



PUBLIC SAFETY CITIZEN TASK FORCE PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday, November 6, 2013

5:00 p.m.

Santa Cruz Police Department Community Room
155 Center Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

MINUTES

I. Chair Reyes Call to Order

1. Meeting called to order at 5:05 p.m. by Chair Reyes.
2. Fourth meeting of the deliberative/legislative process.
3. Task Force members absent: none

II. Approval of October 30, 2013 Minutes

1. October 30, 2013 Minutes approved.

III. Quick General Discussion

1. If a member of the TF wants to make recommendations, tonight is the night to bring those forward.
2. Tonight's pace should be fast.
3. The language should not be perfected tonight. Do not make that a major concern.
4. The blue shaded columns in the spreadsheet are items that have already been approved.

IV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 54

1. A motion to approve the recommendation without an amendment is made and seconded.
2. A motion to amend the recommendation is made and seconded. The amendment includes the additional language to the second paragraph, "City consider a priority to either reactivate or revisit the Police Department's Alcohol Education Monitoring and Compliance Program Officer to collaborate with ABC, all other government, non government and community groups to address the alcohol issue in Santa Cruz."
3. What is the PD's Alcohol Education Monitoring and Compliance Program Officer's role?
4. This officer works with the community to help combat issues with alcohol. This officer is funded through a tax via all alcohol licenses. It is possibly still in effect, though it needs to be revitalized.
5. Would it be more appropriate to have two separate items? One for alcohol and one for medical marijuana dispensaries?
6. That does not seem completely necessary.
7. What exactly is Santa Cruz's alcohol issue?

8. There are an overwhelming number of alcohol outlets in the City. A City the size of Santa Cruz, on average, has about 100 alcohol outlets. However, Santa Cruz has about 250 alcohol outlets. The vast number of alcohol outlets exacerbates many issues.
9. That should be clarified otherwise it is too vague.
10. This clarification could be included in the narrative.
11. That would work fine.
12. The first part of the recommendation seems to address zoning and code enforcement and the second part seems to address enforcement. Will using two different categories disrupt the categorical buckets?
13. This will not be an issue.
14. Addressing, reforming and reducing high alcohol outlets seem to be a priority and deserve a spotlight. Perhaps, adding marijuana dispensaries would make this recommendation convoluted. Consider splitting the one recommendation into two recommendations. Let staff flag it and work on it later.
15. The motion carries unanimously.

V. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 56

1. A motion to approve recommendation 56 is made and seconded.
2. The TF already passed recommendation 41. Recommendation 56 contains similar ideas in regards to code enforcement. Would it be the same web application? Or would this application need to be separate?
3. The City can make the best decisions regarding those specifics.
4. The intent of this recommendation is focusing on the reporting process within the community. At the moment, there is no online crime reporting system. The City has minimal staff to handle this and it often leads to backlogs.
5. The system is not web based, it is paper based. It slows the whole system down.
6. The motion carries with two no votes.

VI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 57

1. A motion to approve recommendation 57 without amendment is made and seconded.
2. Would it be appropriate to add the language “penalties for 647f violations,” to this recommendation? A 647f violation is drunk in public. In Santa Cruz, violators go to jail for five hours and then they are released. At the moment, it appears as if there are no consequences for being drunk in public. This might be a standard reaction to a drunk in public violation; however, the City can change that standard.
3. The maximum penalty for drunk in public is 90 days in jail. Our courts do not want to address drunk in public violations that way. The City Council can make municipal code infractions misdemeanors if they desire and if it does not conflict with existing law. The City Council should consider prosecuting owners and occupants who have so many violations. Use the language, “Penalties for high crime addresses with three violations in six months would be charged with a municipal code misdemeanor.” The number of violations is not permanent, that is something that needs to be discussed.
4. Can this be applied to individuals as previously discussed?
5. An individual can serve up to a year in jail and a \$1,000 fine for committing a misdemeanor municipal code infraction.
6. It appears that there has been an increase in 647f arrests in younger individuals. There seems to be a lot of younger individuals who commit a 647f once or twice.

However, these individuals cost the City. Perhaps this recommendation can address those costs to the City.

