



PUBLIC SAFETY CITIZEN TASK FORCE

October 9, 2013 Meeting Staff Report

Recommendation

It is recommended that the City of Santa Cruz Public Safety Citizen Task Force (PSTF) prepare for public comment by reviewing the following Summary of Educational Phase and Identified Problems/Solutions Spreadsheet. The documents provide the public and PSTF members a summary review of the Task Force proceedings to date. This information helps set a baseline of information and context for the community to provide input and recommendations to the Task Force. Additionally, the PSTF members will have an opportunity to contemplate and deliberate on the breadth of issues related to Themes 1-4, an important first step in developing recommendations.

Summary of Outcome: Education Phase

Background

Vibrant communities are built upon several foundational structures. Personal and collective sense of safety is one essential structural element of community vitality. In the aftermath of several months of intense community focus on illegally discarded hypodermic needles, quality of life issues and a spike in violent crime, the City Council convened a Public Safety Citizen Task Force to assess the state of public safety in Santa Cruz.

The PSTF held its inaugural meeting on May 7th, 2013. With guidance from Santa Cruz Mayor Hilary Bryant and Santa Cruz County Treasurer Fred Keeley, the 15 PSTF members agreed to embark on a six-month journey of discovery. Understanding the multitude of complexities contributing to our sense of safety, Task Force members committed to a regimented approach to the proceedings, with an intentional focus on stripping preconceived notions away and learning about the issues with an open mind and reliance on data.

Nearly three-quarters of the PSTF process was devoted to this educational process. The Task Force hosted thirty expert panelists in total, providing a comprehensive background and varied perspective on the issues. Informed and often intense discussions around crime, fear, resource capacity and responsibility took place. Throughout the proceedings, with the collection of data and research, discussions evolved and the distinction between perceptions and reality were noted. With this knowledge in hand, PSTF members can begin the deliberative process.

Purpose of the Summary

It is expected that the deliberative process will be comprised of two parts of equal importance. The PSTF will build consensus around characterization of the problems and develop policy recommendations designed to improve our community's safety outcomes. The purpose of this summary document is to kick off the deliberative process by setting a framework around the described nature of the problems associated with the four themes of study and the recommendations

that have arisen organically through the education phase (either by panelists, task force members, and community members).

First, the methodology used to prioritize the themes of study will be described. Then, the summary will follow chronologically with the order of thematic meetings, starting with Theme 2: Drug and Alcohol Abuse, Drug Trafficking and Related Non-Violent or Petty Crime and ending with Theme 3: Gang Violence and Violent Crime.

Prioritization of Themes of Study

The Task Force course of study consists of a four-part strategy: study, analysis, solutions, and recommendations. With limited time and emphasis placed on conducting robust study and analysis, it was essential for the PSTF to clearly identify the most critical areas of community concern at the onset. The PSTF established their priorities of study by collecting feedback from three sources: PSTF member perspectives, City Department data and perspectives, and the general public (through an informal poll and testimony before the PSTF).

The Task Force priorities and themes of study emerged through each of these touch points. The vast majority of community members prioritized their safety concerns around the following four themes:

No.	Theme
1	Environmental Degradation and Behaviors Affecting our Sense of Safety in the City's Parks, Open Spaces, Beaches and Businesses Districts.
2	Drug and Alcohol Abuse, Drug Trafficking and Related Non-Violent or Petty Crime
3	Gang Violence and Violent Crime
4	Criminal Justice System and Governance

The PSTF elected to study Theme 2 first understanding that drug and alcohol abuse are strong contributing factors to each of the other three themes of study.

Outcome of Theme 2: Drug and Alcohol Abuse, Drug Trafficking and Related Non-Violent Crime

The Task Force discussed Theme 2 with eight expert panelists. They included:

- Deputy Police Chief Rick Martinez, Santa Cruz Police Department
- A current probationer and heroin addict
- Lynn Harrison, Drug and Alcohol Program Manager, Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency
- Rod Libbey, Janus Executive Director
- Bill Manov, Program Chief, Santa Cruz Health Services Agency Drug and Alcohol Program
- Scott MacDonald, Santa Cruz County Probation Chief
- Lisa Hernandez, MD, Medical Services Director/County Health Officer, Santa Cruz Health Services Agency
- Emily Ager, Community Health and Harm Reduction Supervisor, Street Outreach Supporters

Discussion centered on the state of the community, from the perspective of the Santa Cruz Police Department and Santa Cruz County Health, with regard to substance abuse, local treatment options/best practices, and the relationship between the criminal justice system and drug treatment. The efficacy of the County's Needle Exchange Program was discussed with emphasis on the distinction between enabling drug addiction and harm reduction. The current probationer/heroin

addict provided a personal perspective on the prevalence of drugs in Santa Cruz County and related crime.

