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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

What would it take to end human trafficking in Colorado? Since 2005, the Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking (LCHT) has endeavored to answer that question more effectively while advancing anti-trafficking efforts across the state. The Colorado Project to Comprehensively Combat Human Trafficking 2.0 (CP2.0) represents an important milestone in that journey. The community-based research contained in this report, alongside the recommendations outlined in the supplemental Colorado Action Plan 2.0 (CAP2.0), will bolster our state’s understanding of the crime in context. It will also empower communities and professionals involved in addressing this human rights abuse.

How CP2.0 Research Was Conducted

Building on the foundational work of our original Colorado Project (CP1.0), we visited 20 unique communities in 2018 in order to assess changes in the statewide movement, document successful strategies, name promising practices, and design a new set of actionable recommendations to advance anti-trafficking efforts both locally, as well as nationally. These efforts were largely aided by the participation of 16 human trafficking task forces around Colorado who completed focus groups and organizational interviews. In total, CP2.0 research activities included:

- 183 individual surveys
- 69 organizational interviews
- 29 focus groups

Key Takeaways

The CP2.0 Report reveals that in the past five years, Colorado communities have become more organized and prepared to respond to human trafficking. Six years after our original CP1.0 research, we see:

- Scattered efforts continue to exist, but more coordinated efforts are emerging within anti-trafficking coalitions/task forces.
- Colorado communities continue to cobble together resources, doing so by building on the strengths of their local capabilities and neighborhoods.
- Survivors who are provided support and resources within formal and informal social systems are being helped, and many are beginning to lead initiatives statewide.
- Traffickers are being prosecuted at greater numbers, and with more significant sentences.

Identifying Promising Practices

The CP2.0 Report identifies six promising practices, organized under the framework of the 4Ps (Prevention, Protection, Prosecution, and Partnership). They include:

1. **Acknowledging Root Causes**: Increasing awareness around geographic factors specific to Colorado’s urban, rural, and frontier communities, as well as factors related to specific industries (construction, domestic service, commercial sex), immigration, and drugs.
2. **Trauma-Informed Counseling or Behavioral Health Resources**: Empowering survivors by developing more services that understand the trauma inherent to the experience of human trafficking.
3. **Engaging the Medical Community**: Recognizing health professionals as crucial players in identifying survivors who often present in emergency rooms, clinics, and other health centers.

4. **Having Survivors Inform the Community Response to Trafficking**: Understanding the ongoing need to prioritize survivors’ voices in human trafficking research, program-design, and community-based efforts.

5. **Problem Solving and Diversion Courts for Survivors of Sex Trafficking**: Expanding innovative programs facilitated by District Attorneys and Special Victims Units that connect minor victims with appropriate support and resources.

6. **Intentional and Equitable Inclusion in Partnerships**: Developing more formal partnerships with coherent shared goals and diverse stakeholders at the table.

**Addressing Gaps Through Colorado Action Plan 2.0**

Working together to comprehensively end human trafficking will undoubtedly require increased investment in the promising practices identified in CP2.0. It will also require a greater focus on the clear gaps that remain in our statewide response. These concepts are more clearly articulated in the recommendations and activities within CAP2.0.

Perhaps the single most important need in the movement to end human trafficking across Colorado comes in the form of evaluation and measurement. This involves evaluating the success of various active programs, in addition to testing Colorado’s capacity to address the root causes that can cause human trafficking. We look forward to promoting the kind of interdisciplinary response that makes expanded evaluation possible.

**Toward a Solution**

CP2.0 was only possible through the partnership of an array of community voices including survivors, advocates, law enforcement, and practitioners. We were humbled throughout the data-collection process to hear from so many people dedicated to the anti-trafficking movement. It is with great pride that we are able to deliver this report along with the survivor-informed action plan (CAP2.0) as roadmaps for working together toward a solution to end human trafficking in Colorado.

In solidarity,

**Amanda Finger, MA**  
Executive Director, Co-Founder  
Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking

---

**Annie Miller, Ph.D.**  
Co-Principal Investigator  
Colorado Project 2.0

**AnnJanette Alejano-Steele, Ph.D.**  
Co-Principal Investigator  
Colorado Project 2.0
GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

**Agency:** Choice, action, autonomy, freedom, and self-determination. It refers to the experience of acting, doing things, making things happen, exerting power, being a subject of events, or controlling things.

**Frontier:** A county that has a population density of 6 or fewer residents per square mile.

**Intersectional identities:** Intersectionality is a concept coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989 used to describe the ways in which different forms of discrimination (racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, xenophobia, classism, etc.) can and do interact and overlap. Ultimately, these issues cannot be examined or advocated for separately from one another. More simply put: Intersectionality is a description of the way multiple oppressions are experienced.

**Lived experience:** A representation and understanding of a researcher or research subject’s human experiences, choices, and options, and how those factors influence one’s perception of knowledge.

**Parallel issues/movements:** Movements/issues that also come into contact with potential victims of human trafficking (child abuse, domestic violence, immigrant services, law enforcement, etc.) Many service providers encounter victims of human trafficking, sometimes without recognizing it. Therefore, it is important to include an analysis of agencies within movements such as child abuse, domestic violence, immigrant advocacy agencies, etc. to understand what resources are available to victims of human trafficking (LCHT, 2013).

**Root causes:** Root causes are preexisting social, cultural, and family conditions that create vulnerability for people to be trafficked such as trauma in the home setting, poverty, homelessness, addiction, violence in the home or local community, lack of education, lack of citizenship status, and marginalization due to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual (LGBTQIA) status.

**Rural:** A non-metropolitan county with no cities over 50,000 residents.

**Survivor-centered:** When the rights, needs, wishes, and voices of survivors themselves are prioritized in anti-trafficking programs, policies, and efforts.

**Trauma-informed approach:** A trauma-informed approach realizes the widespread impact of trauma and understands the potential paths for recovery, recognizes the signs and symptoms of trauma in clients, families, staff, and others involved with the system; responds by fully integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, and practices; and seeks to actively resist re-traumatization.

**Urban:** All counties that contain metropolitan areas with over 50,000 residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCHT:</strong></td>
<td>Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Ps:</strong></td>
<td>Prevention, Protection, Prosecution, Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAP:</strong></td>
<td>Colorado Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAP1.0:</strong></td>
<td>2013 Colorado Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAP2.0:</strong></td>
<td>2019 Colorado Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP1.0:</strong></td>
<td>2010 - 2013 Colorado Project, original Colorado Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP2.0:</strong></td>
<td>2018 - 2019 Colorado Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBPR:</strong></td>
<td>Community-Based Participatory Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHTC:</strong></td>
<td>Colorado Human Trafficking Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoNEHT:</strong></td>
<td>Colorado Network to End Human Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPS:</strong></td>
<td>Child Protective Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSEC:</strong></td>
<td>Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHS:</strong></td>
<td>Colorado Department of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHHS:</strong></td>
<td>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBI:</strong></td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIPAA:</strong></td>
<td>Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICE:</strong></td>
<td>U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQIA:</strong></td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning, Intersex, Asexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDTs:</strong></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVC:</strong></td>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVCTTAC:</strong></td>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime Training and Technical Assistance Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAR:</strong></td>
<td>Participatory Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TVPA:</strong></td>
<td>Trafficking Victims Protection Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would it take to end human trafficking in Colorado? Since 2005, the Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking (LCHT) has endeavored to answer that question more effectively while advancing anti-trafficking efforts across the state. The Colorado Project to Comprehensively Combat Human Trafficking 2.0 (CP2.0) represents an important milestone in that journey. The community-based research contained in this report, alongside the recommendations outlined in the supplemental Colorado Action Plan 2.0 (CAP2.0), will bolster our state’s understanding of the crime in context.

With this report, as with the first Colorado Project, LCHT’s focus is on developing and supporting efforts that retain a focus on the collaborative nature of comprehensively ending human trafficking. The aim is to move from assumptions about trafficking to a vision for ending trafficking. We seek to move away from assumptions that conjure images of duct taped minors and young women in chains, to nuanced, research-informed images of pathways to recognizing, preventing, and healing those individuals, families, communities, and systems that experience trafficking and exploitation. Each time we collect data, share findings, and continue to set and evaluate goals, we collectively move closer to clearly defining and measuring success. We do all this together and within local communities. We remain committed to advancing efforts to end trafficking from the most local of places – our neighborhoods. This research report is written for our practitioner community. As such, we utilize first person plural language. WE invite a conversation about these findings with our practitioner peers across the state.

What is the Colorado Project to Comprehensively Combat Human Trafficking?

LCHT is pleased and humbled to share this report, a comprehensive and current summary of anti-trafficking efforts across the state of Colorado as of 2018. These findings evolved from a community-based research process that embeds an array of voices including: survivors, advocates, law enforcement, and practitioners. The overarching goal of this work is to observe measurable changes in the anti-trafficking movement in Colorado. Our initial research was conducted from 2010-2013, establishing the framework for the Colorado Project to Comprehensively Combat Human Trafficking (Colorado Project). This framework created a standardized methodology for Colorado and other states to document the nature of anti-trafficking efforts in our communities. In Colorado, we repeat the Colorado Project methodology every five years and compare it to the baseline assessment completed in 2013. LCHT’s bold vision is that every state will implement this comprehensive model to allow greater understanding of how the country is responding to end human trafficking.

The original Colorado Project (CP1.0) was initiated by LCHT in partnership with national and statewide
researchers and practitioners to develop sustainable efforts to end human trafficking in Colorado. The central research question for all Colorado Project iterations is: **What would it take to end human trafficking in Colorado?** The question poses a significant challenge and can be approached in numerous ways. In CP1.0, we collected data across the state through surveys and focus groups with stakeholders in urban, rural, and frontier regions. In 2018, LCHT generated more specific questions to guide that same research question in Colorado Project 2.0: specifically,

- What is the nature of human trafficking in Colorado?
- What is being done to address human trafficking in Colorado?
- How do we work together to comprehensively end human trafficking in Colorado?

Underpinning all of our research, then and now, are LCHT’s values:

1. **Integrity:** We are committed to authenticity and transparency, and apply the highest ethical standards in every action that we take.
2. **Interdisciplinary response:** We mobilize and leverage a broad range of fields, sectors, frameworks, and methods to problem-solve and make meaningful decisions.
3. **Lived experience:** We celebrate resilience in individual experiences, bringing in all voices to inform what we do and how we lead.
4. **Research-driven insight:** We synthesize data, facts, and knowledge, drawn from diverse sources, to drive social change.
5. **Social justice:** We honor and support inclusion across diverse experiences and intersectional identities, and recognize that all systems of oppression are interconnected.

These values provided guidance for researchers as they made methodological decisions, including the conduct of community-based research. The result of CP1.0 was a comprehensive understanding of strengths and gaps in responding to human trafficking throughout our state. From this research, LCHT, in collaboration with a statewide advisory group, developed the first Colorado Action Plan (CAP1.0) to guide future efforts and initiatives to end human trafficking. In 2018, the key objectives of CP2.0 were to:

1. Replicate the methodologies of CP1.0 to assess changes in the statewide movement compared to baseline data collected in 2012;
2. Document successful strategies to prevent human trafficking, protect survivors, prosecute traffickers, and build key partnerships;
3. Provide direction for more efficient use of resources, coordinate and streamline efforts, and better assist victims and survivors of human trafficking;
4. Assess both the strengths and gaps in efforts to end trafficking;
5. Build upon the CP1.0 research process that can be replicated in other states; and
6. Refine and update CAP1.0 to guide the movement to end trafficking across Colorado. See Appendix A for the 2019 Colorado Action Plan 2.0 (CAP2.0).

The following subsections provide definitions, timeline and methodology that formed the foundation for both Colorado Project 1.0 and Colorado Project 2.0.
The 4P Framework

We began our CP1.0 research seeking shared definitions of what it takes to end human trafficking. To that end, we adopted the “4P” (Prevention, Protection, Prosecution, and Partnership) definitions, which were shaped by five global and federal protocols and legislation (United Nations, 2000; United Nations, 2000; Trafficking Victims Protection Act [TVPA], 2000; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2006; United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime, 2008; Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2008). The 4P framework recognizes that there are multiple sectors engaged in efforts to combat trafficking, as well as necessarily diverse strategies. This 4P model was very successful in the design of CP1.0 and it was used again in CP2.0. It has helped to better understand both strengths and gaps in Colorado, and to develop a more comprehensive response. We devised questions for surveys and focus groups using the following 4P definitions:

**Prevention** measures increase awareness, advocacy, and education towards addressing a community’s systemic vulnerability to a continuum of exploitation, including human trafficking. Prevention plans recognize that exploitation and human trafficking are symptoms of root causes like poverty, gender inequality, and other forms of oppression which create vulnerable populations in the first place.

**Protection** measures ensure that survivors of human trafficking are provided access to (at a minimum) health care, legal aid, social services, and education in ways that are not prejudicial against victims’ rights, dignity, or psychological well-being. Protection also means creating an environment (social, political, and legal) that fosters the protection of victims of trafficking.

**Prosecution** measures ensure the creation and implementation of laws that address the continuum of labor exploitation and the pursuit of criminal punishments for such cases, treating human trafficking as exploitation of victims rather than recruitment/transportation of workers or people in prostitution. This includes not just criminal prosecution, but law enforcement officers and the creation of legislation.

**Partnership** measures acknowledge that combating human trafficking requires a comprehensive response through the cooperation of multiple sectors. Partnerships bring together diverse experiences, amplify messages, and leverage resources. An anti-human trafficking partnership refers to a cooperative relationship between two or more organizations established for the purpose of jointly combating human trafficking in some way (LCHT, 2013, p.8).
Legal Definitions of Human Trafficking

The 4Ps are a guiding framework to understand how various professional communities contribute to the end of trafficking; legislation provides an accountability mechanism for punishing traffickers and codifying the actions available to law enforcement and prosecutors. Both CP1.0 and CP2.0 draw their definitions from international, national, and state legislation. Prior to 2000, practices that are now understood as human trafficking included forced prostitution, forced migration, or were categorized as other crimes. Universal agreement on terminology for the crime was not reached until 2000, which was a pivotal legislative year both internationally and within the United States. The year 2000 marked the passage of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) and its subsequent reauthorizations in the United States.

In the United States, the TVPA created definitions for both sex and labor trafficking:

A. Sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such an act has not attained 18 years of age; or

B. The recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.

While we might think this definition is clear, creating it was and remains contentious at the ground level.

In contrast to other social movements, the national anti-trafficking movement began with a top-down approach based on legislative definitions and directives, rather than as a bottom-up grassroots experience. In implementing the TVPA, the federal government organized systematic nationwide disbursements of task force funding for cities around the United States to prioritize the development and coordination of a response to human trafficking (Foerster, 2009). At the local and statewide level, this was viewed as a mandate...
to examine a crime that was allegedly occurring within a given geographic scope, but the priority emerged from “outsiders” who lacked contextual knowledge of how trafficking looks locally.

While the federal definition has been in place since 2000, Colorado state statutes, which originated in 2006, were only recently updated in 2014. This “second generation” of updating state anti-trafficking laws is a trend seen around the country with an increase in trainings for prosecutors and, in turn, an increase in prosecutions (Farrell, DeLateur, Owens, & Fahy, 2016). For example, “in addition to establishing the Colorado Human Trafficking Council, House Bill 14-1273 changed Colorado criminal statutes on human trafficking to align more closely with federal human trafficking laws. A key difference between state and federal law is that Colorado law focuses on the legal definition of coercion, but note that force and fraud are contained in Colorado’s broad definition of coercion, underscoring the importance of these terms. Like federal law, sex trafficking cases involving minor victims do not require prosecutors to prove coercion to demonstrate to a jury that an individual is a trafficking victim” (Colorado Human Trafficking Council, 2016). A full list of Colorado’s anti-trafficking laws can be viewed in Appendix C.