7. What is the issue that is being targeted here?
8. The problem is significant enough that the Police Department has overtime details to address party houses.
9. The TF should see more information on this.
10. The intent of the original recommendation revolves around the fact that the existing mechanism does not seem to have enough teeth. There will be repercussions on the landlords as well.
11. Party houses seem somewhat unique to Santa Cruz. There would be many issues revolving around addressing the 647f violations as so.
12. The way the amendment addresses 647f violations seems to conflict with the way the recommendation addresses party houses. One focuses on addresses while the other focuses on individuals.
13. The recommendation will target individuals, not addresses.
14. It targets the property and landowners.
15. The City needs to make landlords and renters more accountable for what happens on their properties. Recommendation 57 sends this as a clear message.
16. Consider addressing other issues besides 647f violations.
17. Things such as drug violations, prostitution, etc. are already misdemeanors.
18. It might be simpler for the City Council to absorb the language, “public nuisance.”
19. The City can address this however they please.
20. The motion passes unanimously.

VII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 57.1

1. This recommendation has been labeled 57.1 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. Use the language, “Develop or increase penalties for property owners who refuse to address habitual code compliance violations.”
3. An approach like this has been successful within the Beach Flats area.
4. The motion to adopt the recommendation passes unanimously.

VIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 57.2

1. This recommendation has been labeled 57.2 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. Consider the language “The City Council designate certain existing infractions as municipal code misdemeanors for current infractions, such as public waste, multiple offences for illegal camping, and other offences that the City Council designates to curb quality of life crimes in the City. This would include a request to the court to fund a municipal code prosecutor as well as designating the revenue from current infraction penalties to fund this court.”
3. Who is “this court?”
4. The money collected for the court should go back into addressing the problem, instead of going into the general court fund, which is what is currently happening.
5. The word “this” is confusing.
6. This is not recommending a new court.
7. This motion is seconded.
8. Recommendation 62 is similar; could recommendation 57.2 be combined with that?
9. They are not the same. Combining them would not work.
10. Addressing all infractions might be similar to recommendation 66.

11. The intent of this recommendation derives from the fact that the City Attorney has to prosecute municipal code infractions. The City needs to take certain offences more seriously. This is recommending that the County fund a City prosecutor. The County should contribute because it is the County seat, and many issues derive from this fact. The County needs to take more responsibility in what happens within the City. The City Attorney's office takes on so many different jobs. At the moment, there is a constant reassertion of citations instead of arrests for misdemeanors. Take for example, if an individual is cited for illegal camping the first time, they do not pay their citation or serve time doing community service, and they are not spotted by the police within 24 hours, nothing can happen to them. This recommendation would give police officers the option to arrest, making the constant reassertion of citations a less common practice. This also sends the message that the City of Santa Cruz is not so easy on crime.
12. If you make some infractions misdemeanors, the City does not have to wait for three citations to prosecute, it could happen the first time.
13. This recommendation allows for self-funding.
14. There is a perception that many criminals are coming from other places. The TF needs to keep in mind that the truth of this perception is unclear.
15. A call to question is made.
16. The motion passes with two no votes and one abstention.

IX. Discussion Regarding Abstentions and the Legislative Process

1. The rules on abstentions need to be solidified. Members of City Council and the County Supervisors can only abstain if there is a clear conflict of interest. It is recommended that we adopt these same rules.
2. This motion is seconded.
3. Can the TF still table a motion?
4. Yes.
5. The abstentions seem like a beneficial tool because the TF is not comprised of elected bodies.
6. The TF's job is too important to abstain for fear of disappointment.
7. Tabling is still important.
8. If a motion is tabled, this does not entail it will not be addressed until the next meeting.
9. A call to question is not debatable, though it can be voted on.
10. The motion passes unanimously.

X. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 57.3

1. This recommendation has been labeled 57.3 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion is made to amend a new recommendation with the following language: "Where statute allows, implement cost recovery for police response and enforcement of criminal activity."
3. The motion is seconded.
4. This recommendation is intended to send a message that individuals cannot come to Santa Cruz and live a criminal lifestyle without repercussions.
5. It would be a major disservice if citizens were afraid to call for emergency responses due to potential fees.
6. The intent is to look into charging the responsible individual, not the person calling. Fees are recovered from the responsible party.
7. Language including "...from the responsible party..." is added.
8. A caucus is called.

9. Discuss the wording with Chief Vogel.
10. Something like this recommendation could be used on a wider basis than is currently being used. A concern was brought up that is a somewhat broad and general statement regarding crime. The message is that responsible individuals should understand that there are financial consequences to criminal activity. There will obviously be individuals who will be unable to pay for these things.
11. Is this revolving around an arrest or a conviction?
12. That has not been thought through yet.
13. This is because it would be a separate process if the police department were just looking at arrests.
14. If that is the case, then hold this recommendation to convictions.
15. Consider removing “criminal activity.”
16. There is only financial repercussion to the responsible party if there is a conviction.
17. Drunk in public arrests should be added to this recommendation.
18. That amendment is accepted.
19. The motion carries unanimously.