Several problems resonated through panel remarks and follow-up questions. In summary, Santa Cruz has a high concentration of drug and alcohol addicts. Repeat offenders, of which over 50% commit substance-related crimes, create a significant draw on City and County resources. Santa Cruz appears to provide an environment conducive to untreated and perpetuated addiction due to several factors. There currently is an oversaturation of alcohol outlets and drug dealers in our community. Publicly provided drug abuse treatment is insufficiently funded to meet demand for services. The Serial Inebriate Program (SIP) and Drug Court are successful models for treatment and recidivism reduction, yet are underfunded, yielding mixed results. The underfunding of treatment options, in combination with overcrowding in the County Jail facilities, limits the criminal justice system's ability to effectively adjudicate drug offenses. Thus, a perception has been created amongst the community (offenders and non-offenders alike) that there is little consequence to criminogenic substance abuse and related non-violent crime.

As a result of both community perceptions regarding criminal justice accountability and comparably high crime rates, fear of crime is a current phenomenon in Santa Cruz. Fear of crime can be harmful and debilitating to a community and vastly changes the way community members interact with each other and their environment. Universally, panelists acknowledged our community's perceptions and fear of crime, but also took great pains to ground the PSTF in data, research and a balanced perspective.

Violent and non-violent crime are strongly linked to substance addiction; therefore, prevention and treatment are paramount to improving victimization in Santa Cruz. Universally, panelists were adamant that funding of prevention and intervention programs within schools, County Health and Human Services, treatment non-profits, and the criminal justice system, are more cost-effective in reducing crime compared to incarceration. The County is home to a wealth of effective prevention and intervention programs. Unfortunately, most programs are insufficiently funded and do not provide a cohesive message of balancing treatment with personal accountability.

Outcome of Theme 1: Environmental Degradation and Behaviors Affecting our Sense of Safety in the City's Parks, Open Spaces, Beaches and Business Districts

The Task Force discussed Theme 1 with eight expert panelists. They included:

- Deputy Police Chief Rick Martinez, Santa Cruz Police Department
- Julie Hendee, Redevelopment Manager, City of Santa Cruz
- Monica Martinez, Director, Homeless Services Center
- Ray Bramson, Homeless Encampment Project Manager, City of San Jose
- Pam Rogers-Wyman, Acute Services Program Manager, Santa Cruz County
- Ky Le, Director of Homeless Systems, Santa Clara County
- Jennifer Loving, Executive Director, Destination Home
- Judge Ariadne Symons, Santa Cruz County Superior Court

Discussion centered on the environmental, economic, programmatic and budgetary impacts to the City caused by quality of life crimes, anti-social behaviors, and illegal camping. Panelists offered their perspectives on best-practice solutions to reduce impacting behaviors, ranging from housing homeless individuals and drug and mental health treatment, to reprogramming and enforcement. Several themes crystalized through panel remarks and PSTF follow-up questions.

In summary, Santa Cruz has a disproportionately large homeless population (over 2,000 countywide), many living completely unsheltered. Individual or co-occurring of mental illness and addiction directly influence how a large percentage of our homeless population interacts with the community and our environment. Large swaths of open space, heavily forested and abundant in natural cover, provide suitable space to illegally camp and commit crime. Our community's open spaces and business districts are geographically tied, with the San Lorenzo River corridor providing access from encampments to social services and Downtown.

Lack of jail space, treatment options, and ineffective methods for managing quality of life crimes within the criminal justice system greatly diminish the Santa Cruz Police Department's capacity to enforce these behaviors. Calls for service and arrests are at a record high, with a heavy concentration along the San Lorenzo River corridor. Despite this effort, the problems persist. Without an effective way to manage this problem, potential for crime and drug abuse to escalate is a concern.

Panelists agreed that solutions need to balance prevention with enforcement. Housing the most vulnerable and chronic homeless demonstrably reduces law enforcement costs and could create a marked improvement to community perceptions around homeless behaviors. With substance abuse and mental illness a root cause of the behaviors around Theme 1, prevention and treatment programs should be considered first. Homeless encampment removals can be effective and long-lasting with early outreach and services to those affected. Greater collaboration between law enforcement and the courts is necessary to create more accountability for public nuisance offenders. In totality, it is essential for each of these solutions to work in concert, requiring strong collaboration between jurisdictions and social service providers.