Some of Colorado’s 2016 changes, implemented due to Federal requirements, are especially significant as those bills brought Human Services departments across the state into the forefront of the anti-trafficking movement. With those mandates to child protective services, new partnerships, new attention, and new efforts emerged. With this significant increase in partners, and many new to the movement, we pause to clarify language. Our language choices convey both practical and methodological choices made through CP2.0.

While each role and strategy in the anti-trafficking movement is important, no single organization or plan can address human trafficking comprehensively. Ending human trafficking requires collective action and collaborative efforts among all stakeholders. An investment in any single part of a community response will ultimately fail to address the root causes of human trafficking and risk that survivors will continue to slip through the gaps. As the anti-trafficking movement reflects upon 19 years since the passage of the federal TVPA, the crime has expanded and the response has become more sophisticated.

The results of CP1.0 allowed LCHT to create a methodology to gauge the number and nature of anti-trafficking efforts underway in Colorado. Using the 4P framework and methods developed in CP1.0, CP2.0 aims to continue identifying and addressing gaps in anti-trafficking response and refining a replicable process for other states.

Research into Action: The Colorado Action Plan

Embodying the principle of turning research into action, LCHT led efforts to develop the CAP1.0. An interdisciplinary State Advisory Board comprised of professionals working in anti-trafficking and related parallel social movements analyzed Colorado data; they then created a comprehensive list of statewide recommendations that evolved into the CAP1.0. This multi-sector approach was a departure from other state-level plans dedicated to reducing human trafficking in that it was the first comprehensive, statewide plan in the country driven by data and directly informed by a total of 350 project members and practitioners from a diverse array of communities around the state of Colorado.

Six years after the original research, the CAP2.0 is based on knowledge of what is already working in Colorado, as well as a deeper understanding of where the gaps exist. The Colorado anti-trafficking movement can become even more effective with this greater knowledge.
The results of CP1.0 allowed LCHT to create a methodology to gauge the number and nature of anti-trafficking efforts underway in Colorado. Using the 4P framework and methods developed in CP1.0, CP2.0 aims to respond to this study’s six key objectives.

**Colorado Project 2.0**

CP2.0 provides data drawn from a refined version of the CP1.0 survey, as well as more robust focus groups, and newly adopted organizational interviews to advance our understanding of a comprehensive community response to human trafficking. As noted previously, with the Colorado Project framework, the Colorado anti-trafficking movement has an iterative, data-driven roadmap to measure and demonstrate progress to end human trafficking in our state. The methodology is further detailed in Appendix B.

**Conducting Research from a Community-based and Social Justice Perspective**

Community-based research integrates research and action attentive to the values of: individual and family wellness, sense of community, respect for human diversity, social justice, citizen participation, collaboration and community strengths, and empirical grounding (Dalton, Elias, & Wandersman, 2007). Further, social justice frameworks enable researchers to identify how systems of power and oppression fuel the trafficking of persons, and how intersectional identities (e.g., gender, race, class, sexual orientation, religion) create vulnerability within communities. With this research orientation in mind, LCHT shaped the Colorado Project framework with Community-Based Participatory Research at its core.

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR), often referred synonymously with participatory action research (PAR), is a methodology designed to produce knowledge and insight in partnership with community-based organizations and individuals (Anderson, Ostrom, Corus, Fisk, Gallan, Giraldo, & Shirahada, 2013; Mikesell, Bromley, & Khodyakov, 2013). In many cases and disciplines, the outcome of CBPR includes evidence-based practices (Wallerstein & Duran, 2010), pro-social health programs (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998), or opportunities for researchers to engage with communities to honor various forms of knowledge (Stoecker, 2003; Strand, Cutforth, Stoecker, Marullo, & Donohue, 2003). The leverage of the CBPR methodology in the context of human trafficking is that personal and lived experience is held as equal (or arguably even more important) to traditionally academic knowledge. Our methodology blends PAR with techniques established and verified in academic literatures. CBPR research is intended to be approachable, readable, accurate, and scientifically reliable.

**Report Structure**

The following four sections generally follow the research questions described above.

**What is the nature of human trafficking in Colorado?**

**What is being done to address human trafficking in Colorado?**

**How do we work together to comprehensively end human trafficking?**

Section Two gives guidance on the ways in which communities across Colorado describe, define, contextualize, and consider human trafficking. In Section Three, we examine the responses to trafficking that participants described. Section Three flows across the 4Ps and details strengths, gaps, and community innovations. Section Four is a deeper analysis of partnerships that lead collaborative efforts. Finally, in Section Five, we offer promising practices, analysis, and next steps in the emerging efforts to end trafficking in Colorado.
What Is the Nature Of Human Trafficking in Colorado?

This section highlights how communities describe what they see as human trafficking locally – how they define human trafficking, how they see the crime occurring in their communities and how it might be prevented, how they can more easily conceptualize the many ways in which the crime presents, and how survivors are perceived. Understanding these issues and how they work comprehensively is one of the first steps to responding to the crime and eliminating it.

A central theme emerges: trafficking is happening across the state and the problem is worthy of time and attention. Overall, participants note that there is little agreement on the root causes of trafficking; communities do not share the same definitions or understanding of trafficking; and participants worry that average citizens may not have the tools to identify the signs of trafficking. While this study is not a measure of the prevalence of human trafficking in Colorado (prevalence measures tend to identify the amount of cases or incidence per capita), this section instead highlights the language, conceptions, and definitions constructed by Coloradans.

Framing Colorado’s Problem of Human Trafficking

Human trafficking can be framed as a “wicked problem” (Miller, 2017). Wicked problems, akin and connected to other complex issues like poverty, homelessness, and chronic health issues present unique challenges because they defy precise definition and cut across disciplines, sectors, geographies, jurisdictions, policy, and service delivery areas. The central challenge of wicked problems is that individuals will define the problem of human trafficking differently, often based on their perspective of the issue, and those varied problem definitions create numerous, and sometimes competing, solutions. For example, when we only think of human trafficking as sex trafficking and don’t ask questions about labor trafficking, we often do not see or recognize this form of trafficking. Additionally, if we start with a solution in mind, we may overlook the genuine root causes, and thus, make an impact on the symptom but not the underlying causes. Shifting the focus from our feelings and fears about human trafficking to the intervention points where we can support individuals and communities will create positive social change at a root cause level necessary to ultimately end trafficking. Community responses begin with examining what causes human trafficking; the following sections detail the ‘what’, ‘where’, ‘how’, ‘why’, and ‘who’ of human trafficking in Colorado.

WHAT Human Trafficking Is to Coloradans

How we define a problem leads to how it will be solved. Because of this, a problem’s definition is incredibly important to current and future work. With that in mind, one of the questions we asked in interviews and focus groups was, “How do you define or describe human trafficking?” Some respondents characterize human trafficking in legal terms, using
“exploitation or force, fraud, coercion.” Other participants provided a wide range of definitions and descriptions of populations who might be involved in trafficking. This section details the descriptions, definitions, and images described by participants; we interpret this as the ‘what’ trafficking is in Colorado.

Overwhelmingly, Coloradans believe human trafficking to be sex trafficking; however, our current research shows that we are beginning to include and characterize nuances within labor trafficking descriptions. Respondents separate sex trafficking from labor trafficking as two disparate types of trafficking. One participant said:

In terms of your question about labor trafficking, I think that that’s coming more to the forefront than it has historically. So I think the leading consideration was definitely more of the sex trafficking piece but I have now started to go to conferences and symposiums where the labor trafficking part of things is being discussed more, as well as the intersectionality between labor trafficking and sex trafficking in some cases.

Additionally, Coloradans are working to better define labor trafficking as either a civil issue or a criminal issue. As suggested by this participant:

So, I think there is trafficking that’s not being recognized as trafficking especially in the labor context where people are still told, this is a civil issue, you know, this is an employment issue, not a criminal issue, and then conversely there are situations being seen as trafficking, again, by the authorities, and by law enforcement.

Other community members grappled with whether or not this crime should be thought of as a human rights issue more than – or different from – a legal issue. These are perspectives from three participants:

It’s just an acknowledgment that this level of exploitation that rises to human trafficking is a violation of their basic human rights and that our goal is to help, is to really acknowledge that at its core and work from that.

I think the human trafficking or the human rights violation is so central to that, the forms of coercion that we see perpetrators using. There’s a lot of overlaps whether it’s sex or labor in terms of being deceived, having to work under conditions that they didn’t agree to, and you know, not being paid, those kinds of things.

As I mentioned before, coming from a rights-based perspective that takes into account the root causes that create vulnerability, that lead to exploitation, we try and be cognizant of that, try to place the survivor in the center of making their decisions.

Obligations from a human rights perspective help to distinguish the crime from an issue of migration, public order, or organized crime (Rijken, 2009; Segrave, 2009). Core principles of a human rights approach, like focusing first on a person’s holistic needs, rather than legal or criminal sanctions or national security interests, have been defined and support a specific framework for understanding and responding to human trafficking that differ from responding to a crime. Overall, there is a consensus growing across the state that communities understand sex trafficking and are moving toward agreement that labor trafficking is equally worthy of clearer definition, time, and attention.
WHERE Human Trafficking Occurs in Our Communities

CP2.0 provides anecdotal evidence of the context of how human trafficking occurs in the state of Colorado and nationally, shoring up the ways we categorized the problem in CP1.0:

The anti-trafficking movement continues to see a landscape of scattered efforts, frustrated communities that must cobble resources to combat a vast and complex problem, victims falling through the cracks, and traffickers escaping punishment. In addition, there continues to be a lack of uniform methods to gauge the number of anti-trafficking efforts underway in the U.S., let alone how effective or successful those efforts are in preventing people from being trafficked” (LCHTb, 2013, p.19).

Because we wanted to understand the context in which trafficking happens, the CP2.0 research project asked, “How does this crime primarily occur?” Coloradans interviewed across the state agreed that trafficking happens locally, no matter if the community is an urban, rural, or frontier one. Specifically, human services and law enforcement professionals talked about the variety of people who have been trafficked in their communities. These three quotes from different participants note this variation:

“
We recently had some cases come across where we’ve had moms trafficked. So, I mean there are some incidents where it’s impacting the kids.

I’ve specifically worked with [organization in another city] regarding some of those cases. Then with domestic violence that threat, that power and control where one parent is documented, maybe the other parent is not documented and what that looks like with the threat of crossing borders and taking their children away.

So, what we have found out, in the rural area our youth are more open to being trafficked through the laboring aspect, because there’s a lot of ranches and farms up there. We find out through word of mouth, through other youth that there’s a problem, but not knowing how to address it. Our youth in the metro area, we find a lot of our kids are being sex trafficked.

Recognizing that the crime is happening here, participants described two primary challenges that impact local response to human trafficking: 1) The knowledge and awareness possessed locally, and 2) Economic drivers that create demand.

Challenge 1: Local Resource Knowledge and Awareness

Participants believe that human trafficking decreases in Colorado communities when agencies that provide resources understand the unique circumstances facing their local communities. Two participants’ responses emphasize that point here:

“I think that to truly be more effective, you have to be very locally grounded and understand what’s happening in the different communities.

Every community is very different, and so, how each community handles an incident of human trafficking is going to be unique to that community.
Additionally, some Coloradans believe that human trafficking decreases when district attorneys and judges are educated on the crime of human trafficking and therefore take these cases, as illustrated by these quotes:

"The judges need to be more informed because we found out or heard that a lot of the judges when they get these traffickers and stuff they let them go, really easy sentences because they don’t even know what this all about and they don’t (they’re having problems training the judges) don’t even want to go to training for this.

I think having officers specifically trained on this issue, investigating and making arrests, has been a huge improvement for [our city], and then having DAs educated on it that can prosecute these cases. I’d say lots of improvements though we have a mountain of work to do. I think we’ve come a long way in [these] years.

Legislation helps to frame and define legal issues in new ways that support prosecution. For example, the change from outdated “child prostitute” language to naming the crime “the commercial sexual exploitation of children” is an example of a shift, which in turn leads to a different lens under which prosecutors in particular are willing to prosecute sex trafficking cases.

**Challenge 2: Economic Drivers that Create Demand**

In discussing local characteristics, reasons why trafficking was occurring in their communities, participants referenced economic drivers that appear to increase vulnerability to trafficking. Participants believe that human trafficking will decrease when the public begins calculating risks for human trafficking into daily purchasing decisions based on the principle of supply and demand. From this perspective, ending human trafficking requires action to reduce demand for commercial sex.

"What I would love to see more of here is demand reduction, go after the buyers because the traffickers will continue to come as long as there are buyers and those cases are much easier to prosecute because there’s evidence right there that they attempted to purchase a person and that’s illegal, but it’s not being pursued here.

It also requires community members realizing the human costs involved in purchasing cheap goods and making purchasing decisions based on this awareness.

"I also think there is a lot of denial about labor trafficking because everybody wants a bargain. They want to pay to mow their lawn for nothing. They want a right roof, they want to have roofers that you know don’t have background checks etcetera, they want a good deal and I think there’s a lot of that that goes on that could be close monitored and there are I think there’s regulations in effect they just need to be enforced.

Economic and psychological theories appear deeply embedded in the ways that participants frame the concepts, mechanisms, and causes of trafficking. The psychological ways that respondents understand where trafficking happens might be more easily explored by utilizing the social ecology theory to deeply examine vulnerabilities.
HOW Human Trafficking Occurs in Colorado

To respond to and end a problem as broad as human trafficking, we need to understand the different levels where participants view trafficking as occurring:

**SOCIAL ECOLOGICAL MODEL**

Adapted from Stokols (1992) and Whiteley (1999)

**Individual:** Is trafficking happening because of individual decision-making (restricted choices and/or few to no personal alternatives)?

**Interpersonal (including family):** Is trafficking a result of a dangerous relationship?

**Institutional/Community:** Does trafficking stem from the policies of a given community and/or institution?

**Cultural/Society:** Does it come from the norms of the culture or society in which the victim/survivor lives?

The following quotations represent how participants view trafficking happening within the various levels outlined by social ecology theory. At the individual level, a person’s circumstances or choices are examined as an explanation for human trafficking occurring.

Oh my goodness. I just think of, I think bottom line they’re vulnerable people getting put in positions that they never thought that they would be in. And then I also think of unfortunately people do shitty things to other people and whether it’s because of their own abuse, their own issues, money, greed, you know and that is the bottom line. We all know what the textbook definition is force, fraud, coercion. But you know you’ve got a vulnerable person who’s struggling and then you have someone willing to prey on that person and why they’re doing it now they could be doing it for all kinds of reasons themselves. They could be a mess themselves, it could be addictions themselves, and it could be money, status, just looking to get whatever they need in their life so it’s just like crappy people preying on vulnerable people. That’s what I usually say.
At the interpersonal level the dynamics of the relationship between the victim and perpetrator are examined as a possible explanation as illustrated by these two responses.

“During my time, I had no idea that human trafficking is happening here. I just thought I had a bad employer.

All I’m going to add is for what was brought up for the image of power and control, and the sides of it can appear really subtle, and it’s not really obvious and it happens within the context of relationship. There’s also benefit and sense of positivity happening in that relationship, which makes it more complicated to identify.

Challenges to addressing trafficking at the institutional or community level were also discussed here:

“One of the areas that I think it struggles in that we have around our community…is getting that line of communication over to immigrants, undocumented and those who are also documented. Because we have an influx of persons coming in here that are probably refugees from another country…that have been victims of things like guerrilla warfare and other stuff. They don’t speak our languages, obviously a different religious background, and with that also being raised on different ethics than the American culture. And getting communications to those obviously is an intricate part that needs to be done. But at the same time, I think we’re still struggling with that through, with the language barrier and others. Knowing what’s acceptable or unacceptable

in another part outside of the United States, if that makes sense.

The complexities of addressing human trafficking at the cultural or societal level are discussed further by these two participants.

