



THE TOWN OF
CORTE MADERA
MARIN COUNTY CALIFORNIA

300 TAMALPAIS DRIVE
CORTE MADERA, CA
94925-1418

www.townofcortemadera.org

TOWN MANAGER
TOWN COUNCIL
415-927-5050

TOWN CLERK
415-927-5086

FINANCE / BUS. LICENSE
415-927-5055

FIRE DEPARTMENT
415-927-5077

PLANNING / ZONING
415-927-5064

BUILDING INSPECTOR
415-927-5062

TOWN ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS
415-927-5057

RECREATION DEPARTMENT
415-927-5072

SANITARY DISTRICT No. 2
415-927-5057

CENTRAL MARIN
POLICE AUTHORITY
415-927-5150

September 6, 2016

John Mann, Foreperson
Marin County Civil Grand Jury
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 275
San Rafael, CA 94903

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

Dear Foreperson Mann:

Thank you for your recent report, *Marin's Hidden Human Sex Trafficking Challenge: It's Happening In Our Backyard*, dated June 16, 2016. Pursuant to Penal Code 933.05, I am writing on behalf of the Town of Corte Madera, to respectfully respond to the report.

The report requests that the Town respond to Findings F1-F13 and Recommendations R1-R7. The Town's response to the report's findings and recommendations was approved by the Town Council at the September 6, 2016 Town Council meeting, and is included below.

The Central Marin Police Authority provides police services for the Town. Please note that some recommendations asked that the Town of Corte Madera call for action by agencies other than the Town of Corte Madera, including the Central Marin Police Authority and the Marin County Office of Education. The Town of Corte Madera has noted where recommendations would require implementation on the part of these entities.

Please accept our appreciation for the service you provide to the residents of Marin County, and for addressing this important issue. Should you have any questions regarding this response, please contact the Town Clerk, Rebecca Vaughn, at 415-927-5085 or rvaughn@tcmmail.org.

Sincerely,



Sloan C. Bailey
Mayor

RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT

Report Title: Marin's Human Sex Trafficking Challenge

Report Date: June 16, 2016

Agenda Date: September 6, 2016

Response by: Sloan C. Bailey Title: Mayor

FINDINGS

- I (we) agree with the findings numbered: F3, F8, F9, F10, F11, F12
- I (we) disagree *partially* with the findings numbered: F1, F2, F4, F5, F6, F7, F13
- I (we) disagree *wholly* with the findings numbered: N/A

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations numbered R1, R2 have been implemented.
(Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)
- Recommendations numbered N/A have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
(Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)
- Recommendations numbered R3, R5, R6 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 R4, R7 will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.
(Attach an explanation.)

Date: 9/06/16

Signed: 

Number of pages attached 4

**TOWN OF CORTE MADERA RESPONSE TO THE MARIN COUNTY CIVIL
GRAND JURY REPORT, *Marin's Hidden Human Sex Trafficking Challenge: It's Happening
In Our Backyard***

FINDINGS:

Statement regarding findings, the Town of Corte Madera, through the Central Marin Police Authority (CMPA) provides the following information:

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

Response: The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. This finding is ambiguous and not based on solid data. Human sex trafficking is recognized by the Central Marin Police Authority and handled appropriately. Whether it is under reported or not is open to interpretation and needs to be substantiated with facts. All known instances of human sex trafficking in the Central Marin Police Authority are subject to intervention and are handled accordingly.

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

Response: The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. This finding is ambiguous and the term “significant number” is vague. We do believe that “some” victims are from Marin, whether they are a significant number is open to interpretation.

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

Response: The respondent agrees with the finding, even though the respondent has no direct knowledge of the reports mentioned or their accuracy.

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

Response: The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. The Central Marin Police Authority cannot speak on behalf of the other Marin County law enforcement organizations, but can state that its employees understand that human trafficking victims are not criminals.

- 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 respondent disagrees partially with the finding. The Central Marin Police

Authority cannot speak on behalf of the other Marin County law enforcement organizations, but can state that its officers are in compliance with the training required under California State Proposition 35.