Outcome of Theme 4: Criminal Justice System and Governance Structure

The Task Force discussed Theme 4 with seven expert panelists. They included:

- John Barisone, Santa Cruz City Attorney
- Phil Wowak, Sheriff, Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Office
- Jeremy Verinsky, Chief Deputy of Adult Corrections, Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Office
- John Salazar, Presiding Judge, Santa Cruz County Superior Court
- Bob Lee, District Attorney, Santa Cruz County
- Jerry Christensen, Public Defender, Santa Cruz County
- Larry Biggam, Public Defender, Santa Cruz County

The two-part meeting covered a diverse range of topics, particularly, the role of the criminal justice system in managing the behaviors and activities around the other three themes of study. Several problems were identified by the panelists. Although all of the specific issues had been raised at previous meetings, several areas of heightened concern were voiced by the City's criminal justice partners.

The City Attorney, acting as municipal code infraction prosecutor, lacks adequate resources to effectively prosecute the concentration of nuisance crimes committed locally. The City Attorney pursues only the most egregious cases as a result. However, a relatively small number of individuals, around 100 in a typical year, are responsible for the vast majority of the adjudicated citations.

The community's serial inebriate population is a significant drain on public resources across the spectrum, from law enforcement to hospital emergency rooms. With jail overcrowding and funding constraints, the SIP program is not as effective as it could be.

A significant portion of the City's crime takes place along the San Lorenzo River corridor. The environmental design of the Levee and lack of programming in the adjoining parks and neighborhoods contributes to the prevalence of loitering, problematic behaviors and crime along the river corridor. All panelists voiced support for revitalizing and reprogramming the Levee and adjoining areas.

Panelists further discussed Santa Cruz crime rates. There was consensus among the panelists that the rates of crime are decreasing, across all types of offenses, in line with California and national crime rates. However, they posited that crime rates remain too high, and our rates are skewed because we are an extremely popular destination (for tourists, students, families, transients and criminals alike) and the Central City for Santa Cruz County (County seat, home to the main Jail and major entertainment district in the region, etc.)

A current case study of violent criminals, those in custody for murder, was discussed. Of the 18 cases currently pending, 17 are local residents, and 15 went to high school in Santa Cruz County. The point was made that our violent criminals are primarily local, and not out-of-towners drawn to Santa Cruz for services and community tolerance of criminogenic lifestyles.

This information was in contrast to a case study provided earlier in the proceedings. That case study focused on a number of homicides committed within the homeless or transient population over the last several years and noted a common series of events leading to the tragedy. Namely, it was argued that there is a transient population in our community drawn to Santa Cruz to live a criminogenic lifestyle. Fueled by addiction and sustained by social service provisions, the offenders committed crimes of escalating significance over several months, starting with public nuisance violations and ending in homicides. Heavier enforcement of the lesser crimes, consistent with the "broken window" theory of crime prevention, was suggested as a way to intervene in this series of events.

Both panels highlighted insufficient early prevention and education as contributors to the safety issues in Santa Cruz. School-aged children are our most vulnerable population, therefore early and effective prevention of drug abuse and truancy would greatly reduce future crime locally. Finally, the panelists demonstrated strong support for Problem Solving Courts like Drug, Homeless, Veterans, etc.

Outcome of Theme 3: Gang Violence

The Task Force discussed Theme 3 with four expert panelists. They included:

- Officer Joe Hernandez, Santa Cruz Police Department
- Nane Alejandrez, Director, Barrios Unidos
- Mario Sulay, Commander, Santa Cruz County Gang Task Force
- Willie Stokes, Director, Black Sheep Redemption Program

Discussions centered on the nature of gang activity and violence in Santa Cruz County, what gangs are involved, and the social and economic structures in our community that catalyze gang assemblage, drug trafficking and violence.

Gangs within the City of Santa Cruz span racial lines, with territorial rivalries predominately fueling violent crime. Santa Cruz County has approximately 1200 documented gangs members, of which 64% are 25 years or younger. Current County programs, both preventative and suppression, concentrate resources on the predominately Hispanic Norteño/Northerner and Sureño/Southerner gangs, as these gangs are responsible for the vast majority of gang crime and violence in the region.