“Human trafficking is a symptom of a problem, it is of course a horrible problem but it really is a symptom. It’s a symptom of the ways that we as a society regard the vulnerable and the ways that we tolerate exploitation of the vulnerable. Women are unfortunately vulnerable, and children are vulnerable, and trans people are vulnerable, and gay people are vulnerable, and disabled people are vulnerable, all of the things that create vulnerabilities are the factors that create the potential for exploitation…it’s exploitation of human beings for money, for power and control. And it’s well-tolerated in our culture.

We have to change the culture; you have to hold those that are willing to purchase sex with a child accountable. Currently most of them get probation, you have to hold those accountable that are willing to sell a child and stop it before it happens if you can. You have to get the community involved; you have to make it where this isn’t acceptable. In some areas, this is just normal course of business, it is acceptable. They are, I mean, on national TV, we have sportscasters and professional interviewers on the nine o’clock news that are talking about prostitution and pimping, and making a joke out of it. And trafficking, and they turn it into something very publicized but it’s a joke. And until that culture changes, and it’s no longer acceptable, and we hold people accountable
What Is the Nature Of Human Trafficking in Colorado?

By applying the social ecology theory here, we uncover the mechanisms that our participants suggest lead to human trafficking. Participants revealed that all levels within the social ecology theory are implicated as processes that facilitate human exploitation. The next section details root causes, or those causes that appear to contribute to trafficking.

WHY: Root Causes of Trafficking in Colorado

As in CP1.0, we asked communities to describe root causes, why they believed human trafficking was occurring. Delving further into Colorado’s three different geographic designations – urban, rural, and frontier – root causes of human trafficking are described differently in each of these areas. There is also a sense that sex trafficking happens primarily in cities and labor trafficking, particularly agricultural, primarily happens in rural and frontier areas of the state. Resource challenges are frequently described by respondents in both frontier and rural communities.

Urban
All counties that contain metropolitan areas with over 50,000 residents.

Rural
A non-metropolitan county with no cities over 50,000 residents.

Frontier
A county that has a population density of 6 or fewer residents per square mile.

Participants cited a broad range of conditions that exist here in Colorado that may lead to human trafficking, including: poverty; homelessness/housing instability; highways; the international airport; tourism; generational or interpersonal violence; rural/urban divides; underlying behavioral or mental health issues; and the ever-changing nature of technology. The top three causes attributed to human trafficking (by participants) were industries, immigration, and drugs.

Human trafficking is described as occurring in a variety of industries in Colorado such as agriculture, construction, domestic household and the commercial sex industry, which is seen as affecting the individuals working in those industries. The tourist industry was highlighted as an area of concern:

It’s the youth, teens, actually LGBTQ, Native American peoples, immigrants, agricultural workers. I mean, and you know actually as I say this, we’re in a tourist industry and so we have all these different tourism offices, businesses. The majority of our immigrant populations are working in housekeeping and I know that they’re not making actual wages. I always think agricultural but in truth it’s our tourist industry and the people who are providing services, I would say that qualifies, definitely.
From an immigration perspective, fear of deportation and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), with a growing climate of anti-immigrant sentiment has led to a cooling effect in which undocumented workers who are experiencing violence or exploitation are declining to ask for help and protection from service providers or law enforcement, and potentially becoming more likely to be exploited.

ICE may be coming in and doing that periodically, but the families in the residents don’t understand that there is a difference. That if you call because you’re a victim of domestic violence within that human trafficking realm, you’re not going to automatically be deported, or if you are a victim of sexual trafficking and you’re being sexually assaulted. When you report that somebody can help you and do something, what we hear a lot is you know, I don’t want to tell because I might be deported.

Some participants note the large number of people who have come to the state looking for work in the marijuana industry as a root cause. This influx of population has led to a less stable community and youth who end up being economically vulnerable if they fail to find work in the cannabis industry.

I guess I would say too that the change in the marijuana law has contributed just in that the population has been so transient with people coming in and out of the state on a much higher level than previous years, so people are moving through our state at higher rates.

Ultimately, participants made it clear that human trafficking cannot simply be addressed in a vacuum, but rather must include consideration of issues and structures that produce vulnerabilities. Understanding these risk factors is crucial to the long-term effectiveness of the work to end trafficking. We turn attention to the ways in which respondents describe those who are vulnerable to trafficking and how they perceive survivors of trafficking. These perceptions likely indicate who has access to local resources, services, and programs.

**WHO: Perceptions of Victims and Survivors**

In addition to defining the problem of trafficking and understanding how human trafficking occurs, the capacity for communities to coordinate responses to human trafficking lies in the ways in which survivors are portrayed, perceived, and platformed. Initial portrayals of survivors originate from a history of federally-funded responses depicting foreign nationals trafficked to the U.S. These portrayals only recently started including survivors born and trafficked within the country. The literature on labor trafficking survivorship is finally emerging as distinctly separate from sex trafficking survivorship (DeVries & Farrell, 2017; Owens, Dank, Breaux, Banuelos, Farrell, Pfeffer, Bright, Heitsmith, & McDevitt, 2014). On a further positive note, there has been a change in the way survivors have been treated by providers. Interventions focus on improvements in assessment and therapeutic approaches that are trauma-informed and survivor-centered (Chester, Lummer, & Mulloy, 2012; Countryman-Roswurm, & DiLollo, 2016; Dank, Yu, Yahner, Pelletier, Mora, & Conner, 2015; Domoney, Howard, Abas, Broadbent, & Oram, 2015; Ernewein & Nieves, 2015; Heffernan & Blythe, 2014; Hopper, 2016; Johnson, 2012; Muraya & Fry, 2015). Primarily, responses suggest that Coloradans believe that human trafficking could happen to anyone, anywhere. At the same time, participants suggest that average citizens may still misunderstand trafficking as a “Hollywood” mythology.

And so a lot of our presentations are focused on shifting the community’s perception from...
Hollywood to real life. And letting them know that, no, it is not like that movie. I mean, that kind of stuff may happen. But here’s what’s happening in your community. Here’s why it could be the person in front of you in line at a Walmart that’s involved with trafficking and you wouldn’t even know.

Challenges remain, in part because the media often exacerbates the issue in its framing of survivors (Houston-Kolnik, Soibatian, & Shattell, 2017), particularly in the following areas: survivor autonomy and choice, sensitivities to intersectional identities (Sanchez, 2017), and reframing of “rescue” language (Countryman-Roswurm & DiLollo, 2016).

In academic literature, survivors have often been portrayed in a binary way – one identity of “at risk” victims juxtaposed against another identity of strong assertive survivors (Jordan, Patel, & Rapp, 2013; Sapiro, Johnson, Postmus, & Simmel, 2016; Musto, 2016; UNODC, 2016). This binary perception has evolved to one where survivors are often ascribed polarizing identities. In one conception, they are helpless victims unable (and incapable) of making their own decisions (Sapiro, Johnson, Postmus, & Simmel, 2017). The other portrayal features strong survivors as resourceful and resilient (Dank, Yu, Yahner, Pelletier, Mora, & Conner, 2015).

Our research has shown a more nuanced view to the survivor experience. Our conversations with Colorado communities offer the following examples within and beyond this binary/limited perception.

Perceptions of survivors as helpless are attributed to their need to be liberated. They get sucked into a bad situation. They would identify a runaway on the third or fourth time and then try to you know, follow them – follow their case. So when they pop up somewhere, then you know, see who they’re hanging out with, where they’re going, or what they’re doing before they get sucked into like a full trafficking situation.

As a result, terms reflecting freedom and efforts to “recover and restore” survivors from their plight emerge. Survivors of human trafficking are often perceived as people who lack personal responsibility or ability to make decisions:

A lot of times they will use an example of a runaway, a 12- or 14-year-old who maybe had some tough breaks at home and is upset and runs away. She doesn’t know where to go, she has somebody who runs into her and is offering her a place to stay and food to eat, and so she takes it, and she kind of gets trapped into you know, getting stuck because then and this person is showing her attention and you know all of a sudden, she doesn’t know what to do. And this person ‘loves her and is trying to help her’ but then he’s going to share [her] with all his friends.

Perceptions of survivors who lack agency and the ability to make decisions imply that they lack or lost ability to hold personal responsibility due to brainwashing or coercion that created risk, as illustrated by this quote:

They are so brainwashed that they begin to believe this is for the common good of someone other than them. Or they think that they are getting something from it, ‘well I don’t have to go to school, school is bullshit anyway and when I can earn two or three grand a month why does it matter?’ To me it is brainwash or coercion versus you lie to someone to bring them here from another
country and you say ‘by the way you owe me another 5000 dollars’ worth of work.’ Again, that is human trafficking but that is not for our area...well to me those are two different things.

Participants noted a tendency for survivors to return to their abusers:

I think it’s really important to educate the community on how it does happen and that victims are often blamed for it. Trying to help them understand the reasons they even go back to it, so that they have a greater understanding. It doesn’t make sense, but it’s the reality of it, and the reasons that may happen, it doesn’t make sense that somebody would be rescued from something that looks and is so horrible and then want to go back to it, but they’re going back to it. Maybe it’s because their alternative is the street and no food. So being abused at this level and having food and a place to sleep is a better alternative for them, so I think trying to get the scenarios that people can identify with and understand how someone is brainwashed into believing that this is good for them, that somebody cares about them, and they maybe don’t know what it feels like to be cared for.

The complexity and depth of the relationships within trafficking situations described above opens new conversations for partners working in protection, prosecution, and law enforcement. Many participants from protection-focused organizations perceived survivors as needing healing and appropriate services.

I think one of the hugest things I see with the [group] is that really we were looking at a paradigm shift because technically a lot of our children that have been victims of human trafficking really have come in more of the delinquency/beyond control of parent realm and people were not seeing that many of these children were victims. That even though it appeared they were trading sex for room and board or sex for drugs, it’s really helping to make people aware that this is human trafficking. This is what we’re talking about, it’s not just exchange of money or things like that, that it happens in different ways and how can we help these kids.

Another challenge in identifying survivors can be that survivors of human trafficking sometimes do not self-identify as victims of trafficking. Two participants describe that perspective:

I am just thinking that in their minds they don’t think that they are necessarily [victims]. Survivors don’t always know what is happening, they don’t think of themselves being in human trafficking but they know that there are issues going on with their boyfriend or that they are being abused in some way. So that it is being filtered through in that way, they disclose that they are victims of domestic violence but then it comes out that there was more going on than just domestic violence.

So we never even know who the victim is when we talk to them, because they don’t recognize themselves as a victim, and it could be anybody. It could be anybody, it could be our neighbors, it could be our family, many times it’s coming from the
family, and many times it’s coming- we have foreign victims, we never know who.

On the other end of the spectrum, some participants say that survivors possess agency and self-determination, framing survivorship in terms of resilience when offered lifeline options and being seen as allowed to make their own decisions.

“I think success for me looks very different for me than it used to. But I think success is giving lifeline options. That doesn’t always mean that they’ll take those options, but actually giving them the option is probably success… I’ve had two clients that have families of their own and are doing well now. But that was their own success and that’s just vindication, and what they’re navigating through, it’s a difficult system sometimes."

Navigating these perceptions, stigmas, and definitions of trafficking is a thread woven throughout Section Two. The aim of this section has been to illuminate how threads tie seemingly disparate pieces of the human trafficking patchwork together. Human trafficking definitions, how communities see the crime occurring, a context in which to think about the crime, and the way in which survivors are perceived (and treated) all are part of the way in which human trafficking can be understood and remedied in a comprehensive way. When we begin conversations with the assumption that we all agree about what trafficking is and how trafficking happens, we may miss opportunities to explore the breadth and depth of the issue locally. Having considered a way in which to better understand our assumptions about both sex and labor trafficking, we now turn to data that detail the current status of our efforts to address human trafficking.
What Is Being Done to Address Human Trafficking in Colorado?

Community responses are driven in part by the ways in which the cause of the crime is framed, availability of local resources, how resources interact with each other, and how communities talk about the innovative work that is successful in their local community. We asked professionals and community members across the state to explain what is working in their communities, as well as to share their ideas for the future. This section includes responses from surveys and focus groups; recent scholarly literature trends; an overview of gaps that have emerged; and innovative solutions that are taking place in Colorado communities.

Each of the following subsections have a similar layout. First, we provide Colorado context to one of the 4Ps, then we proceed to celebrate a strength, we define a gap, and then we lift up an innovative community practice described by participants. Strengths are operationalized as practices that over half of respondents in our survey indicated they are doing. Gaps are defined as areas where both qualitative and quantitative data suggest Colorado communities could improve. The innovative community practices are specific examples of success within each of the 4Ps.

Prevention

Prevention efforts in Colorado comprise the largest dedicated efforts of practitioners and community partnerships. In CP2.0, of the agencies we surveyed, 77% of respondents conduct prevention work. Specifically, prevention efforts tend to include training, education, advocacy, and risk or harm reduction programs.

Prevention Strength: Human Trafficking Training and Education Programs

Both CP1.0 and CP2.0 research, as well as recent literature, highlight the need for prevention efforts, particularly for sector-specific training, among them medical and behavioral health professionals (Chester, Lummert, & Mullooly, 2012; Countryman-Roswurm & DiLollo, 2016; Domoney et al, 2015; Ernewein & Nieves, 2015; Heffernan & Blythe, 2014; Hopper, 2016; Johnson, 2012; Muraya & Fry, 2015). The initial national emphasis on training efforts for law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges is now shifting to training and resource needs at the county and city levels (Farrell et al, 2016; Spohn, 2014). Of the 183 survey participants, 114 engage in prevention activities across Colorado. Prevention agencies conduct the following types of work:
Many participants believe that human trafficking decreases in communities when a substantial and broad cross-section of the public understands the crime and when those operating at key touch points know how to respond. Public and practitioner awareness and ability to identify the crime matter tremendously. The need for training and awareness campaigns are paramount.

Based on survey results, the most common actions being taken by organizations in Colorado to prevent human trafficking are training, education, and raising awareness, though overwhelmingly focused on domestic minor sex trafficking. These results were matched by the responses gathered in focus group and individual agency interviews. The most frequent comments from participants as to what is currently being done to prevent trafficking were all focused on raising awareness, such as initiating education or training.

So, the goal being to, number one, raise awareness in the community, really tangible awareness. So people are aware of what’s going on. They know what to look for and how they report it. And resources and training for both the community, but very importantly for our first responders, educators, and those that these situations would be reported to so that something is actually done about it. And eventually, once we get there, obviously being able to follow it all the way through so that the folks who are the victims, I mean, who are trafficked, are being taking care of in the long run.

We’re working on educating our police force, the sheriff’s department, EMTs, everybody who might come upon a circumstance and until they’ve received our educational
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information they wouldn’t know any better really.

In our Colorado community, there’s been a lot of efforts around bringing the community in, helping them to understand the full definition of trafficking…So I think that our community over the past few years has really kind of—most of them have gotten the basics, the 101-type of [training as to] what trafficking is, and now we’re moving on at this point I think to a deeper level understanding, kind of more what do we do now?

These quotes highlight the distinctions participants made about the audience of their trainings or education programs. Primarily, participants suggest that they are attempting to reach a professional community (e.g., law enforcement, counselors, teachers, victim service providers) and that curriculum tends to include content about commercial sexual exploitation of children. As detailed in the second quote, efforts to engage a broader community were significantly more rare. Reaching citizens with broad training materials is a gap that comes out of this particular strength; communities are doing a significant amount of training but those trainings appear to target professionals.

**Prevention Gap: Need for more awareness and reaching diverse communities**

Even with community initiatives to raise awareness through trainings, participants noted a lack of awareness of or interest in human trafficking until something happened in their own communities. Participants commented that human trafficking occurs right in their own communities and many never knew about it until an arrest was made and publicized.

In my neighborhood, [neighbors] already got busted and moved out two years ago. It was happening right in front of us but nobody realized it because I think we just weren’t aware that it even existed here… the place has such a strong town feel to it that you would think that ‘Well, if it’s anywhere it’s got to be in Denver, it can’t possibly be here.’ So it was right in my neighborhood. Nobody knew but after a few years somebody finally figured it out and called the police and the police came and got rid of them.