XI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 59

1. A motion to strike recommendation 59 is made and seconded.
2. The Strategic Planning Committee would better handle the recommendation. This recommendation does not seem necessary.
3. The motion carries unanimously.

XII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 60

1. A motion to approve the recommendation without amendment is made and seconded.
2. Consider removing the language “mental health.”
3. That amendment is denied. This is because the recommendation is intended to address inmates specifically.
4. It might not be legal to use Rountree for this issue.
5. Keep the language “mental health” in the recommendation regardless.
6. Is this recommendation addressing individuals who are already in custody? If so, is this a way of expanding the jail?
7. Yes and yes.
8. Currently, the sheriff has applied for a multimillion-dollar grant to improve the Rountree facility.
9. Consider the language: “Facilitate Rountree as a coerced treatment facility for serial inebriates and substance abusers, and as a mental health treatment center for County health.”
10. That friendly amendment is accepted.
11. If Rountree receives the grant funds, it will become an open facility. The inmates who have significant treatment issues might need to be confined. They have that ability at the main jail. An individual with mental health issues would be excluded from being transferred to a minimum facility according to the previous classification process.
12. The minimum-security facility will be devised so that a variety of programs will take place to help reduce recidivism. Due to this, the TF does not need to spend much time with what those programs will be, or who those inmates will be. The grant that was discussed is for the physical rehabilitation of the facility itself. Rountree will absorb and utilize many existing community programs.
13. Is this significantly different from what the sheriff is proposing in the branch?

14. Regardless, keep the wording as it is.
15. In the County, there is currently no locked treatment facility. Rountree would be a coerced treatment facility for drug offenders. There is outpatient drug court, and these things are seen as a necessity. This recommendation targets underserved populations in the jail facilities, and the mental health population is hugely underserved.
16. The motion carries with five no votes.

XIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 62

1. A motion to approve without amendment is made and seconded.
2. There have been many “boutique courts” over the years. However, because of budgetary problems, most of these courts have been eradicated except for drug court. They are expensive. Due to this, this recommendation seems financially impossible. Consider making this a long-term goal.
3. Is this a suggestion to remove the recommendation or record it as a long-term goal?
4. It was intended to give some history for consideration.
5. The motion carries unanimously.

XIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 64

1. A motion to approve recommendation 64 is made and seconded.
2. Is this recommendation even feasible? How would the City go about enacting this recommendation?
3. One of the problems that the TF seems to be identifying is the behavior of the judges. It would give the voters a way of being informed.
4. The motion carries unanimously.

XV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for an Additional Recommendation

1. A motion is made to include a new recommendation with the language: “Compel presiding judge of Santa Cruz County Superior Court to appear before City Council twice per year to inform what the Court is doing to address high repeat offender rates in the City of Santa Cruz and receive input from the City Council and City Attorney.”
2. This motion is seconded.
3. The TF cannot force the presiding judge to do this. Judges do not face competitive races in the City. If the TF can compel the presiding judge to appear in public in a meeting that is on an agenda and televised, it will be one small step towards increasing the accountability and awareness of what is going on with these issues. Hearing from judges is important.
4. The motion carries unanimously.

XVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 65.1

1. This recommendation has been labeled 65.1 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion is made to include a new recommendation with the language: “Request the County Grand Jury to convene to evaluate the efficacy and efficiency of the current judiciary as compared to other counties.”
3. This motion is seconded.
4. A friendly amendment is made and denied.
5. A motion to amend is made, though is not seconded.
6. Some clarification is needed on what efficacy and efficiency exactly mean.

7. It is to see if the judiciary is being efficient, if they are using their best resources, and how their results are reached. It would include an overhaul of review. This is exactly like how the TF asked for certain City agencies to be reevaluated.
8. Is there some way to refine this language? The recommendation seems broad in its current form. Its connection to public safety is also not readily apparent. A request to make the language more specific.
9. The language has been heard previously and is denied as a friendly amendment.
10. Consider the following language to be added to the end of the recommendation: "...as it relates to discretionary power in sentencing of repeat offenders."
11. This is not accepted as a friendly amendment.
12. There are state guidelines for sentencing. What this recommendation might be asking is whether or not the County's judges sentence on the low end of the state guidelines. If the Courts are sentencing within the state guidelines, they are going to continue doing what they already are doing.
13. Suggest removing the term "efficacy" and replace with the language "...how the judiciary make their sentencing decisions in relation to public safety..."
14. The intent of this recommendation is to have the Grand Jury look at judge sentencing behavior. Consider just voting on this recommendation and having the TF staff refine the language later.
15. Some clarification on what the intent of the recommendation would help with this request. This could include additions or subtractions.
16. A motion to table this recommendation and discuss it later is made and seconded.
17. The motion to table passes.

XVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 65.2

1. This recommendation has been labeled 65.2 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. "Compel Santa Cruz County Probation Department to appear before City Council twice per year to inform what the Probation Department is doing to address probation related issues on chronic reoffenders."
3. The logic is the same as with two recommendations previous. It may be that the City Council wants to address these meetings in the same night. This is an important enough of an issue to be on the Council agenda and keep it at the forefront of public concern.
4. Just as a point of clarification, does this recommendation intend to address adult chronic reoffenders? This is because adult chronic reoffenders are handled differently than with juvenile chronic reoffenders.
5. Juveniles are not often incarcerated. Instead they will be placed on multiple levels of probation or different kinds of services.
6. Updates on AB 109 might be helpful. Could this be considered a friendly amendment?
7. This would be better suitable as a separate motion.
8. Use the term "Santa Cruz County Chief Probation Officer." Also, replace "probation related issues" with "probation related offences."
9. The motion carries unanimously.

XVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 65.3

1. This recommendation has been labeled 65.3 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to make a new recommendation is made. The language includes "A grand jury investigation of the current Superior Court bench as it relates to the use of discretionary power sentencing of repeat offenders. If the investigation yields

evidence that suggests individual judges have exercised discretionary power that compromises public safety, the TF recommends owners to consider a vote of no confidence of the bench or individual recall.”

3. This motion is seconded.
4. The TF has discussed accountability of the individual criminals. However, if the TF is going to ask for outside audits, then the accountability of the judiciary needs to be considered as well.
5. This motion is very similar to the other one. They both seem fine; however, this recommendation seems more specific. As a friendly amendment, consider removing the term “repeat” in context of the repeat offenders.
6. This friendly amendment is accepted.
7. Would this recommendation replace the other one? This is because asking the Grand Jury to do something and telling them to do something are two different things.
8. This is intended to address voters.
9. Suggesting a recall as a TF member does not seem appropriate. This does not seem within the purview of the TF’s abilities.
10. A vote of no confidence does not exist, and should be removed.
11. If the TF recommends voters to consider individual recalling judges. Otherwise this does not seem appropriate.
12. A motion is made to divide the recommendation into two parts.
13. One of the Supreme Court judges often convenes the Grand Jury. Procedurally, the TF should ask for an outside judge to take part in this.
14. That is accepted as a friendly amendment.
15. If it were a conflict of interest, the bench would not even approach it. It would be taken over by another judiciary.
16. This is a tool that should not be considered lightly.
17. Consider adding in the narrative that TF members recommend individual voters to consider individual recall elections. The TF, however, want the Courts to work with many of the City’s challenges. A recall motion might inhibit this ability.
18. Make sure that people know that any citizen can call the Grand Jury and raise issues.
19. Consider excluding the language after “public safety....”
20. There seems to be no recommendations for voters. At the moment, it seems that there is no action voters can take from the TF’s recommendations.
21. The offer for a friendly amendment is denied.
22. When is the last time that there has been competition against a City judge? The problem with the current judicial system is that there is no opposition. Due to this, the TF is forced to work with other mechanisms to attempt to initiate accountability. Recalls seem to be the only way to address the current judicial system.
23. Return to question is made.
24. One of the primary issues with this recommendation is that there is potentially no replacement judge if a current judge was to be recalled. There should be a push towards educating the public around the time of a judicial election.
25. True, however, no one runs against City judges because there is a fear to lose against a City judge and have to later appear before them.
26. The motion to pass the recommendation with the language “Grand jury investigation, external review of current Superior Court bench as it relates to the use of discretionary power of sentencing of offenders,” passes.
27. The second motion to pass a recommendation with the language “If the investigation yields evidence that suggests that individual judges have exercised

discretionary power that compromises public safety, the TF recommends voters consider individual recall elections,” fails.

XIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 65.4

1. This recommendation has been labeled 65.4 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to consider the following recommendation: “More jail space for short-term incarceration.”
3. Everything from recommendation 66 on requires more space to jail people. Due to this, the TF will need to address necessary, additional space.
4. A friendly amendment is made to include the language “... post-conviction” to be added to the end of the recommendation.
5. One of the issues the City is facing is the jails taking people who are disorderly and then releasing them so soon. There is a need for more space to hold people post-conviction.
6. The friendly amendment is changed to include the language “pre and post-conviction.”
7. The friendly amendment is accepted.
8. There needs to be post-conviction incarceration beds for this. Relative to the revolving door, there are practices in place that dictate which criminals will and will not stay at the jail. In the absence of a concern over the individual’s threat to public safety, they will likely be quickly released. Currently, if an individual gets a 30-day sentence and appears in court for that, they serve almost no time. There is no accountability to determine if an individual is changing his/her behavior.
9. What do we mean by more jail space? There literally is no more jail space to work with? Are we discussing creating more room?
10. Ultimately, people are going to have to work out the minor inconsistencies throughout our recommendations. However, many of the TF’s recommendations do not seem viable unless there is quite simply more jail space.
11. Who are we targeting?
12. Part of the problem, historically, has been that people from this community do not go to prison for serious offences, let alone for less serious offences. In respect to AB 109, when other counties were worried, it seems like there were not as many non-violent offenders from Santa Cruz that returned. If the judges deal with public safety and start sending more serious offenders to prison, then there will be more jail space. This might be proactive.
13. The motion carries with five no votes.

XX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 65.5

1. This recommendation has been labeled 65.5 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion is made with the language “Compel the Superior Court to issue a warrant after three failures to appear in a six month period.” This motion is seconded.
3. Need to address the individuals who are not impacted by financial repercussions.
4. It seems that this is already in effect.
5. No it is not.
6. What is the current procedure?
7. The current procedure is that the tickets go to collections and then nothing happens. If the police want a warrant it takes time. One failure to appear in court used to result in a warrant. Now three would result in a warrant.

8. According to the current municipal code, it states that three failures to appear in court should result in a potential warrant. They lack the resources.
9. This recommendation would make it automatic so that it does not take all of those other resources from the City Attorney's office.
10. This is a suggestion for a countywide change.
11. For clarification, the discretionary power is being removed from the City Attorney's office and replacing it with an automatic mechanism.
12. How is the TF going to compel the courts to do this?
13. The City should recommend this.
14. If the TF is trying to take a stand, why should there be three failures to appear in court instead of just one?
15. One failure to appear in court could generate too many warrants. Three within a six-month period seems more reasonable.
16. A friendly amendment is made to replace the word "compel" with "recommend."
17. This amendment is accepted.
18. The motion carries unanimously.

XXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 65.6

1. This recommendation has been labeled 65.6 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to accept the new recommendation with the following language: "Recommend the City hire a part time or full time paralegal process that addresses municipal code violations and failures to appear in court," is made and seconded.
3. The resource to be readily available who can work closely with the courts and the district attorney's office while being able to deliver to the judge. This seems cost effective and efficient to help expedite the process of warrants.
4. Where would the funds for this recommendation come from?
5. The general fund.
6. This undercuts the previous recommendation if it passes.
7. The process, however, is costly and time consuming.
8. There need to be multiple potential solutions to this issue. This would be fine to have different recommendations on the same topic.
9. Is this a view on short, moderate and long-term solutions?
10. The motion carries with two no votes.

XXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 68

1. A motion to accept recommendation with the following language "Have the City develop three or more non-judicial mechanisms to deal with failure to appear in court and select one or more to implement," is made.
2. This partners with the previous statement that there needs to be alternative plans, in case one is not viable.
3. What would be an example of a mechanism?
4. These would be mechanisms that deny access to some services, programs, etc. They may or may not be effective.
5. Is there any way to make the recommendation more specific?
6. The City has a problem, and its mechanisms are not working. The City needs to invest in solving this problem.
7. A motion is made to consider a recommendation with the following language, "Within three months of accepting the TF report, direct City to notify, in writing, each City department, agency and organization outside of the City's jurisdiction of TF recommendations that impact their area and ask that they respond in writing

in how they will begin to work towards achieving the objectives in the relative recommendations.”

8. This will create a paper trail of who is engaging in proactive solutions and how is ignoring the City. Collaboration is important, but so is action.
9. The motion to question carries unanimously.
10. Recommendation 68 is struck.

XXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 69

1. The recommendation is struck.

XXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 70

1. A motion to approve the recommendation with an amendment is made and seconded. The amendment includes the language “Recommend County increase staffing levels of probation officers for adult population to adequately deal with AB 109.”
2. Did the TF previously add some language about AB 109?
3. That was addressed earlier, though the friendly amendment that included language about AB 109 was rejected.
4. There may be some changes coming in place.
5. The motion carries unanimously.

XXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 72

1. A motion to approve is made and seconded.
2. This issue was studied, and there was no evidence to suggest that this is a problem.
3. Their analysis was very sloppy. Their analysis was to detect if there is an effect.
4. If an individual is being released, could they be offered a ticket to their previous place of residence?
5. There is already a program for this called Homeward Bound. The jail, however, cannot force that these individuals take these tickets and return to their previous place of residence.
6. The Homeward Bound is not only for those individuals using the HSC, there are some funds designated for the jails.
7. As a friendly amendment, consider the language “whenever possible,” to the end of the amendment.
8. This is accepted.
9. It may also be beneficial to support programs that are already successful in this realm.
10. As a friendly amendment, consider the language “Ensure the jail has access to funds for bus tickets to return to their community of origin.”
11. Something along those lines will be accepted, however, have the TF staff work on the precise language later.
12. A question is called for.
13. The motion carries unanimously.

XXVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 72.1

1. This recommendation has been labeled 72.1 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to accept a recommendation with the following language, “Instruct the City to report at a City Council meeting on their progress on the TF’s recommendations six and twelve months after recommendations,” is made and seconded.

3. The motion carries unanimously.

XXVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 73

1. A motion to strike the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. It seems that this recommendation is redundant.
3. The judges have their own panel of review, so one of the previous recommendations may fail.
4. Is there some board that reviews the judges?
5. It is the word of judicial performance that deals with individual judges. They then can remove someone from the bench. There would be major conflict of interest if the entire process were internal. Due to this, they would have to go to another entity.
6. It seems as if the TF is going backwards. Something like this was already passed. The TF should continue moving forward.
7. This is interpreted as a call to question.
8. The motion carries unanimously. The recommendation is struck.

XXVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 75

1. A motion to approve recommendation 75 is made and seconded.
2. This recommendation seems to help the City on issues of public safety. It also helps provide the technical capacity to analyze decisions the City makes.
3. Can the language be cleaned up to clarify that the TF is directly speaking to the City and that a Department of Public Safety is asked for.
4. There already is some sort of a public safety committee in existence. Perhaps the TF should simply expand what is already in existence. Also, the issue with creating a new department is another layer of bureaucracy.
5. It is unclear if the City Council can even work something like this into its costs.
6. A commissioner might be a better idea. Limiting this to one person would be a good idea.
7. Something similar to this is pointed out in recommendation 31. It feels that this recommendation is redundant and unnecessary.
8. This recommendation could be reworded.
9. Consider accepting this recommendation; it is very powerful and important. What the City will do with it is for them to determine. The City is saying now that public safety is their highest priority, and this addresses that directly. This recommendation shows some sense of priorities over the issue of public safety. The concern with a committee is that it is too fluid. Departments, however, have focus on work and they are not as prone to politics.
10. If the City is hiring for other positions, there should be finances and the ability to address this recommendation.
11. A question is called for.
12. It appears that there are many different departments in the City, and the City Manager's office oversees these departments. A friendly amendment is made to include language about a public safety position in the City Manager's office that overlooks all of the departments.
13. Having just one position for this workload is a lot to ask for. A department of public safety shows that the City truly is prioritizing public safety.
14. The question to call is withdrawn.
15. The City can perceive this recommendation as if it had failed. This is because it oversees every department.
16. More than one position seems appropriate.

17. The TF does not dictate how this will be perceived. Regardless, the TF needs to make a bold statement.
18. What all of this information represents is that the problem encompasses so many different aspects.
19. This recommendation has been incredibly effective in other situations; it could do the same in this context.
20. The term “department” has many staff members. The use of the term department connotes a large staff, as opposed to what has been discussed.
21. A question has been called for. The motion passes with four no votes.

XXIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 79

1. A motion to approve is made and seconded.
2. This recommendation seems to provide some guidance or direction for the recommendations.
3. Add the language “...as appropriate,” to the end of the last sentence.
4. This amendment is accepted.
5. The last part was a section of recommendation 43 that was potentially deleted before.
6. A private organization will back the initial bond. If the program is successful, the bond gets paid back. It is basically an alternative funding program through a private entity.
7. The language, “as appropriate” does not mean much. The sentence seems undermined by this language.
8. Change the term “appropriate” to “if applicable.” This makes a stronger statement.
9. How does this apply to public safety?
10. Consider adding a preamble that clarifies that none of the recommendations are for general purposes and that they are specifically for implementing public safety aspects.
11. This addresses the magnet effect.
12. There is a limited amount of money that the City can spend on community block grants. The TF should ensure that they are going to the best programs. If not, the City is squandering money that could be better spent.
13. A friendly amendment is proposed to include the preamble, which clarifies that the following recommendation(s) address issues of public safety.
14. Consider the language, “The City should also tie the distribution of community block grants related to public safety to results based programs and require measurable deliverables.”
15. Remove everything from the “City social service programs...”
16. The friendly amendment is accepted.
17. The motion carries with one no vote.