The Santa Cruz County Gang Task Force deploys predominately in South County, where 75% of the gang cases take place. Santa Cruz City’s gang-related violence frequency is sparked by rival gang members from outside of the area. South County and neighboring region gang members elect to commit crime in Santa Cruz to avoid detection from familiar law enforcement. Neighborhoods in Santa Cruz, particularly concentrated in Beach Flats and the Westside, fall victim to territorial gang rivalries, much of which does not originate with Santa Cruz gang-affiliated residents.

Overwhelmingly, panelists agreed that prevention and early intervention is critical to limit the number of young males entering gangs in Santa Cruz County. Because active and supervised youth are much less likely to join a gang, after school enrichment programs are essential for under-represented and at-risk school children. Families of under-represented and low socio-economic classes need community support and outreach, with wrap around models providing services, counseling and familiarity with law enforcement officials.

Identified Problems/Solutions Spreadsheet

The PSTF has gathered a tremendous amount of information throughout the educational phase. Expert panelists, the public and Task Force members themselves have identified specific problems and corresponding solutions. In an effort to provide the PSTF members with a comprehensive recording of the proceedings to date, and the foundational information to begin deliberations, staff prepared a tally of identified problems/solutions. The spreadsheet is formatted with the following information.

Problem	Solution	Who	Description	Type*	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Categorized problem	Identified solution with origin noted	Who may operationalize solution	Summary description	Type of crime prevention technique*	How program/success is measured	Cost estimate	What other communities are doing or have done

The category “crime prevention technique*” has been added to familiarize the PSTF members with the nomenclature used to describe many of the solutions identified to date. With this information, the PSTF can begin to think about who operationalizes recommendations and but also if recommendations are diverse in nature, from prevention (upstream) to enforcement and interventions of those in custody (downstream). A brief description of the four types of crime prevention approaches is included as a reference (borrowed from *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention Programs: A Literature Review*, Thomas Gabor, LLC).

- 1. Developmental Crime Prevention (also referred to as Social Prevention).** Measures subsumed within this approach promote the well-being of people and encourage pro-social behavior through social, economic, health, and educational measures, with particular emphasis on children and youth. The goal is to intervene early in the lives of at-risk individuals and groups so as to forestall the development of crime and other behavioral problems later on (Homel, 2005). The focus is on risk and protective factors associated with criminal behavior, including personality factors, parental, peer, and school-related factors.

2. **Community or Locally-Based Crime Prevention (also referred to as neighborhood initiatives).** This approach tackles the neighborhood conditions that influence offending and insecurity by drawing on the commitment and resources of community members. These efforts can range from organizing neighborhood watch programs to neighborhood revitalization efforts (e.g., Weed and Seed) and comprehensive programs that seek to improve neighborhood cohesion and image (Schlossman et al., 1984).
3. **Situational Crime Prevention (also referred to as enforcement and environmental design) .** This approach seeks to prevent the occurrence of crimes by reducing opportunities for crime, increasing the risks of being apprehended, raising the level of effort required to commit crimes, and minimizing the benefits from crime. Included here are such measures as target hardening, access control, surveillance, and prevention through environmental design (Clark, 1997). Situational crime prevention can be undertaken by members of the public, businesses, schools, and other facilities. It can be facilitated through a detailed analysis of specific crime to determine vulnerabilities of a specific target or site ward the end of the developin customized countermeasures.
4. **Crime Prevention Through the Justice System (also referred to recidivism reduction).** Crime prevention measures may also originate from the justice system. Targeted law enforcement strategies may focus on specific crimes or crime “hot spots”. Legal sanctions may have a deterrent effect and incarceration may exercise an incapacitation effect by removing offenders from society. In addition, interventions in custody and community settings may be designed to change offender behavior and thereby prevent recidivism.