While efforts to train a variety of professionals, such as first responders, and to educate the community are ongoing, gaps in awareness remain. To be more proactive, communities need to receive education, especially vulnerable groups in communities (e.g., farm workers, immigrants, minorities, disabled, sex workers).

I do believe that if we want to be proactive, so [that] we can protect victims when they come up, we do have to educate the community. The farm workers. We have to get into communities that are very vulnerable just because they’re falling through the cracks, meaning individuals with a disability, whether that is mental or physical. We are going into the communities with African-American individuals, Latino communities ...
A productive prevention strategy is working within local school districts to reach a wide base of youth. Participants suggested that prevention in schools should have a broad mandate, both in who should receive prevention services and how services should be delivered. Engaging youth in active learning and leadership opportunities related to human trafficking is seen as an effective way to make an impact. A noted goal was to broaden the reach to all youth rather than simply youth in high-risk communities. Given the reality that youth from all socioeconomic, age, race, ethnic, sexual orientation, and sexual identity backgrounds have the potential to be trafficked, and that youth can be key leaders in the effort to combat trafficking, one community told us:

"Things that we believe in include: that prevention should be provided for all youth, not just those that someone out there has identified as at-risk; that prevention should be focused on youth of all genders, from all ethnic backgrounds, really of any demographic. All youth should have access to prevention strategies; there’s a lot of research out there that shows that prevention that allows youth to lead, rather than just kind of being taught through the direct instruction is more effective."

Beyond reaching youth with knowledge about trafficking, the skills to recognize risky situations are important for all youth. Participants emphasized the importance of using creativity to engage youth on this topic:

"It needs to be done in the plays in the high schools, it needs to be done in music, and it needs to be done in a cultural way where we educate without it seeming like education. It’s got to be education and entertainment at the same time and I think we need more of that kind of work and there needs to be grants to help to promote that."

Policy mandates and/or implementation of training for teachers and other school professionals will have a broader impact at the school district and/or state level than at the level of the individual school or teacher. Incorporating impactful teaching and learning across school districts in Colorado has the potential to cast a wide prevention and protection net for our youth.
Prevention efforts significantly increased across Colorado in the last few years. Communities generally recognize that the professionals and first responders have the tools and training necessary to identify trafficking. Urban communities disproportionately have the resources for prevention efforts and many rural and frontier communities noted that training is still a desire.

Across all communities, one area for development is the training and awareness efforts that might arise for citizens and the general population. We celebrate the success of prevention efforts and turn our attention to efforts aimed at supporting, protecting, and serving those who have experienced trafficking.

**PROTECTION**

Protection activities are less common than programs available to prevent trafficking. This trend represents Colorado communities; communities in rural and frontier regions as well as those with robust parallel movement agencies are likely only now able to adapt their services specifically for survivors of human trafficking. A notable strength is that, of the programs that do provide services to survivors, there is breadth and depth of those services.

**PROTECTION STRENGTH:**

**DIVERSITY IN SERVICES, AGENCIES, AND CLIENTS**

**HOW MANY AGENCIES ARE PROVIDING SERVICES?**

81 of the 183 provide services to support survivors of labor and sex trafficking across Colorado.
Figure 3.3
TYPES OF AGENCIES PROVIDING SERVICES:
MORE THAN ONE MAY APPLY.

Figure 3.4
WHO IS BEING SERVED?

72.5% of clients have experienced
SEX TRAFFICKING
COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN (CSEC)
LABOR TRAFFICKING

77% of the organizations have served
FEMALES

86% MALES
82.5% TRANSGENDER M TO F
80% TRANSGENDER F TO M
74% INTERSEX

53% of the organizations have served
DOMESTIC YOUTH
DOMESTIC ADULTS
FOREIGN NATIONAL ADULTS
UNACCOMPANIED REFUGEE MINORS
WHAT SERVICES DO AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDE?

- Information about local transportation: 68%
- Contact numbers to seek help if victims of trafficking are threatened: 66%
- Referrals to workforce readiness programs: 59%
- Referrals to educational programs: 59%
- Referrals to job training programs: 54%
- Life skills services: 49%
- Assistance with relocating clients to other communities: 49%
- Information about local public schools or other educational opportunities: 49%
- Information to address safety of family members of victims of trafficking: 46%
- Information about availability of government-provided health insurance for children: 41%
- A safe address program for victims of trafficking: 37%
- Classes about financial literacy: 37%
- Obtaining government funded housing: 32%
- Job training program: 27%
- Local, sliding scale medical services: 27%
- On-site schooling: 10%
- Orientation on U.S. cultural customs and laws to foreign national survivors of human trafficking: 7%
A majority of agencies (63%) providing protection to survivors described that they have social services available for clients. Agencies (46%) also provide case management or additional support for clients. However, participants describe some specific needs of survivors that appear to be unavailable in many communities or costly to obtain for survivors.

**Protection Gap: Housing for Survivors**

Survey data illustrate that there are still gaps in services, and the feedback from our focus groups shows that housing is a critical area of concern. Of the 81 individuals who responded to survey protection questions, only 12 said that they offered shelter for survivors of trafficking. Long-term transitional housing was the least available service (n=4), while emergency shelter was the most common (n=9). Most of the shelters served survivors of domestic violence or homeless populations as their primary client base; none of those shelters offered a separate living area for survivors of trafficking.

In the human trafficking literature, universally safe housing continues to be identified as one of the greatest needs for survivors (Baker & Grover, 2013). Over the years, shelters have opened and closed in Colorado to specifically serve survivors of human trafficking, most typically underage girls. Our current study found that housing resources are a critical need and sorely lacking in Colorado. One participant called the situation a “housing crisis,” as there simply are too few housing opportunities for vulnerable people in Colorado.

Where do you put the kid? That’s the problem. We don’t have enough places. We have the governor’s council … and all these laws to say it’s child abuse and someone has to do something, and we recover them and then we have nowhere to put them, nowhere to keep them safe. We’ve got a gazillion children, where do we put them? We can only send so many out of state. There are not enough safe places for these kids.

While there are housing options for survivors emerging in a few communities, many communities lack emergency shelter options altogether. In the few communities where some form of shelter is available, it is rarely designed specifically for the needs of survivors of trafficking. One participant explained:

I know our domestic violence nonprofit human services are geared to address a situation or do an investigation or assessment and provide services. But we don’t have things like: there isn’t a homeless shelter, period, in [the local community]. That’s also speaking for other counties surrounding us. And with that said, there’s definitely not a special bed or a person who is necessarily trained to address the housing needs for a human trafficking victim, or additional training that’s been received, because we don’t even have a shelter for just your average homeless person.
PROTECTION INNOVATIVE COMMUNITY SOLUTION:

UTILIZING DATABASES TO SHARE INFORMATION AND CROWDSOURCE RESOURCES FOR SURVIVORS

A unique protection strategy currently being used in pockets of Colorado is accessing online platforms to share information between task force members, including law enforcement, with the resources of concerned community members who want to support survivors and previously did not know where they could plug into that response. The platform currently being used by some Colorado communities allows for child welfare agencies and law enforcement to make specific requests for different forms of support for survivors – from transportation to food to infant car seats, and to have that need filled by anyone who is part of that online community. According to participants, there has been great success in fulfilling the expressed needs of survivors and doing so in an anonymous way where the law enforcement or child welfare agencies work as the intermediary between the community member and the survivor. Here is how some participants talked about those successes:

“We had a goal of like with the FBI having needs for these -- working with these people or working with these victims. And the goal was to figure out how to get that need met for them and I feel like that was a shared goal, everybody pitched in, everyone said I can help, we could do this and we worked towards a solution and finally came to the Care Portal.”

“I think it’s just…again, figuring out where those gaps are and then I mean like a gap that were raised are going to be filled by Care Portal. It’s how do we get those immediate needs met in a timely and efficient way? And you have the FBI over here on this side that’s got the need, and you’ve got the church over here that wants to help, and I feel like our mentor/director was this spearhead for Care Portal and she saw that need, she said we have a tool that can fill this space, so that’s filling a gap that came out of this meeting.”

This tool is bringing together communities to recognize the diverse needs of survivors as well as highlighting the issue of human trafficking in hyper-local situations. This will foster a greater understanding of the complexities of the crime and what the impact of a localized community response can be.
Housing is a gap regardless of the community type. Additionally, housing is not a protection issue limited to individuals who have experienced trafficking. Housing shortages, short- and long-term are an ongoing focal point for social justice advocates across all of our communities. Many more communities serve survivors of trafficking than identified in CP1.0. Over 67% of survey respondents provide some form of protection services (N=119). These services predominantly support youth, women, and crime victims, but many new organizations to Colorado since CP1.0 arose specifically to serve individuals who have experienced trafficking. Just as these protection services increase with awareness, so too have prosecutions of trafficking cases.

PROSECUTION

When the U.S. began to implement the TVPA in the early 2000s, law enforcement efforts were a key priority, and they remain so today. Recent research has begun to focus upon "second generation" improvements to state legislation (Farrell et al, 2016). Similar to many states, Colorado’s 2014 legislation (HB 14-1273) made significant improvements to the first state laws enacted in 2006. In the period between July 1, 2006 and August 15, 2013, there were only two convictions under state trafficking statutes (Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice, 2013), with one of those convictions reversed by the Colorado Court of Appeals on March 27, 2014 (Court of Appeals No. 11CA154). Since the enactment of additional statutes in 2014, 129 cases have been documented as demonstrated below (Colorado Human Trafficking Council Annual Report, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE § 18-3-503</th>
<th>SEXUAL SERVITUDE ADULT § 18-3-504</th>
<th>SEXUAL SERVITUDE MINOR § 18-3-504</th>
<th>TOTAL FILINGS (CASES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.6**
Compared to CP1.0, overall prosecution efforts in Colorado are more organized and robust. One of our limitations in CP1.0 had been the low survey response rate to prosecution questions. To that end, LCHT collaborated with the Colorado Human Trafficking Council (CHTC), which was created by the legislature and appointed by Governor Hickenlooper in 2014, making Colorado the first state in the nation to meet this recommendation from the Uniform Act on Prevention of and Remedies for Human Trafficking (National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, 2013). Specifically, we worked with the CHTC’s Data & Research Task Force, which formed to fulfill the legislative mandate to collect data relating to the prevalence of and the efforts of law enforcement to combat human trafficking in Colorado. From 2015 to 2017, the Data & Research Task Force used some CP1.0 prosecution questions in its efforts to survey law enforcement investigators and prosecutors. These results and summaries are described in the 2015 and 2017 annual reports, posted on the CHTC’s website. Task force members reviewed results and made recommendations that were later endorsed by the full Council membership, as noted below. These recommendations provide insight into the gaps identified in the Data and Research Task Force studies (Colorado Department of Public Safety, 2015):

Based on findings from the law enforcement survey that was carried out by the Council in August of 2015, and considering its initial assessment of the current data collection practices in Colorado, the Council recommends that:

1. All law enforcement agencies collect and report on incidents and arrests containing the human trafficking offense codes of a) “involuntary servitude” and b) “sexual servitude” as part of the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data it submits to the Colorado Bureau of Investigation pursuant to C.R.S. § 24-33.5-412(5).

2. For the purpose of data collection to measure the prevalence of human trafficking in Colorado, the District Attorney or relevant law enforcement agent shall indicate at the time of charging if an offense is alleged to include an underlying factual basis of human trafficking, regardless of the crime charged. This information shall be collected through a data system best determined by stakeholders.

3. Pursuant to the mandate outlined in C.R.S. § 18-3-505(4)(e) for the Council, it is recommended that training standards and curricula developed for Colorado-based law and applicable code enforcement agencies, including but not limited to the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment and the Colorado Department of Regulatory Affairs, include the following topics:
   a. The indicators of sex and labor trafficking; and
   b. How to collect and report on human trafficking incidents and arrests.

Recommendations from the Council’s 2017 prosecution study (Colorado Department of Public Safety, 2017) included the following:

Recommendation 1: Efforts should be made to channel anti-trafficking expertise and resources, from metro-area jurisdictions to those located outside the metro area. Two avenues for knowledge and resource transfer for prosecution are:

a. Colorado District Attorneys’ Council (CDAC)-sponsored training on investigating and prosecuting complex cases in which human trafficking is featured as a key content area;

b. Implementation of a CDAC-based
Recommendation 2: Based on the Council’s prosecution study findings highlighting the valuable role that cross-agency, multijurisdictional collaboration plays in furthering sex trafficking investigations and prosecutions, a Council-based labor trafficking task force should be created to promote new resources for case referrals and better coordination of labor trafficking response. The task force should consider membership for and outreach to a wide representation of relevant stakeholders, specifically, the Colorado Departments of Regulatory Agencies, Revenue, and Environmental Health; representatives from the Economic Crimes units of District Attorney’s offices; worker’s compensation insurance providers; federal regulatory and enforcement agencies; and immigrant/ethnic and community-based organizations not currently represented on the Council.

Recommendation 3: The Council should conduct further analysis emphasizing the needs and experiences of human trafficking victims/survivors, especially as they relate to their participation in the criminal justice process.

Overall, there has been great progress from Colorado’s investigators and prosecutors in the intervening years since CP1.0. The mandated annual monitoring of efforts to combat human trafficking will continue to provide regular status updates while CHTC remains legislatively mandated. And while LCHT did not administer the prosecution portion of the survey for CP2.0, law enforcement and prosecutors were interviewed in our focus groups and organizational interviews. Specifically, participants discussed the ways in which communities partner and/or engage with law enforcement in the following sections.

Partnerships between different branches of law enforcement have led to major busts and sting operations, which appear to have a tremendously beneficial impact beyond the arrest of traffickers. The public learns of the dimension of the problem, even in their own communities, and is better informed and aware. One example is described by a participant:

“We had in the past fall the operation “Cross Country” with the FBI and they recovered, I think it was four days’ worth of … significant arrests. I think it was upwards of 184 victims of sex trafficking, including, I think … more than ten children who had been trafficked here in [our city]. So I think positive partnerships with the FBI and law enforcement have been able to address that.

Media attention from major busts is key to public awareness of human trafficking.

You know like we had a significant bust at [a large community event] and one over in [city A] and one recently in [city B], and when that stuff makes the news, that’s helpful. So I think it’s improving.

This is one significant example of the interplay among the prevention and prosecution efforts.
Prosecution Strength: Reporting to Authorities and Using the CoNEHT Hotline

The initial response to human trafficking is often making a report to local authorities. When a potential violation is clear, participants said they alerted authorities directly (e.g., the FBI, local police). When someone is uncertain about a potential violation, however, participants find it useful to have the Colorado CoNEHT (Colorado Network to End Human Trafficking) Hotline available to get advice on how to respond.

“If [the crime] was really blatant, I would rather call the [city] Police Department and their Human Trafficking Division or the FBI and our connections with the Victim Specialist there. If it seems like something really big, we probably just go straight to them with more just ideas of possibly entrapping things then we want to push it. I want to call the hotline if we think it’s a possible thing or maybe we’re not sure, call the hotline and then just go from there.”

The statewide hotline provides an additional avenue for prosecution, prevention, and protection. Prosecution efforts significantly increased from CP1.0, both in investigations and arrests, prosecutions, and updated laws, specifically HB14-1273. Greater training is warranted across the state, particularly in low-resourced jurisdictions, in both the ways in which data are recorded (e.g., human trafficking offense codes), as well as promising practices for investigating and prosecuting trafficking cases. Information-sharing challenges do and will continue to persist, especially considering cross-agency and multi-jurisdictional collaboration has been a consistent recommendation over the past several years. We honor our collaboration with the CHTC in being able to better measure law enforcement efforts to combat human trafficking.
Participants were excited about the use of novel tactics in law enforcement and prosecution to confront trafficking in local communities. Examples of these strategies include creating partnerships between law enforcement and hotels for better intervention, as well as prosecuting traffickers for other crimes such as tax evasion, worker’s compensation violations, and violations of labor laws. These creative strategies “cast a wider net” in which traffickers can be caught and prosecuted. One participant described a local plan to involve and train hotel management about human trafficking:

“I think our hotel initiative will help in the enforcement area. We have two hotels under construction now, one off of [highway X], or [highway Y] rather and there’s three others over there and the plan is when those are built have a program where all of the hotel operators [are] trained on what to look for. Hotels right off of the interstate, highway logic is that it’s probably happening there. And I’m not sure they know what to look for, so we didn’t create that training program, we read about it and thought it was a good idea so I think that’s a promising practice we’ll implement here that’s in effect in other places.”

