RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT

Report Title: Marin's Hidden Sex Trafficking Challenge

Report Date: 6/23/16

Agenda Date: 8/25/16

Response by: Tom Perazzo Title: Board President

FINDINGS

- I (we) agree with the findings numbered: F3, F9, F10, F12,
- I (we) disagree *partially* with the findings numbered: _____
- I (we) disagree *wholly* with the findings numbered: _____

  (Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefor.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations numbered _____ have been implemented.

  (Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)

- Recommendations numbered R5 have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.

  (Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)

- Recommendations numbered _____ require further analysis.

  (Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.)

- Recommendations numbered _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.

  (Attach an explanation.)

Date: 8/25/16 Signed: 

Number of pages attached 2

Southern Marin Fire Protection District
308 Reed Boulevard
Mill Valley, California 94941

Phone: 415 388-8182 Fax: 415 388-8181

August 25, 2016

The Honorable Judge Kelly V. Simmons
Marin County Superior Court
P.O. Box 4988
San Rafael, CA 94913-4988

Re: Marin Civil Grand Jury Report responses: Marin's Hidden Human Sex Trafficking Challenge: It's Happening in Our Backyard

This is the official response of the Southern Marin Fire Protection District to the findings and recommendations of the Grand Jury's report titled, "Marin's Hidden Human Sex Trafficking Challenge: It's Happening in Our Backyard." This response was approved by the Southern Marin Fire Protection District Board of Directors at their meeting on August 3, 2016.

The Southern Marin Fire Protection District is required to respond to all of the findings and to recommendation #5.

The requirement to respond to all of the findings posed a challenge to the District in conforming to the required response format, as many of the findings pertained only to law enforcement agencies and schools, and not to the fire service.

FINDINGS

F1. Human Sex Trafficking is mostly unrecognized, under-reported, and rarely subject to intervention in Marin.

Response: The District is unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District is not aware of the reporting or intervention rates for human sex trafficking.

F2. A significant number of human sex trafficking victims are from Marin, not just transients imported from other areas.

Response: The District is unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District is unaware of the place of residency of human sex trafficking victims and/or whether said number is "significant."

F3. Reports from two Marin County victim advocate organizations show that approximately 30% of the victims they aid under the age of 18.

Response: Agree.

F4. Some Marin County law enforcement officers still believe some human trafficking victims are criminals.

Response: The District is unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District does not know what Marin County law enforcement officers believe.

F5. State law mandates that officers receive two hours of training on human trafficking and some Marin agencies may not be complying with this law.

Response: The District partially agrees and is partially unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District agrees that state law mandates that law enforcement officers receive two hours of training on human trafficking. The District is unaware of whether some Marin agencies may not be complying with this law.

F6. Training of Marin County law enforcement on the *Marin County Uniform Law Enforcement Protocol for Human Trafficking* has been inconsistent across agencies.

Response: The District is unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District is unaware of the consistency levels of training throughout agencies.

F7. Law Enforcement officers and others who are closest to human trafficking believe that California mandated two-hour POST training video on human trafficking is not sufficient.

Response: The District is unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District does not know what law enforcement officers and others who are closest to human trafficking believe.

F8. Marin law enforcement agencies rarely use multidisciplinary training, incorporating collaboration between Children Family Services (CFS), the District Attorney, law enforcement experts, and possibly victims.

Response: The District is unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District does not know what methods Marin law enforcement agencies utilize for training.

F9. Training for firefighters and EMS professionals in recognizing human trafficking victims and reporting the crime is inconsistent in Marin.

Response: The District agrees with this finding.

F10. It is difficult to determine the extent of human trafficking in Marin because of inconsistent classification and definitions of the crime, as well as the lack of a central clearinghouse for this data.

Response: The District agrees with this finding.

F11. The Marin County School Districts do not provide education on a systematic basis for students, parents and teachers in recognizing signs of human trafficking.

Response: The District is unable to agree or disagree with this finding. The District does not know what Marin County School Districts provide for education of students, parent and teachers on this subject.