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Unsolved Violent Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional involvement 2. Additional surveillance 3. Anonymous Crime Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City/Neighborhood 2. City/Neighborhood 3. City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage witnesses to communicate with the PD by offering more/higher rewards. 2. Additional security cameras 3. Nixle Application for mobile devices provide a unique, convenient and anonymous way to report criminal activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevention through justice system. 2. Situational Prevention 3. Prevention through justice system. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A US DOJ study (http://1.usa.gov/1cazuMI). 2. LA study (http://bit.ly/1f3Vmu3) 3. http://www.nixle.com/
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commission a Study 2. Alternative housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City/County 2. City/County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There could be a study commissioned by the Council that would examine cost savings in regards to housing and treatment for serial inebriates/chronic offenders as opposed to emergency services and jail time. 2. Alternative housing could include a sanctuary camp, or other housing alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community/Local prevention 2. Community/Local prevention 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Justice Policy Institute (http://bit.ly/1dor1D3). 2. Portland, OR (http://bit.ly/dgyxRi).
Under utilized public areas/facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety 2. Reprogramming 3. Reactivation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City/County 2. City 3. City/Neighborhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase sidewalk space and bicycle routes, particularly inbetween populated areas and schools. 2. Santa Cruz needs to tackle its serious green space issue, such as Pogonip. Reprogramming could happen through continued investment, work and revival. 3. Reinstate public trust in safety of public areas/facilities. Includes better enforcement of laws. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Situational prevention 2. Situational prevention 3. Situational prevention 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City of Hendersonville, TN (http://bit.ly/1g8TUFx) 2. California and Georgia (http://bit.ly/GBZrq6).
Anti-Social Behavior Around HSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heightened attention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need at least First Alarm around HSC, particularly around meal time. Also, potentially use drug dogs to eradicate the RVs around this area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevention through justice system 			

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Crime Prevention	<p>1. Heightened security</p> <p>2. Early Intervention</p> <p>3. Night walks</p>	<p>1. City/Neighborhood</p> <p>2. City/Neighborhood</p> <p>3. Neighborhood</p>	<p>1. Implementation of signs, security cameras, bolstered lighting and automatic license plate readers at intersections.</p> <p>2. Schools are a major resource in early intervention. Any extra resources that can be added to the schools will help dramatically. Also, prenatal care and kindergarten are very important.</p> <p>3. Heightened communal attention will better allow reporting of crimes, interaction with neighbors and a heightened sense of security.</p>	<p>1. Situational prevention</p> <p>2. Developmental prevention</p> <p>3. Community/Local prevention</p>			<p>1. "A large university campus in northern England" (http://bit.ly/18N0xb2).</p> <p>2. Washington (http://bit.ly/18YSQPI).</p> <p>3. Boston (http://bit.ly/176UUTx).</p>
Alcohol Outlets	<p>1. Reduce number of alcohol outlets.</p>	<p>1. City</p>	<p>1. Work with planning and zoning committees to redefine and eliminate future high risk alcohol outlets.</p>	<p>1. Situational prevention</p>			<p>1. A study covering 1,637 zip code areas in California (http://bit.ly/18Sy2Yd).</p>
Substance Abuse	<p>1. Education</p> <p>2. Rehabilitation Refocus</p> <p>3. Easier Access to Assistance</p> <p>4. Increase funding</p> <p>5. Drug Court</p>	<p>1. City/Neighborhoods</p> <p>2. City/County</p> <p>3. City/County</p> <p>4. City/County</p> <p>5. City/County</p>	<p>1. The community needs to better understand the benefits of treatment over incarceration.</p> <p>2. Rehabilitation should treat substance abuse as a disease, ease on its punishment. Treatment should include job training, education, help with reentry, etc.</p> <p>3. More accessible and affordable methadone clinics, more needle exchange locations with a simplified program, strengthened access to free food, water and shelter.</p> <p>4. Increase funding to address the empty bed problem. Also increase funding for overall treatment, for it is noted to be significantly cheaper than incarceration.</p> <p>5. A strengthened drug court will better allow the court system to address the judicial needs of substance abusers.</p>	<p>1. Community/Local prevention</p> <p>2. Situational prevention</p> <p>3. Situational prevention</p> <p>4. Situational prevention</p> <p>5. Prevention through justice system</p>			<p>1. Department of Justice (http://bit.ly/1fOslhK)</p> <p>2. See above.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>5. Nationwide study (http://bit.ly/GAHyZ3).</p>

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Substance Abuse Cont.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> SIP Funding Sober Center 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> City/County City/County 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase funding for the Serial Inebriate Program (SIP). A sober center has been implemented in Santa Barbara and should be considered 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Situational prevention Situational prevention 			
Tolerance for Underage/illicit Substance Use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Education 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> City/County & Neighborhoods 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Widespread implementation of community education, especially in regards to underage alcohol use and marijuana use. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Community/Local prevention 			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (Only the abstract is available) (http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hec.1126/abstract) and (http://bit.ly/1fOvOSV).
Lack of Collaboration with Courts and Treatment Programs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative treatment 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> City/County 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In order to keep people in treatment, make the programs more attractive and work closely with the criminal justice system. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention through justice system 			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> California (http://bit.ly/4tp5Rr) and Iowa (http://bit.ly/1fOyekn).
Social Services	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in implementing homeless services. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> City 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Potential changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of (a) an identification system (b) a registry protocol currently used in Santa Cruz motels to give police and service providers a better sense of who is using the facility, and (c) rules that prioritize services for residents of Santa Cruz County over people from outside the area – with an exception for the winter emergency shelter and victims of domestic violence who are in imminent danger. We propose that the City designate a police officer to meet regularly with the Homeless Services Center staff to identify homeless individuals who are engaging in criminal behavior and coordinate actions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Situational prevention 			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> City of Champaign, examples of best practices (http://bit.ly/159RO3H).