The hotel initiative is an example of local communities implementing creative ideas that are borrowed from other localities to support law enforcement to apprehend traffickers. In the same vein, other communities in Colorado also noted they are working closely with gas stations along highly visible highways. Participants talked about utilizing violations of laws other than those focused on trafficking to be able to prosecute a case against a trafficker:

“One of the things they’re looking at currently is evaluating current state laws. They’re also looking at the secondary aspects of prosecution in which they go after them, the Capone Syndrome, in which they look at them for tax evasion, they look at some of the perpetrators and they’re looking at prosecuting them through labor laws, which is an interesting way of going about prosecution, and then workman’s compensation issues. Because when somebody gets injured they go to the hospital and are all of a sudden abandoned at the hospital, and then they’re going after them that way, and in order for them to do that we have to have cooperation with medical providers that are willing to make that phone call to the task force. So who is your ally in one of these task forces, you know, the important thing is to get anybody and everybody on board and make those alliances tight and let them know they’re safe and making those recommendations and referrals.”

Local licensing requirements are also being used in some Colorado communities to shut down businesses that are exploiting their employees. By understanding and utilizing all legal remedies available in local, state, and federal statutes, the potential to prosecute a variety of cases that involve trafficking is greatly enhanced and these statutes can be tools for intervening when the ability to prosecute specifically on a trafficking charge is limited.
We now turn our attention to efforts aimed at partnerships that bring together diverse experiences, amplify messages, and leverage resources.

In Colorado, one of the key changes since CP1.0 is the increase in the number and location of formal partnerships ranging from local grassroots efforts to the creation of the CHTC. Today, Colorado has 17 unique task forces across the state focused on ending human trafficking, a significant increase from four coalitions in 2012.

**Partnership strength: Growing partnerships specifically addressing trafficking**

Each partnership has its own unique history and genesis. In communities that had multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) in place, those teams were often the catalyst for coordinating efforts. Other partnerships came together because communities saw a need and reached out across sectors and agencies to work
on this issue without funding or a mandate. As one participant described:

“Cultural shift, it’s all of us coming to the table and saying something has to change, we have to work together. You guys, DHS is doing their thing, CPS is doing their thing, probation is doing their thing, and we’re all supposed to be on the same side and we’re not sharing information, and these pimps are working together and we’re not and we’re losing and the kids are suffering. We need to fix this. And so everybody just came to the table. We have no funding, we didn’t get money to do it, we just decided to do it and it’s working.

Partnerships are growing quickly across the state. We view this growth and development of new partnerships as holistically positive. Section Four provides more details on partnership strengths. LCHT will also release community profiles that highlight strengths across partnerships in smaller regional areas across Colorado.

**Partnership Gap: Representative Membership**

Effective collaboration necessitates partnerships across many sectors so that each can take the information on trafficking and use their professional lens to educate their respective colleagues. This also increases the ability to recognize and intervene in potential trafficking situations.

“I think every sector. Dentists, health care professionals, hotels, not just where trafficking could occur, but people who are in the communities, in schools, colleges, in car rental places, airports, airlines, in all of those places so that they have a better understanding and ability to offer a path.

The optimal collaboration creates a wide and inclusive network that brings together people from diverse perspectives and professions to share knowledge, information, and skills while casting a broader net for reaching potential and actual victims of human trafficking. Even with such great momentum and success, there are still concerns about gaps in terms of who is sitting at the table.

I wish I saw even more people, more organizations and representatives of organizations that are not working on human trafficking but are curious in starting. So more representation for victim services, the domestic violence field, I think these are very important communities that may feel very cut off from the services that the members here are offering. So it’s a little bit, it’s like affirmative outreach from these partnerships to other partnerships that are outside of human trafficking to other communities. Because otherwise how are they going to come here? Are they going to know?

Work still needs to be done to bring more survivors, members of parallel movements and diverse communities and professions to the anti-trafficking partnership table to better coordinate limited resources and acquire new ideas and approaches to tackle this problem.

However, Colorado has made significant progress in putting the infrastructure in place across the state and across professional sectors to make a comprehensive impact on human trafficking. The centrality of collaboration and networks to the development and effectiveness of a statewide strategy to support survivors and prosecute traffickers cannot be overstated. Section Four is exclusively dedicated to examining the nuances of a multisector, multi-P Partnership.
Partnerships, both those aimed at ending human trafficking, and those that adapt to address human trafficking, are increasing across the state of Colorado. Communities throughout the state describe efforts of intention, care, and respect as they seek collaboration for a comprehensive response. In addition to the 17 dedicated anti-trafficking task forces that exist in Colorado as of 2018, there are numerous other partnerships that extend their missions to include anti-trafficking efforts (most commonly related to prevention or protection). Overall, the state of partnerships to combat trafficking is strong.

**Trust Present in the Partnership**

Trust is an essential requirement for effective partnership. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) conclude that trust can be defined as one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open. When these conditions exist, collaborations support respect between agencies and across sectors, as illustrated by this quote:

I think one of our greatest successes is this right here, that we have this communication and trust with each other, that we learn about what each agency does, and have respect for each other and what our work is because our goal is the same.

Participants suggest that trust tends to be relational and/or responsible. Relational trust is defined by the personal connections that individuals have within the movement. For example, one respondent suggests, “I would throw that back to say the most important thing that we’ve established here is person to person trust.” Another form of trust is a responsibility-based form of trust which is defined by duties or roles. For example:

Team building and building trust, so I don’t think we have really ever had any issues. I think the trust comes from being open and transparent about what our roles are. Being able to say this is my role and this is your role and let me handle this part and you handle that part. We are able to have tough discussions and that is kind of what we built our trust around.

When asked about trust many respondents described open conversations across sectors:
I think for trust, I believe there have been open conversations from the different disciplines. For example, law enforcement or the district attorney’s office representatives or, you know, just the regular helping professionals who are represented have had some debate, healthy debate. Because each discipline is impacted a little bit differently and has a different lens or professional perspective to place upon. And I feel like discussing those things which impact people’s lives and our laws and how things may be prosecuted or assessed even in people’s ability to communicate openly about their disciplines, perspective and lens has demonstrated that there is a level of trust within [the partnership].

When partnerships enjoy trust, they have the opportunity to set and achieve goals together. Successful partnerships build on trust by being specific about the goals they have. One respondent suggests:

Trust within a partnership has to start with very clear expectations of what is the vision, the shared mission, our goals as partners, what expectations do we have for one another, what kind of skin do we have in the game, what are your strengths and weaknesses.

Trust that grows through achieving shared goals can further strengthen the partnership. For example:

Five years ago, we didn’t have a task force in the police department to look at human trafficking, right? So that is like huge. And now we have this collaboration. Also five years ago we didn’t have the diversion program. We are not tied in with the [other prosecution and law enforcement agencies]. We knew about each other and we kind of like smell around each other but we weren’t like working, partnering in a collaborative way.

Hardy, Phillips, & Lawrence (1998) argue that the purpose of trust in a collaboration is to make inter-organizational relations function more effectively by curtailing opportunistic behavior, by reducing complexity, and by fostering cooperation in ways that more formal contracts cannot. In order to maintain trust, partnerships should be willing to regularly evaluate and re-align goals as well as commit to the time required to achieve those goals (Latussek & Vlaar, 2018; Shaw, 2003; Vangen & Huxham, 2003). One respondent discusses that commitment by saying:

I think some of the trust comes from the longevity of the work… I knew that I was walking into a group of trusted individuals in a field where that is not necessarily the norm. So I think the longevity is a big part of it. And also, I mean really we joke about meeting fatigue and within a lot of task force meetings, and [other] meetings, our own internal meeting we need to be part of, but I certainly am speaking only for myself, but I look forward to our meetings. I look forward to the comradery and certainly the trust at the very foundation of that.

Trust, when successfully achieved and maintained, appears to be a meaningful form of currency for an effective partnership.

Survivors in Partnerships

Survivors of human trafficking have a compelling role to play in combating human trafficking effectively
throughout the world, as well as locally in Colorado. Survivors bring a profound understanding of human trafficking based on their lived experience. They provide the clues investigators need as evidence in court, as well as signs a community needs to identify and ultimately prevent trafficking (U.S. Advisory Council on Human Trafficking, 2016). They also bring a unique perspective on the effectiveness and sustainability of programming meant to support survivors both in crisis and in their long-term survivorship.

The importance of survivor inclusion is needed at all levels of policy decision making. Though there are diverse ways a survivor may choose to engage in the anti-trafficking movement, significant involvement and knowledge gained from individuals with lived experiences has been found in every aspect of the 4P’s (Hussemann, 2018). Cho tells us that,

“Survivors working with and as service providers is not a new concept. In fact, many fields, e.g., domestic violence, sexual assault, health, and addiction recovery, include service professionals who also have lived experience. However, because the human trafficking field is relatively new, victim service providers are still exploring how to thoughtfully seek and incorporate survivors’ perspective in service delivery (Cho, 2018, p.1).”

Many respondents found survivor leadership to be a new or novel concept. I don’t know of any survivors [in our partnership]. We run into survivors when we’re doing community events. People will come up to us afterwards and tell us that they are a survivor and thank us for what we are doing but we don’t have any survivors actually working in the organization that I know of. And we don’t actually perform rescues of trafficking victims at all.

This statement highlights what many other partners revealed: a direct connection to potential survivor leaders, but little support or guidance as to how those survivors might be successfully integrated into partnerships.

Others recognized that they could have greater success but weren’t sure how to effectively engage with survivors as demonstrated by this participant:

“I don’t know that we have done a fantastic job at identifying these survivors that are in our community. We do discuss what resources are available to them and I suspect we have survivors of sex assaults and other crimes that weren’t prosecuted [as trafficking] because the right questions weren’t necessarily asked that could be tapped into. But no, I don’t think we have any survivors currently working with us.”

Several partnerships took the initial step of inviting survivors to speak at meetings or events. Sometimes these situations were tokenizing for survivors. As one participant told us:

“I also feel responsibility to be the voice of those who are not represented [in the partnership]. And those are of those who are marginalized. I happen to think that our representatives who have been trafficked, I mean it’s a good start and their voices are heard respectfully, but I don’t think they have significant influence.”
Some participants weren’t aware of the tokenizing aspect of limited survivor participation. For example:

And then we had [a survivor] and her piece was a really good telling of her story of being trafficked here and then bringing analysis side of the piece, really helped some people because that’s something we can offer them, that’s really tangible and easy for them to do.

Some groups thought that inviting survivors in to tell their story was equivalent to participation in the partnership, as illustrated by this quote:

We invite them as part of the conversation to several of our [events] and some of our meetings, everybody’s welcome and often times we do have survivors come. In fact, we’ve had some survivors display their artwork and we’ve had survivors come and speak and share their story so we invite them to the table.

There were a very small number of partnerships that have meaningful and significant survivor participation. Even then, there were very few survivors in the partnership. These few survivors often felt sidelined by their counterparts or seemed to be “utilized,” or tokenized, as the only survivor, and therefore responsible for holding that perspective for all survivors. Some partnerships realized that they were lacking in survivor leadership and deliberately sought partnerships with survivor-led organizations.

There are other organizations out there now that are survivor-led organizations that we partnered with… and are moving forward with more of those alliances.

While not equivalent to survivor inclusion within the partnership, this is a way that partnerships can start to educate themselves on the importance of including survivor voice into their work.

It is clear that there are few partnerships that have been successful at elevating survivors as leaders. Some partnerships did not yet realize the importance of this inclusion or had not yet considered how to make it happen. Other partnerships strive for this involvement, but few knew how to make it a reality.

**Challenges to Survivor Participation**

Partnerships are presented with unique challenges when engaging survivors in the anti-trafficking movement: lack of services and support, inability to identify survivors in communities, the inherent trauma survivors may face while working in the movement, and the exclusion of the “wrong sorts” of survivors who fall outside of the common narrative of exploitation (Angelis, 2017). In survivor interviews, we hear that survivors feel pigeon-holed by this one aspect of their identity. As if being a survivor is the only thing they are and that they can accurately represent all survivors because of that one experience. Additionally we heard that many survivors feel excluded from the movement because they didn’t fit the mold of the ideal survivor. Despite these challenges, it is critical to include survivors to inform the movement.

These barriers are in no way insurmountable. Many partnerships acknowledge the importance of survivor participation as shown here:

Survivor voices are very important to the work that we do because, as you pointed out, that’s the most effective way of evaluating what you’re doing, is talking to the people who have experienced it.
There must be an increase in support for survivors beyond crisis and transitional situations to include long-term survivorship. However, creating long-term and sustainable support is difficult given current funding realities. Insufficient funds are clearly an issue among organizations responding to human trafficking (Pierce, 2009). One survivor respondent described a lack of support in the form of not receiving compensation for the significant time they spend informing the anti-trafficking movement.

I don’t know, I mean the difficult thing is for people like me, I work full-time. And so, everything I do for human trafficking is on my own time.

Survivors are forced to choose between not participating or working long work weeks in order to participate, usually without compensation.

Several partnerships expressed that they would like to have survivors participate in their work but didn’t know how to identify them in the community without causing further harm. One respondent spoke of one of the challenges to survivor inclusion.

There’s a balance between making sure that there’s a space for survivors and not pushing anyone into a position where they don’t want to be. And so, I think that’s just a balance.

However, there is hope this could change as the crime begins to become more understood and tools to identify survivors are developed (Hemmings, 2016).

Services and inclusion in the movement is often privileged, excluding those on the margin of the human trafficking narrative, such as: LGBTQIA-identified individuals, men, young boys, and domestic victims of labor trafficking (Angelis, 2017; Teigen, 2018). One survivor expressed their frustration with this:

I mean, where do I get my masters in survivorship? So that people will think I’m valid.

Within each of the 4Ps, the roles, leadership, and capacity for inclusion appears to vary. Survivors of human trafficking are often rightfully resistant to volunteer their involvement in the criminal justice system, especially prosecution, or in partnerships where law enforcement are in leadership roles, due to lack of trust, previous mistreatment, criminalization, limited understanding of process, and uncertainty if incarceration of their perpetrator(s) will remedy their harm (Husseman, 2018; U.S. Advisory Council on Human Trafficking, 2016). However, having a justice practice guided by the needs of individual survivors would be critical to bringing trust back to the process. One survivor explained,

Yeah, and for me, I’m still scared of the FBIs, law enforcers...Yeah. Especially like, law enforcers, I don’t trust them that much...I can’t think... I can’t look at them eyes-wise. I don’t know, it’s just like... I have the mentality that they can deport me any time.

When asked by the interviewer, “Do you think that if you had more of a personal relationship with some of the prosecutors or law enforcement [on the task force] that you would feel less nervous or scared in meetings?” that participant replied:

I think so. I think so. Cause they never, like, reach out to me, like... you know, talk to me in deeper sense.

Deep, interpersonal connections that go beyond a surface relationship may be necessary to build trust
in partnerships – especially partnerships that seek to embed and embrace survivor leadership.