- 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 respondent disagrees partially with the finding. The Central Marin Police Authority cannot speak on behalf of the other Marin County law enforcement organizations, but can state that the *Marin County Uniform Law Enforcement Protocol for Human Trafficking* is included in the Central Marin Police Authority policies and procedures and is reviewed by its employees.

- F7. “Law enforcement officers and others who are closest to human trafficking believe the California mandated two-hour POST training video on human trafficking is not sufficient.”**

Response: The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. While the Central Marin Police Authority recognizes that law enforcement officers could always use more training in all of the areas they handle, the POST training video is sufficient to train its officers in the handling of this matter.

- 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 respondent agrees with the finding.

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

Response: The respondent agrees with the finding, even though the respondent has no direct knowledge regarding training for firefighters and EMS professionals.

- 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 respondent agrees with the 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 respondent agrees with the finding, even though the respondent has no direct knowledge regarding education provided by the Marin County school districts.

F12. “Human trafficking outreach has been fragmented and is currently insufficient in reaching critical audiences.”

Response: The respondent agrees with the finding.

F13. “The Marin County Coalition to End Human Trafficking Coalition (sic) needs dedicated resources to make it more effective.”

Response: The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. While the Central Marin Police Authority recognizes that more dedicated resources and funding could make the Marin County Coalition more effective, the Authority does not agree that it “needs” more dedicated resources to become more effective.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2015/2016 Marin County Civil Grand Jury recommends that:

R1. “All law enforcement officers should be consistently trained in the *Marin County Uniform Law Enforcement Protocol for Human Trafficking*.”

Response: The recommendation has been implemented by the Central Marin Police Authority.

R2. “All Marin law enforcement agency heads should ensure their officers receive the California mandated two hour human trafficking training.”

Response: The recommendation has been implemented by the Central Marin Police Authority.

R3. “The Board of Supervisors should convene a local group of human trafficking experts (including CFS, law enforcement subject experts, FBI, victim advocates, DA’s, and perhaps a victim) to create a multidisciplinary training presentation. This training should include the unique roles of all County personnel, resources, and processes in addressing human trafficking. Additional resources will be needed to support this training as none are devoted to this task now. This training should include information on the trafficking of females and males, as well as LGBTQ.”

Response: The recommendation requires further analysis by the Board of Supervisors. The Central Marin Police Authority has communicated to the Town that it would be willing to participate in trainings put on by “human trafficking experts” should such training be created.

R4. “Once this multi-disciplinary training package is completed, Marin County law enforcement agencies should ensure that all Marin law enforcement officers be trained.”

Response: The recommendation has not been implemented by the Central Marin Police Authority. The Central Marin Police Authority has communicated to the Town that this recommendation will be implemented in the future if a multi-disciplinary training package is created.

- R5. “Marin County fire departments should ensure that all EMS personnel are trained in recognizing human trafficking and how to report it, and incorporate this in their annual training.”**

Response: This recommendation requires further analysis. The Corte Madera Fire Department will review existing EMS trainings and identify if there are opportunities to incorporate recognizing and reporting human sex trafficking in these trainings by December, 2016. The Corte Madera Fire Department did send staff materials on how to identify and report human sex trafficking in March 2016.

- R6. “The Board of Supervisors should fund the creation of a database that systemically tracks adult and minor victims, using consistent classification and shared definitions to properly identify the victim and the crime, as well as document its prevalence. Data should be gathered from any organization dealing with trafficking victims, including law enforcement agencies, government agencies (e.g. Marin County Health and Human Services), civic organizations, and victim advocate organizations.**

Response: This recommendation requires further analysis by the Board of Supervisors. The Central Marin Police Authority has communicated to the Town that it would be willing to provide data for the database should it be created.

- R7. “Marin County Office of Education should work with the Marin County School/Law Enforcement Partnership to develop educational programs to ensure that students, parents, and teachers are trained in recognizing the signs of human trafficking and where they can find help.”**

Response: This recommendation requires further analysis by the Marin County Office of Education. It will not be implemented by the Town of Corte Madera because the Town does not have the ability or the authority to implement a recommendation that requires the analysis and participation of two government agencies to which it does not belong.