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Social Services Cont.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't support any new homeless service facilities in the City of Santa Cruz. We believe that other jurisdictions in Santa Cruz County need to share equally in the costs and location of social services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with property owners of public housing to screen current and prospective tenants for serious criminal history. • Partnering with the County to continue and expand funding for mental health outreach workers. • Expand the ""Homeward Bound"" program using San Francisco's model to provide more bus tickets • We are requesting that the County Jail return their prisoners to their community of origin upon completion of their sentence. • Finally, ask the judicial system to provide a monthly list of offenders who have failed to appear in court, so that the City Attorney can prosecute them under the City's repeat offender law. 				
Social Services Cont. 2	2. Educate public on unintended consequences of direct charity	2. City/Neighborhood	2. Citizens need to understand that personal charitable giving (not to/through an organization/association) often causes more issues and only perpetuates the challenges of homelessness.	2. Community/Local prevention			
Justice System	1. Veterans' Court	1. City/County	1. VA support and other administrations/organizations can help with this. San Luis Obispo is a good City to look at who has implemented a veterans' court.	1. Prevention through justice system			1. San Luis Obispo County (http://bit.ly/GCDLe1).
Lack of Neighborhood Involvement	1. Streets Team	1. City/Neighborhood	1. A collaboration among social service agencies, government agencies, individual communities and private sectors.	1. Community/Local prevention			1. Boston has a Streets Team (http://1.usa.gov/1fJWCnl).

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Lack of Funding/Resources	1. Social Impact Bonds (SIB)	1. City/County	1. SIBs raise private investment capital to fund crime prevention and early intervention programs that reduce the need for expensive crisis responses and safety-net services. This is accomplished by aligning the interests of nonprofit service providers, private investors, and government. The government repays investors only if the interventions improve social outcomes, such as reducing homelessness or the number of repeat offenders in the criminal justice system. If improved outcomes are not achieved, the government is not required to repay the investors, thereby transferring the risk of funding prevention services to the private sector and ensuring accountability for taxpayer money.	1. Situational prevention			1. Nationwide implementation (http://bit.ly/1fWmlng).
Geographic Concentration of Criminal Activity	1. Strategic and Proven Approaches to Crime Fighting 2. Regulatory Approach to Populated Crime Areas	1. City 2. City	1. Crimes that are susceptible to regulation should have four regulations: measurable, important, concentrated and preventable. Crimes should be frequent or very serious. Decide who will regulate places, police, a third party, etc. Ensure that there is evidence to problem/solutions. 2. A regulatory approach to crime places has the potential to lower the cost to taxpayers of reducing crime by shifting costs from governments to the relatively few place owners whose actions create crime-facilitating conditions.	1. Prevention through justice system 2. Situational prevention			1. Overview (not region specific), (http://bit.ly/1dZ1FhX). 2. Policy portfolio (http://bit.ly/19EJrgA).

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Difficulties in Police Strategies	<p>1. The Broken Windows Approach Applied to Municipal Code Infractions</p> <p>2. Strategic and Directed Policing Models</p> <p>3. Hot Spots Policing and Problem Oriented Policing</p>	<p>1. City/Neighborhood</p> <p>2. City</p> <p>3. City</p>	<p>1. The broken windows approach does not always mitigate violent crimes, though if it is applied coorrectly it can reduce property crime. Non-traffic citations reduce property crime, often more effectively than the broken windows approach.</p> <p>2. Strategic and directed policing models (e.g., COMPSTAT, hot spot policing, etc.) may be more effective in crime reduction efforts than reactive policing methods. Crime control models are more effective in lesening total and property crime rates, though less so for violent crime rates.</p> <p>3. Hot spots policing generates small, but noteworthy, crime reductions. Problem oriented policing interventions generate larger mean effect sizes when compared to interventions that simply increase levels of traditional police actions in crime hot spots.</p>	<p>1. Prevention through justice system</p> <p>2. Situational prevention</p> <p>3. Situational prevention</p>			<p>1. Dallas (http://bit.ly/17VPYQz).</p> <p>2. City of Perris, CA (http://bit.ly/19Eie8Z).</p> <p>3. Multiple national locations and one international location (http://bit.ly/1azY6hu).</p>