**Partnership Conflict and Contention**

Challenges related to survivor inclusion and leadership are not the only places where partnership leaders must carefully navigate the experiences, personalities, positions, and aims of collaborators. Partnerships naturally experience conflict. Through participant responses, it became clear that early in partnership formation the conflict was somewhat different than in later phases of partnership life. Two of the more common experiences in nascent partnerships came from the personalities or persons involved (as individuals) or the perceptions of the roles and goals of the organizations represented by persons joining the partnership. For example,

> And really, most of the conflict rose out of personalities, it wasn’t necessarily a part of the group or the way we did things, it was more some of the people who came to the table who had philosophical differences or something like that, and as long as we maintained somebody from that discipline to bring their stuff to the table, that worked itself out.

This example of personality-driven conflict dissipates as relational trust (described above) grows. The second kind of conflict, stemming from different worldviews or different priorities, sounded like this:

> I think when the group first started, and we go back to not everyone’s seeing human trafficking in their roles a little differently, there was some mistrust. There were also passionate, passionate people in the first original group that their passions were being questioned. And then there were people who were trying to control the message. And so, trust develops over time and permission to disagree. There are strong leaders in that group and they’re going to disagree and that’s okay. And then there are others who really want to understand why they can’t control that message. And that’s a difficult thing for people. But as a leader you have to be able to have all sides and allow that conversation. I trust everyone around that table right now.

When asked about how conflict occurs, another respondent suggested:

> Throw darts at each other. Verbal darts. It hasn’t gotten really heated very often. People tend to be civil with each other. I suppose you know, going back to a much earlier question about my own role, is that one of the problems is that everybody gets pigeon holed into their roles, and their personalities, and what they think.

The roles and perceptions of others as they come to the table in the partnership signals what early partnerships can do to overcome experiences of conflict and distrust and work to build both relational and responsible forms of trust.
In maturing partnerships, respondents often suggested that conflict was welcome and necessary for the group to evolve, grow, and maintain trust. Conflict resolution practices that provide opportunities and mechanisms that are both formal and informal appear important across many types of partnerships (Chung, 2016; Currie & Teague, 2015). For example:

Absolutely conflict arises and I think I would be very disappointed if it didn’t in order to have progress we need to have conflict and in my short time on board I have seen some healthy conflicts. So far I have not seen anything that I think is beyond damaging and irreparable, but rather having conversations about critical issues in the field and the exciting part coming from the outside is when you’re seeing those conversations happen that means that progress has already been made, right? Those initial kinds of bumps in the road have been overcome and now we’re really having those critical, difficult conversations across agencies and organizations. So yes conflict has arisen, and so far I think it has been really healthy conflict. And I think we’ll continue to see it, hopefully, in order to address the many challenges that are ahead of us now and will be forthcoming.

Healthy conflicts and opportunities for offline discussions appeared to be the most common
responses to resolving conflict. Typically, the partnership’s leader held the responsibility of resolving conflict and this duty was rarely spread across the full membership of the partnership. This suggests that partnership leaders may need to recognize this as part of the job description when leading these efforts.

**Partnership Goals**

Working in partnership requires diverse groups with different objectives to create coherent shared goals. Developing a mission with clear goals supports trust and stability in a partnership and decreases the likelihood of conflict based on confusion around the role of the partnership. While some of the 17 Colorado task forces have established goals, most did not. Of those who responded whether or not partnerships have explicitly-defined goals: 40% answered affirmatively, while 60% said they did not. Notably, 20% of those who responded yes admitted that they didn’t know what those goals were. Some partnerships had explicit goals set in their bylaws and others had come together as group to determine their goals. Some believed that the partnership itself – that is, networking and information sharing functions – was the goal:

> I think it’s networking...and keeping people up to date on some of the key things going on throughout Colorado.

Some believed the goals were implicit; though they hadn’t been discussed, it seemed understood that the goal was to end human trafficking.

> We have not ever sat down and had a meeting where we slugged out what the purpose- I think we assumed that we were on the same page but we’ve not ever formally addressed that. I don’t think it would be a bad thing to formally address that but whether people would come to the

Overall, partnerships, while regularly meeting and staffing cases or providing material support to survivors, often lack clearly articulated goals and typically do not have adequate resources to address the community-specific root causes of trafficking. Additionally, partnerships that appeared most effective at meeting goals were those that combined representatives from multiple Ps and supported each of those partners to exercise equal voice and leadership in the group. When goals were explicit and attainable in the short-to medium-term they were often met, providing measurable progress toward ending human trafficking and building trust and momentum within partnerships. Based on this finding, one emerging recommendation for partnerships would be to direct efforts to creating one or two specific goals that seek to reduce local vulnerabilities to trafficking. Partnerships with clear and attainable goals were able to partner more effectively and build rapport as they worked together to accomplish specific tasks.

Some just had not yet reached the point in their partnership to set goals. According to respondents, most if not all partnerships that had set out specific goals, had accomplished them and were moving on to new goals.

> I think one of the biggest goals was the development of a uniform screening tool that all the counties used and then making sure the counties implemented that tool and making sure that the counties all followed.

> Partnerships with clear and attainable goals were able to partner more effectively and build rapport as they worked together to accomplish specific tasks.

> Overall, partnerships, while regularly meeting and staffing cases or providing material support to survivors, often lack clearly articulated goals and typically do not have adequate resources to address the community-specific root causes of trafficking. Additionally, partnerships that appeared most effective at meeting goals were those that combined representatives from multiple Ps and supported each of those partners to exercise equal voice and leadership in the group. When goals were explicit and attainable in the short-to medium-term they were often met, providing measurable progress toward ending human trafficking and building trust and momentum within partnerships. Based on this finding, one emerging recommendation for partnerships would be to direct efforts to creating one or two specific goals that seek to reduce local vulnerabilities to trafficking. Partnerships with clear and attainable goals were able to partner more effectively and build rapport as they worked together to accomplish specific tasks. Partnership, a late addition to the 4P framework, is clearly essential to successful efforts to end human trafficking.
Colorado within a National Context

Colorado possesses a broad range of diversity including urban, rural, and frontier communities; diverse economic drivers spanning tourism, heavy and light manufacturing, construction, agriculture, ranching, and start-up technologies; and refugees/immigrants and minorities and populations with intersectional identities. Colorado has cross-national highways and a booming population that has seen more than 150,000 new residents to the Denver metro area in the past three years in addition to the many visitors who are drawn to our state’s natural beauty. The state is a national leader in cutting-edge drug policy, sentencing, and specialized courts. These policies make us a model for other states, an incubator for the human trafficking movement, and a place where resources and community action result in efforts that contribute to global efforts seeking to end human trafficking.

Our goal in this section is to give context and framing to the data reported from participants across the state. In Section Three we described innovative community solutions described by participants; here in Section Five, we discuss promising practices. We use “promising practices” terminology in order to both: 1) acknowledge that no one holds sole authority to define what works “best” in any given community or at any given time, and 2) invite new and innovative practices that may emerge from non-traditional sources. Promising practices, compared to the innovative community solutions, are research-informed and moving toward an evidence-based practice for the field. In contrast, innovative community solutions are programs that have not been evaluated, measured, or drawn from research. Through our intensive data-collection and analysis effort, we find three key foci: Promising practices in the 4Ps; shifting cultural and political environments; and making a difference through comprehensive, measurable responses. These findings celebrate our collective accomplishments in the anti-trafficking movement thus far and provide goal posts for collaborative efforts still to come.

PROMISING PRACTICES

In addition to the 4P framework, CP1.0 sought to develop “promising practices” language, which has been used in disciplines like psychology and social work to acknowledge the need for evidence-based practice. We explicitly recognized in CP1.0 and again in CP2.0, that “best practices” for one community may not apply to other communities. There is much variation in the ways communities around the United States have responded to the crime of human trafficking in this relatively young movement; therefore, the use of promising practices language...
signifies emerging and developing efforts when there is a lack of empirical data that traditionally serves as a
benchmark for what would be considered a “best practice.” Clearly, there is a need for evidence-based practice;
however, what currently exists is a wealth of knowledge and experience from practitioners involved in this work.
The following section offers promising practices organized by the 4Ps.

The following promising practices are accompanied by on the ground considerations. These application
recommendations are intended to support opportunities, in proverbial terms, for “the rubber to meet the road.”
Specifically, under each promising practice, LCHT suggests possible starting points for adopting the promising
practices. We recognize that many communities get questions about the effectiveness and efficiency of their local
efforts. In order to support your responses to those questions, we’ll outline some starting points for data collection.
Ultimately, our goal is to support community efforts that can be confirmed, through comprehensive and measurable
means, to enhance efforts to end trafficking.

Prevention Promising Practice: Acknowledging Root Causes

One of the many promising practices that Colorado communities are undertaking to end human trafficking is
acknowledging the root causes of trafficking. These are among the many issues that need to be incorporated into
any comprehensive strategy to end trafficking. One participant embodied this understanding, noting:

“It’s one thing to provide treatment and support services around someone who has been victimized,

as opposed to people not having to be put in a position where they may be more vulnerable than

others. And so economic security, housing, access to education … those pieces which identify

these risk factors.

When risk factors are not seen or understood, communities and individuals are at risk and the possibility of
individuals falling through a gap in service structures increase. A participant emphasized this concern:

“l

I definitely reiterate the boys component, I think that’s really lacking and additionally I think that

LGBTQ youth and especially trans youth are not focused on enough, especially given the data that

LGBTQ youth are five times more likely to be trafficked than not, so I think that that’s a really big

hole as well.

An awareness of the vulnerability of LGBTQIA youth as a risk factor is a step towards filling the potential gap in
services and support efforts. Some communities have established internal registries of “high risk” youth; this allows
agencies that interact with youth to pay attention to the potential of trafficking for specific youth with higher risk
factors, such as a history of running away. These lists are one example of efforts to coordinate across sectors and
customize support services for the actual youth who live in that community.

Combining an awareness of the unique nature of our different Colorado communities while placing root causes
at the core of the work to end trafficking holds out the promise of integrated efforts and knowledge-sharing across
and within parallel movements as we work to end human exploitation. As we listened to communities across
Colorado, it became clear that while there is an acknowledgment of the critical importance of root causes, very few communities have programs or goals that focus specifically in these areas. One emerging recommendation for prevention is for communities to localize their response to trafficking and focus on root causes in their communities.

**Application Recommendation:**

**ACKNOWLEDGING ROOT CAUSES**

- Identify two or three of the most prominent root causes of trafficking specific to your community (in our research, participants often identified tourism, immigration, mental and behavioral health, poverty, and violence as example root causes).
- Develop three- and five-year plans that would support programs and efforts that address those specific root causes.
  - Provide space for existing and developing partnerships to participate.
  - Conduct asset-based community scans that identify additional stakeholders who would be in parallel movements or systems that address root causes (for example, look to include economic development and workforce development programs that might improve economic opportunities which could reduce labor trafficking or wage theft).
- Build in data collection that responds to the following:
  - How do you presently measure or evaluate that root cause?
  - Are there indicators that might be more useful for communicating how the root cause leads to trafficking?

**Protection Promising Practice:**

**TRAUMA-INFORMED COUNSELING OR BEHAVIORAL HEALTH RESOURCES**

Colorado communities are responding to human trafficking by offering counseling and other behavioral health services that are trauma-informed. Trauma-informed approaches are becoming more available, including advancements in uses of screening checklists and institutional intake forms (Chester, Lummert, & Mullooly, 2012; Countryman-Roswurm & DiLollo, 2016; Domoney et al, 2015; Ernewein & Nieves, 2015; Heffernan & Blythe, 2014; Hopper, 2016; Johnson, 2012; Muraya & Fry, 2015). In Colorado, the challenge begins with connecting survivors with appropriate resources.

“I think that we also have in [this] county a large amount of mental health resources that have recently gone through and become more trauma-informed. A large majority of my job as a juvenile probation officer is to connect my clients with resources that will help them, and I believe that in this community we have a lot of really good mental health people that will assist with survivors.”

While addressing basic needs such as housing, transportation, food, and job training are part of a long-term process for recovery and sustainable resilience, trafficking survivors also need opportunities to recreate and “reconstruct their self-image, identity, and future” through trauma-informed therapy (U.S. Department of Justice, 2012, p. 8 cf Countryman-Roswurm & DiLollo, 2016). This approach acknowledges the trauma inherent to the
experience of trafficking, as well as the trauma some survivors experienced prior to being trafficked – creating complex trauma. In this therapeutic model, overcoming trauma is placed at the center of the work to support positive behavioral and mental health outcomes.

I just think a lot of the best practices or our promising practice in that area is applicable to this population in terms of therapeutic intervention. So we do trauma assessments that would be applicable to this population, and do trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy and all kinds of other stuff. And so I think that those trauma-informed practices go hand-in-hand with addressing the needs of this population who’s typically experienced a lot of complex trauma.

Trauma impacts all aspects of health and wellness including how the brain functions (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, SAMHSA, 2014). Recognizing the influence of trauma on the trafficking survivors, shifts the focus away from blame for personal behavior and choices and towards healing. Trauma-informed care uses a strengths-based approach that views all persons as having capacities, talents, competencies, possibilities, visions, values, and hopes (Heffernan & Blythe, 2014). A crucial component of trauma-informed care is to build trust with the survivor, as well as support a sense of autonomy and ownership in the process. (SAMHSA, 2014)

So I think our promising practice would be…I think really trying to help build trust, withhold judgement, again make sure people understand they are in the driver’s seat.

Building trust in relationships with survivors provides the support structure to empower individuals to move forward in healthy ways.

Application Recommendation:
**Trauma-Informed Counseling or Behavioral Health Resources**

- **Utilization of Trauma-informed protocols:**
  - Those protocols are in new employee training materials, all current employees practice those skills and techniques, and the organization/agency outlines how to conduct trauma-informed practices (ex. an individual can opt to have the door to offices open or closed during sessions or meetings).
  - Survivors’ wishes, safety, and well-being are prioritized in all organizational practices.

- The newly adopted trauma-informed practices are responsive and flexible to survivor feedback.

- Documentation of trauma-informed changes to prior practices are recorded and can be reported to external entities. This documentation of trauma-informed changes records the outcomes experienced by clients, participants, or survivors as a result of those changes (e.g., survivor reports increased perception of safety). The same indicators are utilized throughout agency documentation practices to ensure systematic data collection.
Protection Promising Practice: Engaging the Medical Community

Educating health care providers to recognize signs of human trafficking is a key promising practice, since many victims of trafficking will present at the emergency room, clinics, and other health care centers (Greenbaum & Crawford-Jakubiak, 2015; Konstantopoulous et al, 2014). Participants see the medical community as crucial to local efforts to combat trafficking and support training so that health care professionals have the tools to recognize human trafficking and make appropriate referrals. One community told us:

We have medical clinics throughout Colorado and what we’re trying to do is educate the providers on how to detect victims. So this is something new for them. They have not had any training on it and because the clinics we served most of the time were understaffed and uninsured, so most likely they do have victims of trafficking and so teaching the providers they can write questions so they can start talking to [the victims] and they can refer them to different resources available.

A critical element of training in this sector is to acknowledge the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA, 1996) and the emphasis on protecting privacy within the medical profession as well as the constraints on sharing information. As one participant from this sector made clear:

I can say that health center staff is extremely interested and enthusiastic about learning more and recognizing signs, and see what they can do to help our patients within the capacity that we can is just challenging at first because we’re healthcare providers and patient privacy is a big deal for us.

The aim for training is to build upon the enthusiasm from the medical community and provide instruction that incorporates knowledge of HIPAA and patient privacy protections so that health care providers can make effective interventions with confidence and within the parameters of their profession.

Application Recommendation: Engaging the Medical Community

- Trainings conducted for health agencies include recommendations for the adoption of trauma-informed and survivor centered protocols.
- Protocols, procedures, and organizational processes in the health care facility reflect human trafficking-sensitive practices (handling human trafficking cases is carefully outlined in organizational materials).

Protocols should include:
- Basic trafficking indicators
- Red flags based on local trends
- Separation procedures
- Interview procedures
• Safety planning
• Mandatory reporting
• Referral processes
• Follow-up procedures

- Health care providers and staff at medical facilities should all be included in trainings (e.g., security and intake receptionists should receive the training as they may be best positioned to witness red flags or behavioral cues that indicate trafficking).