XXX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 13

1. This recommendation is on page 8.
2. The yellow items in each section will be moved through. Then it will be asked if there are any additional motions to add to that section.
3. Blue indicates recommendations that have already been adopted and yellow are ones that still need to be addressed.
4. Under page five of the youth programming section, a motion is made to approve a recommendation with the following language, “The City partners with Santa Cruz City Schools and the CEO to support and expand existing after school programs, specifically the academic leadership and...”

5. A motion to approve recommendation 13 without amendment is made and seconded.
6. Try to make the recommendation more specific. Increase the City participation in the Homeless Action Partnership. Add to the Point and Time Homeless Census Survey Questions, questions that concern the City.
7. What is the Homeless Action Partnership and how would the City's participation benefit public safety?
8. Delete the first sentence.
9. The motion carries unanimously.

XXXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 2.1

1. This recommendation has been labeled 2.1 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to adopt a recommendation with the language "The City partner with SCCS and County Office of Education to support and expand existing after school programs, specifically academic enrichment, for example arts academy and scholastic sports programs," is made and seconded.
3. Specifically would want the City and schools to have a stronger relationship.
4. The motion carries unanimously.

XXXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 2.2

1. This recommendation has been labeled 2.2 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to adopt a recommendation with the language "Partner with SCCS and COE to develop elementary mentorship programs for high school students. This is to incentivize businesses, non profits and NGOs to participate in mentoring and internship programs," is made and seconded.
3. What were the ideas to incentivize businesses and NGOs?
4. That is up to the City. It does not have to be monetary.
5. The motion carries unanimously.

XXXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 2.3

1. This recommendation has been labeled 2.3 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to adopt a recommendation with the language "Work with Santa Cruz Metropolitan District to explore transportation options for youth and family, specifically in regard to getting children to school in the morning and home from school and after school programming," is made and seconded.
3. Many students have issues with transportation problems, especially in regards to getting to after school programs.
4. It is very disappointing that the schools and school districts are not involved in this.
5. This is related to public safety; however, the funding is hard to imagine at the moment.
6. In regards to the Metro, if a bus is not full, it will not cost them any more to allow a child onto the bus to access school or programs. Most of the buses are not full. Due to this, the cost might be minimal.
7. The TF has the ability to discern finances, but say that certain things are priorities.
8. Making the TF's intentions obvious might better clarify this.
9. The motion carries unanimously.

XXXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 2.4

1. This recommendation has been labeled 2.4 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to adopt a recommendation with the language “Collaborate with SCCS and COE to address the summer cap in programming,” is made and seconded.
3. The motion carries with one no vote.

XXXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 2.5

1. This recommendation has been labeled 2.5 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to adopt a recommendation with the language “Collaborate with SCCS and COE to ensure all youth are educated around the issues of recreational drug use, underage drug use and gangs,” is made and seconded.
3. Programs have been implemented to address social conduct. They have been very successful. However, it does not target the youth at a young enough of an age.
4. This highly resembles a previous recommendation.
5. The collaboration section of this recommendation is important.
6. Include the language, “and others,” after “COE” because there are other programs that are already doing something like this.
7. The following language is added: “...starting at the elementary level schools contribute to grant funded elementary counselor positions to fill social curriculum.”
8. Add the language, “City to provide relevant data to support grant renewal for elementary counselors.” Also, strike “starting at the elementary level...”
9. The amendment is accepted.
10. Consider adding “sexual assault, domestic violence and bullying...” to the list.
11. This amendment is accepted.
12. The motion carries unanimously.

XXXVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 14.1 - 14.3

1. These recommendations have been labeled appropriately for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. A motion to adopt a recommendation with the language “Coral St. campus agencies work with the SCPD liaison to reveal, name and photograph top offenders that claim 115 Coral St. as their address. SCPD is encouraged to make recommendations regarding service restrictions or enhancement to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. All three agencies are encouraged to work in partnership with the SCPD liaison. The City support the security enhancement project that is currently underway at the Coral St. campus, including the installation of a single point entry gate and an ID card program for all service recipients at HSC. The City is encouraged to request quarterly updates on progress of the project implementation,” is made and seconded.
3. This addresses all of the concerns that the TF has been hearing around the HSC and other services.
4. Observe a motion that has the potential to clash with this recommendation. This is labeled 14.2.
5. A recommendation is discussed. It is labeled recommendation 14.3; its language includes “Recommend the City of Santa Cruz end mobile distribution of needles within the City of Santa Cruz.”
6. Both 14.2 and 14.1 can both be voted on. They do not contradict each other.
7. The City cannot restrict certain services from an individual. However, the liaison can work collaboratively with the HSC and make a plan.
8. 14.1 seems to be a troublesome recommendation.

9. A friendly amendment to use the language “photo ID card” instead of “ID card” is recommended.
10. The friendly amendment is accepted.
11. What is the TF expecting HSC to do in regards to 14.1?
12. There is a liaison with HSC. If the liaison had a way to work with repeat offenders around the HSC, it would help determine what services are appropriate or not.
13. Remove the term “encourage” and change the language to “SCPD to make recommendations regarding appropriate service restrictions or enhancements...” and in the next sentence remove “are encouraged” and replace with “all three agencies to work...”
14. The second half of the friendly amendment is not accepted.
15. Does the City fund some of these services?
16. Yes.
17. Then why is it a problem for the City to tell the services what to do?
18. The issues in recommendation 14.1 spread wider than the repeat offenders. Take the murder of Shannon Collins for example. Her murderer would never have been found if the City solely focused on repeat offenders.
19. A call to question is made for 14.1.
20. The motion fails with 7 no votes.
21. The last sentence of recommendation 14.2 is unclear.
22. In general, the TF is providing recommendations to the City Council. These recommendations are supposed to express TF sentiment. The City Council can then filter out which recommendations are viable and which are not. The TF has gotten bogged down in many of the details. This is why this recommendation is vague.
23. Consider deleting the last sentence. It still does not seem to benefit the recommendation.
24. The last sentence is important, though there should not be an exhaustive list made up.
25. How is the City going to get this list of individuals? This does not make any sense.
26. It will be through the history of their interactions with the criminal justice system.
27. The TF should stay more general in this recommendation. This recommendation should be targeting individuals who continuously break the law, but it does not seem to accomplish that.
28. Consider other language that better expresses the point that was just brought up.
29. Let the staff refine the language with the understanding that the intent of recommendation 14.2 is to create accountability.
30. Some of the social service providers may support this recommendation.
31. Consider the following language “The agencies located at Coral St. will cooperate with SCPD in recommendations to modify or eliminate services to persons identified as chronic offenders who threaten public safety.”
32. The friendly amendment is accepted.
33. Collaboration is key between all of the agencies. This language seems to contradict that. The language is too aggressive.
34. A motion to substitute the language “...will cooperate...” with “...work cooperatively with...” is made and seconded.
35. In order to successfully work with SCPD, there needs to be mutual collaboration.
36. The motion to amend with the two-word substitute fails.
37. The motion to amend with the full sentence substitute passes.

XXXVII. Closing Discussion and Comments

1. Move to direct staff to provide the TF with a proposed process for identifying three, five top priority recommendations within each existing category of recommendations with all remaining recommendations to be included in the TF final report as an appendix and to provide the TF with a process in the packet for next week's meeting.
2. Move to direct staff to provide a revised narrative for each section using existing language and a sense of the TF for the TF's consideration at the next meeting and to be included in the packet for next week's meeting.
3. All members of the TF should review the recommendations and find things that need to be refined. This needs to be done next week.
4. Place the recommendations up to tonight, but not including tonight, in the four categorical buckets. Also address how each recommendation touches the criminal justice system and the social service system.

Adjournment -- The Public Safety Citizen Task Force adjourned from the public meeting of November 6, 2013 at 11:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 12, 2013, 5:00 p.m., Santa Cruz Civic Auditorium Tony Hill Room.

The City of Santa Cruz does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Out of consideration for people with chemical sensitivities, we ask that you attend fragrance free. Upon request, the agenda can be provided in a format to accommodate special needs. Additionally, if you wish to attend this public meeting and will require assistance such as an interpreter for American Sign Language, Spanish, or other special equipment, please call the City Clerk's Department at 420-5030 in advance so that we can arrange for such special assistance. The Cal-Relay system number: 1-800-735-2922.

Public Safety Task Force meetings will be recorded for the purpose of preparing minute