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Difficulties in Police Strategies Cont.	4. Pulling Levers	4. City	4. Pulling levers focused deterrence strategies (targeting high offenders) seem to be effective in reducing crime	4. Situational prevention			4. Multiple locations, though Highpoint, NC was of particular interest (http://1.usa.gov/1a03GVu).
	5. Situational Crime Prevention Techniques	5. City	5. Situational crime prevention techniques comprise opportunity-reducing measures that (1) are directed at highly specific forms of crime, and that (2) involve the management, design, or manipulation of the immediate environment in as systematic and permanent way as possible so as to (3) increase the effort and risks of crime and reduce the rewards as perceived by a wide range of offenders.	5. Situational prevention			5. Multiple locations (http://bit.ly/14COBf4).
	6. Increase Police Force	6. City	6. Extra police, as in both a presence and actual size of force, have the abilities to significantly reduce crime. Hiring more police officers also hold the ability to reduce costs on residents. Use of additional police officers impact their capabilities. Also, for the City's population, Santa Cruz has significantly less officers than the average city.	6. Prevention through justice system			6. Observations made nationally (http://1.usa.gov/19fUM9V & http://bit.ly/TX4O7D).

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Difficulties in Police Strategies Cont. 2	7. Five Phases for Police	7. City	<p>7. Phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information and communication phase, allows the officer to get to know the community. • Problem analysis. Data that is collected during phase one is used to find cause of neighborhood issues. • Phase three: engage community. • Phase four, the stabilization phase. Stabilizing the neighborhood is centered on identifying key stakeholders, key residents that care deeply about the future of their community. Once those people have been identified, the neighborhood officer helps connect them with community resources and support to ensure their success. • The fifth phase is the maintenance and monitoring phase. Resources are reduced as the neighborhood begins to sustain itself. By going through the first four phases, crime decreases, community involvement increases, and the need for neighborhood officers is all but eliminated. 	7. Prevention through Justice System			7. Madison, WI is the location of focus (http://bit.ly/1bOg8wX).

Problem	Task Force, Panelist, & Public Solutions	Who	Description	Type	Measurement	Cost	Case Studies
Municipal Codes	1. Consider Ventura's Safe and Clean Initiative	1. City	1. • Redirecting limited law enforcement resources: Focused police presence is reducing criminal and antisocial behavior; with emphasis on behavior not residential status. • Redirecting limited maintenance resources to better maintain clean public spaces. • Partnering with community resources to activate public spaces • Strengthening collaboration with the County, social service agencies and faith-based organizations to support both “place-based” social services and supplement those services by assertive street outreach teams. • Reinforce social services and philanthropic giving toward the philosophy of a hand-up, not a hand-out	1. Situational prevention			1. Ventura, CA (http://bit.ly/18QgqzF).
	2. Banning Vehicle Dwellings	2. City	2. Banning vehicle dwellings could help clean streets and contribute to the sense of a clean and safe neighborhood.	2. Prevention through justice system			2. Palo Alto, CA (http://bit.ly/1c8jniQ).

Recommended Process for Deliberations

Treasurer Fred Keeley has been asked to recommend an process approach for the deliberative phase. To prepare the Task Force for discussions around process, Mr. Keeley has provided a memo summarizing his recommended approach and the roles of each participant. Mr. Keeley will present the process recommendation at the meeting and be available to answer questions from the PSTF.

To: Santa Cruz City – Public Safety Task Force

From: Fred Keeley

Re: Report Process

Date: October 3, 2013

Thank you for your excellent work to date in helping our community to understand and make progress on the range of public safety challenges facing the City of Santa Cruz.

As you began your six month process of examining public safety issues within the City of Santa Cruz, the Mayor asked that I provide you with a bit of assistance relative to your process. As you remember, she was kind enough to ask that I attend your first public meeting, and share some overarching thoughts as to management of your process, and “what you are managing toward”.

In that regard, I recommended that you divide your work in to two fundamental elements. First, to gather information from a wide range of sources concerning both problems and solutions. Second, that you organize your final work product such that your recommendations provide clear problem statements, clear recommendation for solutions, and that the solutions be measurable.