- Pillars of success in engaging the medical community would be:
  - At least 80% percent of staff in a facility would have successfully completed human trafficking training.
  - Additionally, 75% of physicians and nurses who are eligible for Colorado continuing education credits (CEUs) in human trafficking have them.
  - At least 75% of health care facilities institutionalize the recommended protocols listed above.

Protection Promising Practice:

Having Survivors Inform the Community Response to Trafficking

Professionals in the field expressed the importance of having the community response be survivor-centered and guided by input from survivors. As one participant said, “I think having survivor-informed response is critical.” The work to incorporate survivor perspectives is not yet widespread, but more organizations are placing value on incorporating survivor voices in a more meaningful way.

Lack of survivor engagement is a widespread limitation in the work to end trafficking, as well as in the research on human trafficking. To date, few survivor-led or co-authored studies have been published beyond scholarship that highlights the challenge of access to survivors as study participants (Godziak & Bump, 2008). This shortcoming affects the quality and relevance of all types of social services, including housing and access to economic empowerment opportunities. Without knowing the true needs and priorities of survivors, we cannot hope to provide community responses and services that are appropriate and accessible. Services for human trafficking survivors will likely fail if they do not match the identified needs of survivors, but rather reflect what service providers assume survivors want or need. It is reasonable to presume, then, that survivor voices need to guide the design of these initiatives (American Psychological Association Task Force on the Trafficking of Women and Girls, 2014; Caliber, 2007; Clawson & Dutch, 2007; Iman et al; Pierce, 2009; Raphael & Ashley, 2008; Raymond & Hughes, 2001). There is also a growing support for survivors to be leaders in this movement:

We’ve seen different onboarding of peer-to-peer leadership and mentorship. This community was onboarded with My Life, My Choice, a few years ago, and we’ve seen some different leadership models that have started to emerge…we’re seeing more onboarding of survivor-involved organizations and leadership…

The idea of developing survivor-led mentoring programs and other opportunities for leadership is a nascent, but expanding, philosophical value in the anti-human trafficking movement. This value will take intentional effort in localized communities and across the movement to actualize, but it is a crucial component of work to end
human trafficking in a way that listens to the voices of survivors and does not re-exploit at-risk individuals and communities.

**Application Recommendation:**

**Having Survivors Inform the Community Response to Trafficking**

- Survivors can opt to decline some services and still be allowed to remain in programs seeking to support them.
- Survivors have multiple service options available to them and are allowed to choose the services that suit their needs. (e.g., each survivor can opt into or out of counseling, can opt into or out of workforce trainings, as opposed to prescribed or required services).
  - This may be particularly challenging in communities with limited resources but is worthy of time and attention.
- Agencies that provide protection services collect data on the services they provide and track the services utilized by survivors (respecting appropriate confidentiality and data sharing practices).

**Prosecution Promising Practice:**

**Problem solving and diversion courts for survivors of sex trafficking**

With the TVPA and newer state statutes on human trafficking, a prosecutorial shift in mindset has been steadily growing over the past two decades. A “victim-centered approach,” for example, implored the field to ask deeper questions about someone’s circumstances to determine if elements of human trafficking were present, if the person was actually the victim of a crime instead of the initially-perceived perpetrator. Around the country, states are exploring ways to better support victims of violence who are forced to commit crimes as a result of their victimization (including trafficking), instead of arresting them for the crimes they were forced to commit. However, in 2018, some individuals are not initially being recognized as victims and are in fact being arrested for these crimes, including here in Colorado (KKTV 11 News, 2017). According to the National Center for State Courts and the Center for Court Innovation (Malangone & Mazur, 2018), in the last ten years several states have begun to recognize that many individuals arrested for prostitution may in fact be victims of human trafficking or related crimes (January 31, 2019). A number of alternative courts and diversion programs have sprung up around the country in New York, Michigan, Hawaii, Mississippi, Tennessee, Ohio, California, Texas, and Colorado to name a few (Human Trafficking Resource Guide, January 31, 2019). While some courts are focused on youth and some on adults, all are focused on prostitution and the potential for trafficking victimization related to sex work. In a study by the Urban Institute that looked at prostitution arrests in a single jurisdiction in New York City, it was found that 35% had experienced trafficking in their lives, 20% were currently experiencing trafficking, and 70% said they had experienced prior physical (57%) or sexual (47%) assault, while 53% reported being victimized multiple times. (p.11, 2017). These types of statistics have been used to justify the creation of problem-solving courts or diversion courts for those arrested for prostitution in many states (Leon & Shdaimah, 2012; Berman & Feinblatt, 2015).

In Colorado, participants in CP2.0 identified the use of courts in two Colorado cities as potential promising practices: the Human Trafficking Diversion Program in the 4th Judicial District and Denver Restore, Educate, Support, Treat (REST) Court in Denver Juvenile Court. The latter is focused exclusively on confirmed cases of minor trafficking in Denver but participants can be referred by child welfare, meaning they don’t necessarily have
to be involved in the juvenile justice system in order to be referred to this treatment court. The program in the 4th Judicial District is intended to “reduce recidivism for adult women and men who are victims of human trafficking and individuals involved in the sex trade” Judicial District Court (http://www.4thjudicialda.com/HumanTrafficking.html) and therefore does require that victims are arrested and prosecuted but does not require that they be confirmed cases of human trafficking necessarily. Both provide programming to support the individual with health and education resources and with successful completion resulting in no record of prostitution-related charges. One participant explained the diversion court like this:

So about 2 years ago they started looking, taking a look at folks that were picked up for solicitation and the special victims’ unit at the DA’s office recognized hey not all of these women probably woke up and said hey this is want I want to do, right? Some maybe, but the majority of it… so they created this diversion program that I facilitate on behalf of the task force and so if a client chooses to participate they come through a four-session program and we do a needs assessment and we figure out like how did you get to where you’re at and what do you need? Is it education? Is it because of homelessness? Is it because of addictions, abusive situations? Like why are you in this spot and how can we help connect you with resources because this community cares about you and that lifestyle is dangerous, basically, it can be dangerous.

While there are several studies (Swanner, Labriola, Rempel, Walker, & Spadafore, 2016; Martin, 2014; Office for Victims of Crime Training and Technical Assistance Center, e-Guide, n.d.) that support the success of these courts in diverting punishment for crimes that victims were forced or coerced to commit, there is still the question of why they are being arrested in the first place (LCHT, 2012; Urban Institute papers, 2018), and, in many cases compelled to retell their story of abuse in public, over and over again, resulting in revictimization, and sometimes lack of participation and a loss of protections against being charged. Promising practices for specialized courts should include trauma-informed and survivor-centered approaches. For example, according to the Office for Victims of Crime Training and Technical Assistance Center (OVCTTAC), a single presiding judge to handle all the cases, working with regularly assigned prosecutors and defense attorneys, would create a consistent response and would increase trust in the process (n.d.). Survivors should be linked to a diverse, customizable, and culturally-appropriate array of service provision depending on their individual needs (recognizing that needs will vary), including but not limited to legal (civil and criminal), medical, dental, mental health, housing, and drug treatment. Programming should be flexible, to allow room for relapse and triggers. A graduated approach (that allows for small goals to be reached over time) is recommended by the OVC and the Center for Court Innovation (Malangone & Mazur, 2018).

To date, these specialized courts are only addressing sex trafficking and related crimes, it would also be important to consider how crimes that individuals are forced to commit as a result of labor trafficking (e.g., drug muling, drug selling, forced panhandling) may also be identified in the court system.

Application Recommendation:
**Problem solving and diversion courts for victims of sex trafficking**

- Survivors should be encouraged to tell their story to only one provider. All attempts to decrease re-traumatization are exercised.
• Survivors should be referred to various trauma-informed, culturally sensitive, and a diverse array of service provision.

• Programs will need to respond appropriately to individual survivor needs. Goals and outcomes for the program are set in conversation with the client and case manager. Timelines are flexible and personalized programs are available.

• Specialized courts for labor trafficking should be developed. Labor trafficking crimes and cases will likely appear very differently than other types of trafficking and require specialized services.

• Courts should track outcomes of clients in specialized courts through various evaluation tools – those may include reduced recidivism and self-perceptions or well-being, employment opportunities, caring relationships or support networks.

**Partnership Promising Practice:**

*Intentional and equitable inclusion in partnerships*

Partnership, arguably, is the **P** where Colorado communities most significantly excelled since CP1.0. The partnerships are different in each place, but representative of resources, support, and energy. In resource scarce communities like Yuma, Durango, and La Junta, efforts centered in youth-serving organizations tend to lead the charge. In communities where there are fewer resource constraints like Jefferson County, Denver, and Colorado Springs, law enforcement, prosecution, grassroots organizations, victims’ services, citizens, faith-driven communities, and others are leading partnership efforts or participating with enthusiasm and dedication.

Supporting survivors in the movement makes our response to human trafficking stronger within the 4P framework. Meaningful voices from those with lived experience help guide the movement. Thus, ensuring there are roles available for survivors will help sustain an effective movement in the future. Though including survivors has challenges, inclusion of a broad spectrum of survivor voices would not only greatly inform the movement, but would also support survivors on a path of lifelong survivorship and ensure that the diversity of survivorship is included in services.

In talking with professionals across the state, we heard stories of great successes by partnerships across sectors and jurisdictions. Communities have rallied around this cause and created pockets of support for survivors that are no less than inspiring. However, we can do better. The data suggests that victim supports were overwhelmingly for victims of domestic minor sex trafficking only and were often only functioning in small geographic areas. If partnerships can learn from each other’s successes and challenges, especially the attainable goals that human trafficking partnerships around the state have set out to accomplish, the movement will be strengthened and support for survivors of human trafficking will grow. The centrality of learning from each other and sharing ideas and information was summarized by this participant:

“I’d say the partnerships are probably one of the biggest assets that we have because it seems like within this field, different groups can take a little bit different road to get to the end result. … You kind of look at what they’re doing and saying, oh, yes, we could apply that here. Sometimes, it’s a give and take. And as partnerships where they’re learning some things from you and you’re learning some things from them…the partnerships are really the biggest asset, I would say.”
Repeatedly, we heard that partnerships were the largest asset for organizations to network and combine resources. Partnerships were most useful for learning about existing resources and identifying survivors, which ultimately resulted in more investigations and prosecutions. We heard that several existing MDTs were introducing human trafficking into their purview. As this practice was highlighted in several individual interviews as beneficial for victim service providers, law enforcement, and child welfare, we would offer this as an additional promising practice for partnerships across the state.

**Application Recommendation:**

**Intentional and equitable inclusion in partnerships**

- Consider some of the following ways to increase intentionality of partnerships:
  - Conduct a stakeholder scan of the community.
  - Identify all possible agencies, programs, partnerships, and organizations who could achieve goals related to decreasing human trafficking.
  - Create a plan to invite, train, and support new members to the partnership; add new partners slowly to ensure trust, cohesiveness, and commitment.
  - Re-evaluate the partnership’s stated goals as new partners join the effort
  - Give all partners clear responsibilities – get all the stakeholders at the table involved in achieving goals and tracking impact.
- Consider some of the following ways to increase equity in partnerships:
  - Allow survivors to lead partnership efforts (e.g., support survivors to lead the efforts in goal planning within the partnership).
  - Create opportunities to support events, activities, and programs of partners in parallel movements.
- Track goals and efforts conducted by the partnership.

**Shifting Political and Cultural Environments**

Communities across Colorado note that a changing social and political environment may also impact reporting, resources, and partnerships. The national climate for refugees, immigrants, second generation migrants, and historically underrepresented groups presents challenges. Respondents note specifically that ethnic and racial minorities are experiencing increased fear in reporting to law enforcement authorities or seeking services. For example, one respondent notes,

> Overall there’s a higher level of intimidation for various populations since January of ‘17 [Inauguration of President Trump], so I think that contributes to existence of human trafficking for people who are fearful of speaking up about exploitation, it’s not entirely community specific but it’s a factor.

Changing expectations and regulations related to the T-Visa process (trafficking visa) likely impacts agencies seeking to support international asylees. Additionally, T-Visa applications appear to be decreasing, the wait time for processing is increasing, and a new enforcement policy is in place to deport applicants when the T-Visa is denied.
(USCIS Memo, September 27, 2018) decreasing the likelihood that survivors will apply. The political and cultural environment is likely to remain a challenge in coming years. This suggests that communities will need to find and invest in ways of connecting to underrepresented populations.

Communities experience these political changes as cultural changes as well. One key example of this political and cultural change in Colorado is the legalization of marijuana and the perceived effects of those changes on communities. Overall, respondents expressed concerns around the transient nature of people visiting Colorado for the pot industry, workers’ rights within legal grows, and a larger connection to international drug cartels. While drug use broadly was referenced as a contributing factor to human trafficking both in CP1.0 and CP2.0, in the current research, respondents in many communities raised as an emerging concern the impact of the legalization of recreational marijuana in 2014. Some participants linked marijuana legalization to furthering illegal activities, as noted here:

“Honduran boys are brought here being forced to sell heroin down on the [location A], all because marijuana is legal here. So what was happening was, from the way I understand it now...the Mexican cartel is bringing heroin in and taking the marijuana out. And they are forcing these young boys to sell heroin down here and if they don’t their families are being raped and killed or whatever back in Honduras.”

Since Colorado was the first state to legalize recreational marijuana, communities have had adequate time and experience to observe cultural changes. Currently, there are no standardized methods or tools for law enforcement or community-based providers to measure a direct connection between the new marijuana laws and human trafficking cases. An emerging recommendation for communities throughout Colorado is to treat the marijuana industry like any other industry that is expanding and invest in prevention methods (i.e., know-your-rights materials), both in English and Spanish. Shifting political and cultural climates will continue to influence efforts across the state. As we continue to advance the Colorado Project methodology and the Colorado Action Plan, we will strive to ensure that all iterations of this work are attentive and responsive to change.

Making a Difference: A Measurable Comprehensive Response

We continue to reflect on the basic research question, “What would it take to end human trafficking in Colorado?”

Figure 5.1
While the problems still remain, our current research in Colorado indicates that we have organized in ways to make Colorado communities aware and prepared for instances of human trafficking. Since the research problem was first articulated in 2010, eight years later, we see:

- Scattered efforts continue to exist, but other efforts are more coordinated/aligned within anti-trafficking coalitions/task forces. Coalitions/task forces more intentionally seek to fill in response gaps from a 4P comprehensive perspective.
- Colorado communities continue to cobble together resources, doing so by building on the strengths of their local capabilities and neighborhoods. Several communities fill resource gaps with help from nearby coalitions or with services from parallel issues.
- Survivors who are provided support and resources within formal and informal social systems are being helped. This support comes from criminal justice and child welfare systems, as well as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Survivors have also begun to lead initiatives statewide.
- Traffickers are prosecuted at greater numbers with significant sentences, thanks in part to significant changes with the Colorado 2014 legislation and training district attorneys and judges.

As we’ve considered promising practices and changing political and cultural environments, we find that overall, the single most important need in the movement to end human trafficking across Colorado comes in the form of evaluation and measurement. In particular, a review of CP2.0 data revealed tremendous variation in the ways that participants understood the concept of promising practices. Respondents most often equated promising practices language with programmatic successes within their communities. While the goal in the current research has been to record what practices are working well for a given community, focus group and interview participants provided responses that ranged from local community practices, to program descriptions, to practices that they heard about in other communities and states. LCHT’s definition of promising practices intends to acknowledge the field’s need for evidence-based practice beyond the wealth of anecdotal experience. We seek to recognize that “best practices” for one community may not apply to other communities, but aim to understand how effectiveness and success is measured across projects and programs. Eventually, promising practices will undergo their own process of evaluation and testing, with a sensitivity to community factors, including the capacity to address root causes that create conditions for human trafficking to happen. While affirming the concept of promising practices, we have continued to honor the efforts and ways in which anti-trafficking efforts overlap and partnering occurs with other Colorado issue areas.

