VictimCited	Booked			
C17c. Was person actuall	y C17d. Referred to Neighb	orhood Cour	t: C17e. I	Referred to FOPP:	
selling NOT buying:	yes			yes	
yes	no			_no	
no					
C18. Violation(s)/Charges	s (if none, mark No Charges):				
C19. Resolution of incide					
cited	exceptional clearance	r	eleased		
booked	unfounded			fy	
none	diverted			/	
	party Allow up to 7 differen	ent Sec D na	ages		
Unique ID#:	purity lines up to runners	one see 2 pe	<u></u>		
D0. Identity of person	D1. Age: (0-99)	D3. Race:		D4. Biological Sex:	
confirmed:	D1. Age. (0 95)	B(lack	.1	Female	
Yes			-	Male	
		H(ispa		IVIAIE	
No	D2 Minerattime of incident	A(sian		DE Candani	
	D2. Minor at time of incident:	W(hite	-	D5. Gender:	
	Yes	U(nkn	-	transwoman	
	No	Other		ciswoman	
		(specify:	)	transman	
			1	cisman	
D6. Residential Address:			D8. False I	D given to LE:	
San Francisco			Yes		
California City outsic	de of SF (specify:)		No		
Other US Sate (Spec	ify:)				
Other Country (Spec	:ify:)				
	·				
D7. Form of ID provided:					
CA Driver's License					
CA State ID					
Other State Driver's	License				
Other State ID card	License				
Non-US ID (Specify o	country of: origin				
No ID provided	country or. origin				
<u> </u>		D11 Drior	record in SF		
Condoms:	mt DOb Cairod as avidance		record in SF	:	
D9a. Mentioned in repo		yes			
yes	yes	no			
nono					
•			D12. Prior record outside of SF:		
yes, with permission					
ves without nerm	nission	no			

seized as evidence	
no	
D13. Presenting Demeanor: (Select all that apply)	
Positive demeanor (respectful; responsive; accommo	dating)
Negative demeanor (disrespectful; aggressive; resista	ant)
Person was crying	
D15. Descriptions/ph	otos of sexualized clothing or communication:
yes (specify:	)
no	
D16. How person classified on report: (select only one)	
SuspectDetained VictimCited	Booked
D18. Violation(s)/Charges (if none, mark No Charges):	
D20. Relationship to Person of Interest:	
Parent/guardianFoster parentAcquai	ntance/peerFriend
Intimate partnerStrangerPimp	Other, specify
D19. Resolution of incident:	
citedexceptional clearance	released
bookedunfounded	other: specify
nonediverted	

#### **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**

C

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

- 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

#### Appendix B

#### **SFDA Disposition Codes**

Code	Code Description	Туре	Authority	DA Stat Status
9	Charge Booked in Error Via JMS: Do Not Report to DOJ	Discharge Code	Police	Exclude
16	849B(2) PC-REL Only/INTOXICATION ONLY	Discharge Code	Police	Exclude
18	REL/TOT TO OTHER JURISDICITON/AUTH	Discharge	Police	Exclude
19	No Incident Report Provided	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
20	Lack of Corpus	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
21	Substance not Prohibited by Law	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
24	Lack of Evidence	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
27	Further Investigation Necessary	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
29	Dism/A, Interest of Justice, 1385PC	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
31	Unable to Sustain w/o Victim's Testimony	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
33	Questionable Search and Seizure	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
36	Released to Other Agency/Jurisdiction	Discharge	District Attorney	Discharge
39	Dism/B, Case Comp/Restitution	Dismissal		Dismissed
40	Disch, No Complaint Filed, Sup Ct	Dismissal	District Attorney	Dismissed
44	DISM, Other Defense Motion	Dismissal	Court	Dismissed
46	Dism, Charge Not Included in Info	Not Case Level		Pending
48	Certified to Juvenile Court	Action Taken		Action Taken
49	Dism/S, By Order of the Court	Dismissal	Court	Dismissed
50	Disch, Detention Only, 849.5PC	Exclude		Exclude
52	DISM, 1000.3PC/No Arrest	Diversion		Diverted
65	1385 PC - Lack of Evidence	Dismissal	DA or Court	Dismissed
68	1385 PC - Interest Of Justice	Dismissal	DA or Court	Dismissed
72	1385 PC - Guilty Plea to Other Charge	Dismissal		Action Taken
75	DISM, 1001.7PC/1001.9PC	Diversion		Diverted
76	Dism, 1203.4 PC	Expunged		Expunged

83	Discharge to Proceed With MTR	Discharge	District Attorney	Other Action Taken
84	Complaint/ Petition Withdrawn, Case Disch	Discharge		Special Circumstances
85	5 Year Old BW Purged per Court Order	Dismissal		Special Circumstances
95	Discharge to Proceed on Parole Violation	Discharge	District Attorney	Other Action Taken
152	Finding - Not Guilty	Not Guilty		Not Guilty
181	Fine Sentence	Convicted		Convicted
190	County Jail w/ Probation Condition	Convicted		Convicted
191	County Jail	Convicted		Convicted
193	State Prison Sentence	Convicted		Convicted

#### Appendix C

#### **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