When your Task Force Chair asked that I make a second appearance, in a formal capacity, at your meeting, I recommended that you consider thinking of your solutions in four “buckets”: 1) Those recommendations that could be implemented through the current budgetary and legal authorities of the City of Santa Cruz; 2) Those recommendations that could be implemented through the current budgetary and legal authorities of the County of Santa Cruz; 3) Those recommendations that would provide neighborhoods with tools for self-help; and, 4) Those recommendations that would require voter approval.

Now that you have, essentially, completed the very major task of gathering vast amounts of information and testimony regarding the nature of the many public safety challenges facing the community, and hearing many recommendations for improving the safety of all members of the community, you are embarking on the report-writing phase of your work.

To assist you in that process, and understanding that you and you alone are the individuals who will decide on the characterization of both the problems and the solutions, I have been asked to suggest a process for completing that portion of your charge.

The process that I recommend is a form of legislative process. This is a process that has been used to both make law (calling on my experience representing this community in the California State Legislature), and for resolving complex community issues (calling on the experience that led to a successful resolution of the “third high school” issue in the Pajaro Valley, and the water challenges on the Monterey Peninsula in Monterey County).

Roles:

1. **Public Safety Task Force Members.** You are the decision-makers. The City of Santa Cruz has vested in you the responsibility to gather information, accept testimony, reach your own conclusions, and report to the Mayor and City Council. The process going forward recognizes these facts and respects them.
2. **City Staff.** Staff assigned by the City Manager has been and will continue to be responsible for providing you with the most comprehensive information, best practices from other communities, and responding to other requests you have that will assist you in fulfilling your task.
3. **Chair and Vice-Chair.** Your Task Force has elected two officers, the Chair and the Vice-Chair. These two individuals have responsibility for presiding at your meetings, and managing the flow of information between City staff and the Task Force.
4. **Convener.** The new role being established by your Task Force is for a Convener to set forth a process for your approval that will lead to the adoption by the Task Force of a final report and recommendations to the Mayor and City Council. **NOTE: It is not the role of the Convener to direct your work or shape your recommendations. The Convener’s role is process, not content.**

Process:

1. **Draft Report.** The City Staff will provide you with several documents that serve as the record of your proceedings. That includes a three-ring binder of the minutes of your meetings, and additional material that you have requested. Additionally, a spread-sheet of the issues and suggestions that have been presented to you over the course of your public meetings and correspondence. Lastly, the City Staff will provide you with a preliminary draft report. It is important to note that the preliminary draft report is to serve as a beginning point of your deliberations, not as a constraint in any way on the content of your final report.

2. **Timing.** Beginning on October 16th, and continuing on October 23rd and October 30th, the Task Force will work through each line and page of the preliminary draft report, using a “tentative agreement” format for each line and page. In other words, you will, as a group, edit the work (adding, subtracting, and making other edits that accurately reflect the collective thinking of the Task Force).
3. **Tentative Agreement and Edits.** As you move through the document, the Task Force will be asked to indicate those elements where you have Tentative Agreement, and those items which you Edit as you move forward. You reserve the right as individual Task Force members and as a full Task Force to return to any items in the report, regardless of whether or not you reached Tentative Agreement on the item. (It is recommended that you not re-open TA items lightly.)
4. **Motions.** The current membership of the Task Force is fourteen (14). A majority is eight (8). While it is suggested that you resolve as many issues as possible by consensus, a majority vote will prevail. It is suggested that both TA’s and Edits be brought forth through motions, with seconds, discussion/debate, and adoption or rejection. It is suggested that with regard to motions, that you adopt a process whereby motions can be amended in the first degree, and that substitute motions be considered in order. This will allow your Task Force to identify issues where there are minor or major differences.
5. **Caucus.** In order to provide the maximum opportunity for reaching consensus on your final work product, it is suggested that you adopt a “Caucus” procedure. This would be, in effect, a “time out” at any point in your proceedings, except for during a roll call vote, where any Task Force member could call a “Caucus”. This would temporarily suspend your work for five to ten minutes, so Task Force members would discuss one or more items in a less formal setting. It is suggested that you consider adopting a limit of three (3) Caucuses during each Wednesday night session, and that no Task Force member could call for more than a single Caucus in a single meeting.
6. **Staff Direction.** It is suggested that as your Task Force closes in on the Final Report and Recommendations, that you direct staff to prepare cost estimates, such that the Mayor and City Council, as well as other interested parties, can see the implications of both individual and cumulative recommendations.