An important outcome of the Colorado Project is that it provides frameworks, theories, and research design that enable us to assess stability or change and growth in anti-trafficking efforts. Since its inception, the project has focused primarily on the “how” (actions) as opposed to the “who” (agencies and organizations) driving these initiatives.
As we reflect once again upon the bold question of what it would take to end human trafficking in Colorado, CP2.0 data confirm that we are steadily moving toward a solution. Survey, focus group, and interview data detail how each of the 4Ps are actualized in Colorado. We see evidence of evolving definitions, shared language, and communities working to organize responses in a comprehensive manner. Gathering a second time point of data in 2018 helps to measure persistent gaps and robust successes. With these data, we are able to see what 4P efforts endure, particularly after political and funding fluctuations. With the CAP2.0, we can work collectively to implement needed next steps.

LCHT continues to advocate for a data-driven response to comprehensively end human trafficking. Respondents in focus groups, when asked about data collection practices and sharing, reflected that while individual organizations may collect demographic or description data (ex. a count of survivors served, number of services offered to survivors), the majority of communities have no systematic way to measure how they contribute to ending human trafficking. One participant notes in response to our query.

Any survivor we work with or we have in our circle, we keep it very confidential and we don’t record it any place. We just, are a place where the word kind of spreads a little, I guess I would say it that way and that’s how we get referrals. So, we don’t keep any records, except in my memory.
A national effort to compile and share data included the Bureau of Justice-funded national databases designed to track human trafficking cases at Northeastern University, and there has been a longstanding call for continued training and improvements to investigation and prosecution (Farrell, McDevitt, & Fahy, 2008). Colorado communities have the capacity to lead in data collection that might provide an evidence base to determine practices many communities could utilize to end trafficking.

While the Colorado Project has measured actions taken, as well as strengths and gaps, the question still remains as to whether a comprehensive task force response effectively ends human trafficking. Evaluation is a critical endeavor that remains. We have identified the components of a comprehensive response, proposed a shared language, and championed the necessity of a strengths-based survivor-centered approach that must be tailored to specific communities. With the evolution of 17 task forces and coalitions around Colorado, there are ways in which the composition and community that surrounds these initiatives can be further analyzed beyond the bounds of this report. We suggest that communities and partnerships alike ask the following questions as they take steps to set goals and measure the outcomes of their efforts:

- Are there particular ways in which coalitions are composed and curated that are more successful than others?
- What is the impact of prioritizing certain forms of human trafficking in some communities?
- How might urban, rural, and frontier anti-trafficking efforts inform one another and tell us how to assemble successful coalitions?
- How does understanding Colorado’s efforts influence the ways in which human trafficking happens in the Southwest region of the United States? Nationally? Globally? How might social ecology theory help us to answer this question?
- What is the impact of the Colorado Action Plan and does it support federal and global efforts to end human trafficking?
- How can survivors be more equitably and sustainably included in anti-trafficking efforts?

Certainly, questions remain while the future of anti-trafficking initiatives continue to unfold. Deeper analyses of these CP2.0 data are forthcoming from LCHT, with plans for stewarding several of the actions recommended in CAP2.0. We look forward to working alongside community leaders around the state with the aid of CP2.0 Community Profiles. The survivor-informed CAP2.0 provides a roadmap for working to fill the gaps and utilize comprehensive strategies as we work together toward a solution to end human trafficking in Colorado.
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What does it take to end human trafficking in Colorado? In a word, it takes action. Action at the community level and action at the state level - both are essential to more efficiently and effectively combat human trafficking. Over the past two decades, Colorado communities have organized responses to the problem of human trafficking, formally defined in 2000. The Colorado Project to Comprehensively Combat Human Trafficking seeks to create a roadmap every five years to guide our state’s priorities in ending trafficking. The first statewide action plan was developed in 2013; the following recommendations build upon these efforts and the data we collected from surveys and interviews across the state in 2018.

Key points for consideration:

The Colorado Action Plan 2.0 recommendations were developed by a diverse group of survivors, practitioners, law enforcement professionals, and advocates from across Colorado after reviewing Colorado Project 2.0 data. Throughout the development process, special attention and consideration were given to create trauma-informed and survivor-centered recommendations that honor the:

- Unique purpose, mission, vision, and goals of diverse Colorado partnerships and the collaborative work across disciplines in all of the 4Ps (Prevention, Protection, Prosecution, and Partnership).
- Lived experiences of survivors and other groups and communities at risk for violence and/or exploitation.
- Rich diversity of survivor experiences and their views on justice (e.g., for many, outside the criminal justice system).
- Vast differences among Colorado communities, inclusive of urban, rural, and frontier designations and their populations.

For further detail and analyses on methods, data, and analyses, please refer to the Colorado Project 2.0 Report.

### Prevention Recommendations

1. **Deliver sector-specific trainings to a diverse range of Colorado communities including:**
   
   a. Professional training for frontline professionals (e.g. school staff and educators, law enforcement, healthcare workers).
   
   b. Public awareness and education initiatives for community members and private sector.
   
   c. Training for people most impacted by the crime (e.g. youth, victims of crime, people experiencing homelessness or substance abuse, sex workers).
   
   d. Trainings should be informed and/or led by individuals with lived experiences.

2. **Design comprehensive trainings. All curricula should include:**
   
   a. Both labor and sex trafficking
   
   b. Knowledge of state (CoNEHT) and national hotline and resource directory
c. Community-specific resource information wherever training is provided

d. Awareness of community-specific root causes

e. Sensitivity to language use and survivor self-determination

f. Trauma-informed definitions and response

g. Evaluation of training reach and impact

h. Resources available for individuals who disclose after a training

i. Guidelines/recommendations for protocol development

j. Case studies that are sector-specific for the audience

k. Direct actions for individuals to engage thoughtfully and respectfully

PROTECTION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Address potential gaps in services for survivors of human trafficking (e.g. male, female, LGBTQIA, and disabled among others) with awareness that labor and sex trafficking exist in Colorado. Expand existing programs and create new ones in underserved communities.

a. Increase availability of safe housing for survivors of human trafficking (e.g., emergency safe shelter, short- and long-term transitional housing, gender inclusive).

b. Increase availability of substance abuse and mental health (including inpatient) support for survivors transitioning out of human trafficking situations.

c. Increase availability of transition services (including housing) for children and youth aging out of the foster care system, including support for prevention and recovery.

d. Increase designated points of contact/points of entry so there is “no wrong door” for survivors who seek services (e.g., schools, health centers, human services, recreation centers).

e. Offer a mechanism for communities to share promising practices in protection services with other communities across Colorado.

2. When filling service gaps, be sensitive to root causes of human trafficking that can contribute to risk for exploitation, including environments in which survivors are at-risk of being re-trafficked.

a. Increase availability of affordable housing.

b. Increase access to services by providing transportation to and from services.

c. Decrease barriers to access and service continuation by advocating for services that recognize lived experiences (including prior convictions, substance use, and gender identity).

d. Increase availability of mental health resources.

e. Increase partnerships (i.e., with existing coalitions, commissions) for culturally and linguistically appropriate services for marginalized populations (e.g. LGBTQIA community, disability community, individuals with limited English, sex workers).
PROSECUTION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Increase targeted professional development for successful prosecution of human trafficking cases.**
   a. Train agency heads (chiefs/sheriffs/troopers) and community officers to improve case identification and provide advanced training to detectives handling related cases.
   b. Provide training to prosecutors/judges that aids them in case identification and proving coercion and other essential elements at trial.

2. **Recognize ongoing efforts in prosecuting sex trafficking cases, prioritize the investigation and prosecution of labor trafficking cases.**
   a. Advance a better understanding of labor trafficking to assist with more effective case/victim identification (e.g., forced/coerced drug distribution, farm labor, domestic servitude, and other forced labor crimes).
   b. Support investigators in developing financial/economic evidence collection related to human trafficking cases and promote the use of financial criminal statutes to pursue traffickers.
   c. Increase rural agency capacity through pooling of resources garnered from more robust cooperation (e.g., within regional task forces).
   d. Establish a designation of “human trafficking (HT),” as a sentence enhancer or identifier, for crimes identified as involving human trafficking but not charged with specific human trafficking offenses.

3. **Increase information-sharing amongst key stakeholders.**
   a. Convene a robust task force of key stakeholders to create a centralized information-sharing mechanism amongst various systems and databases. Facilitate dialogue to determine who should be included in discussions; how to create permissions and access points; and when information can be shared under which conditions.
   b. Any information-sharing protocol must require consent from survivors and be in an environment where security and confidentiality are prioritized.

PARTNERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Encourage intentional and equitable inclusion of underrepresented and/or unrecognized stakeholders in partnerships.**
   a. Assure genuine and ongoing commitments to survivor voice and leadership.
      i. Support genuine engagement, which achieves hearing all voices in the partnership.
      ii. Consider all voices in the partnership as equal (i.e., avoid tokenizing).
      iii. Compensate survivors for their time and commitment.
   b. Address gaps in partner membership with the aim of meaningful representation across sectors, position, role diversity from organizations (i.e., some directors, some direct service providers who see clients), and varied experience in the movement.
i. Include historically missing voices in partnerships (e.g., business sectors, LGBTQIA, non-English speakers, disabled populations, sex workers, tribal populations, refugees/asylees).

c. Establish formalized support and orientation for new members to join partnerships.

2. Create a collaborative document that provides promising practices to Colorado partnerships. Concerns related to sharing practices, protecting anonymity of contributors, sustainability of the document and its dissemination will be openly addressed by the lead organization managing the document. This document should:

a. Define the problem, ensuring that each partnership shares a definition of human trafficking, the statewide statute of the crime, and can articulate how trafficking happens locally.
   i. Partnerships have training to ensure shared language and understanding of the crime of human trafficking.

b. Highlight promising practices.
   i. Partnership members can describe local efforts to end trafficking.
   ii. Partnership members can describe national and global promising practices that might apply to or be lifted up by the local community.
   iii. Partnerships share tools statewide for trust building, conflict resolution, and referral network information.

c. Ensure establishment of shared goals, vision, and mission within partnerships.
   i. Partnerships develop measurable goals. (The outcome of effective goal setting is ensuring members feel valued and their time commitment is worthwhile.)

d. Incorporate evaluation and measurement.
   i. Partnerships establish norms for collecting data on their efforts.
   ii. Partnerships are able to determine the effectiveness and impact of their efforts.

e. Include strategies for sustaining leadership.
   i. Partnerships develop mechanisms to encourage shared leadership and a succession plan for leadership turnover.

f. Streamline statewide human trafficking trainings.
   i. Reduce duplicative efforts in human trafficking trainings by developing a platform to share training responsibilities and communicate statewide about ongoing training curricula, survivor support, and evolution of promising practices.

3. Cultivate relationships between Colorado partnerships to increase each community's capacity to end human trafficking.

a. Assist communities in obtaining and sustaining funding for anti-trafficking efforts.

b. Provide ongoing technical assistance by creating statewide social media and hotline awareness as well as statewide branded materials.

c. Engage current partnerships using promising practices to offer guidance and technical assistance to emerging partnerships.
APPENDIX B

METHODODOLOGY

Surveys
The CP1.0 Research Team developed survey instruments by conducting an extensive review of academic, governmental, and nongovernmental (NGO) agency literature to identify initiatives and activities reflective of the 4Ps. While the primary focus of the literature review was on survey tools and initiatives in the United States, international scholarly sources on human rights and policy were also considered. The National Advisory Board, comprised of a collaborative of leading U.S. researchers and practitioners, fully discussed and vetted the key promising practices that were assessed in the survey which was then refined by LCHT. Survey questions asked about: services provided for human trafficking, the ways in which anti-human trafficking efforts are approached by the criminal justice system, the various prevention efforts, and the partnerships that exist in the anti-human trafficking movement. (For further detail on the instrument and collaborative process, please note the LCHT Colorado Project National Data Report, 2013).

Survey Sample
CP2.0 team members employed both purposive and convenience sampling strategies to identify as many agencies and organizations across Colorado involved in anti-human trafficking efforts as possible. These strategies included:

1. Use of membership lists from Colorado Network to End Human Trafficking,
2. Consultation with the Project team members and members of the Colorado Governor’s Council on Human Trafficking,
3. Identification of organizations via member lists of Colorado coalitions organized around parallel issues (including homelessness, immigration, labor exploitation, interpersonal violence).

A list of 519 agencies and organizations involved in anti-human trafficking or similar initiatives was compiled. Among the 519 identified organizations, 336 organizations involved in prevention, protection and partnerships received the survey and 158 organizations responded. An additional invitation to the survey through social media networks gathered an additional 25 responses for a total of 183 responses and a response rate of 54%. Participants were invited to the project and received the survey link by email. Survey participants completed a survey with questions about the services available for people who have experienced human trafficking in their area of Colorado and answered sections relevant to their sector (e.g., service providers completed protection survey).

Focus Groups
Improvements in LCHT focus group methodology from CP1.0 enabled the researchers to delve deeper into the ways in which coalitions work together comprehensively. LCHT refined qualitative questions to delve further into three questions about Colorado’s human trafficking response in 2018:
1. How are communities defining human trafficking?
2. What is being done?
3. How are collaborative efforts developed and managed throughout Colorado?

To determine the location for focus groups, the state was divided into seven regions, facilitated by a process of layering the locations of service provider organizations to identify potential service provision “hubs” within each region. The layers included, among others: mental health services; legal services and immigration lawyers; immigrant rights organizations; organizations working with populations experiencing homelessness; domestic violence and sexual assault organizations; federal, state, and local law enforcement agency offices; chambers of commerce; population centers; and county seats. As these layers were added to the map, locations within the seven regions began to emerge as potential sites for holding focus groups based on a clustering of the entities layered on the map.

Twenty-nine focus groups were then conducted in 20 locations including 16 human trafficking task forces and four additional rural areas in Colorado where there are currently no human trafficking task forces. The focus groups offer insights regarding manifestations of human trafficking across the state and local resources that address an end to human trafficking. Focus group participants were comprised of task force/coalition members including but not limited to service providers, law enforcement agents, and community leaders. CP2.0 focus groups were facilitated with existing partnerships in Denver, Colorado Springs, Pueblo, Fort Collins, Grand Junction, Steamboat Springs, Fort Morgan, Buena Vista, Glenwood Springs, and Greeley. Focus groups were audio recorded, transcribed, and coded into categories where several themes emerged that helped us gain an understanding of community-specific nuances of the crime as well as the practices and resources available.

Interviews of organizational leaders were gathered by convenience sampling of agencies from each community that represent the 4Ps identified by task force leaders. To find organizational participants in communities where there were no task forces or partnerships, the research team contacted the CP1.0 participants and, through snowball sampling, identified additional participants to participate in CP2.0. Two degrees of snowball sample design were utilized so new participants could also recommend other participants.
2015 Legislative Session
HB15-1019 (pdf) - Prostitution by a minor and minor victims of human trafficking
SB15-30 (pdf) - Removing culpability for prostitution for a victim of human trafficking

2016 Legislative Session
HB16-1320 (pdf) - The regulation of massage therapy to modify practices that are linked to criminal behavior
SB16-110 (pdf) - Protecting the privacy of child victims when releasing criminal justice records
HB16-1224 (pdf) - Concerning child abuse involving Human Trafficking of minors

2017 Legislative Session
HB17-1040 (pdf) - Concerning authorizing the interception of communication relating to a crime of human trafficking
HB17-1072 (pdf) - Concerning human trafficking for sexual servitude
HB17-1172 (pdf) - Concerning criminal penalties for persons who commit human trafficking of a minor for sexual servitude

2018 Legislative Session
SB 18-055 (pdf) - Increase Surcharge for Trafficking Children
HB 18-1018 (pdf) - Human Trafficking Commercial Driver’s License