



## **PUBLIC SAFETY CITIZEN TASK FORCE PUBLIC MEETING**

**Wednesday, October 23, 2013**

**6:00 p.m.**

Santa Cruz Civic Center Tony Hill Room  
307 Church Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

### **MINUTES**

#### **I. Chair Reyes Call to Order**

1. Meeting called to order at 6:15 p.m. by Chair Reyes.
2. Second meeting of the deliberative/legislative process.
3. Task Force members absent: Dennis Smith, Rod Libbey and Kristen Long.

#### **II. Approval of October 16, 2013 Minutes**

1. October 16, 2013 Minutes approved.

#### **III. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Second Draft Narrative**

1. Perhaps begin work this evening on the second page, line 53. If there could be one motion to approve everything up to and including recommendation 10 on page 6, then a discussion could be opened on this. This includes the work that was done last week.
2. A motion is made to approve page 2 and 3 of the second draft of the policy recommendation. Not yet seconded.
3. Another motion could be to approve tentative agreements on pages 2 -5, up to and including recommendation 7.
4. A motion to approve the second draft of the staff report from pages 1-4, and up to line 7 on page 5, including a tentative agreement. This motion is seconded and is now under discussion.
5. Not comfortable with the language on page 3 lines 110-112. Would like "...use of discretionary social service provisions by individuals who routinely victimize the community, are currently evading the criminal justice system, and who demonstrate no desire to change their behavior" struck from the document.
6. There is an objection, because the language in question represents a certain individual that the TF has learned about through various presentations. Perhaps the wording can be changed.
7. Consider agreeing that there is not an agreement on page 3 lines 110-112 and the TF will return to it on another evening.
8. A potential edit to lines 110-112 includes removing "routinely victimize the community" and "demonstrate no real desire to change their behavior" because they are vague.
9. Set it aside and work on it at a later date. Lines 110-112 are not in the motion. They are neither approved nor disapproved.

10. Page 2 line 82, change "...an investment in our youth is paramount to reducing future crime," to "...an investment in our youth is part of the strategy to reduce future crime."
11. There is no objection to this and it will be added to the motion.
12. Page 3, lines 130 and 131, the link that is made between education and crime reduction is large. Potential language would include "in addition to community wide education on how to identify and report mentally ill people who pose a threat to the public and themselves, how to identify gang related activity in homes, neighborhoods and classrooms, and how to talk to children about gangs."
13. Those examples do not have to be permanent, though the substitution language is agreeable.
14. There is an objection to the statement "...education on how to identify and report mentally ill people who pose a threat to the public and themselves..." in terms of a public safety issue. Also, the expectation of education on this subject is inappropriate.
15. Would like to see the notion of "see something, say something" in this section. Would like to raise awareness to the community that they are part of the solution, and if they see something, they should call 911. Perhaps separate the mentioning of gangs from the rest of this recommendation.
16. What would happen if we removed the words "mentally ill" and replace with "people?" The statement will still be strong.
17. Without objection, include the motion but strike the words "mentally ill." This will be accepted in lieu of the language that is in lines 130 and 131.
18. Would like to see something further in the report that reflects a campaign encouraging people to engage in the community in regards to "see something say something."
19. Page 3, lines 142 and 143, change "...marginalized and under-represented communities in Santa Cruz," to "...communities in the highest crime areas and to engage with marginalized and underrepresented groups."
20. There is no debate or deliberation on this addition to the motion.
21. Page 2, line 69, what is the word "programming" referring to? Could terms like "opportunities" or "involvement" be used instead?
22. Perhaps replace "programming" with "programs."
23. What are pro-social activities?
24. Pro-social activities are activities where people engage in positive activities that include a wide variety of programs. It is a term widely used in social services.
25. Page 2, line 87, the word "programming" reappears, wonder if "pro-social programs" would be an appropriate substitution.
26. No objection
27. Line 94, Pacific Avenue should be included in this section. It should be mentioned because it is an important part of our community.
28. No objection and it is included.
29. Is the use of the term "reform" in terms of truancy policies in recommendation 7, truancy enforcement, page 5, appropriate? Would "enhance truancy policies" be a better fit? Reforming the policies implies that they are not currently sufficient enough. There is not enough information for the TF to decide if those policies are sufficient or not.
30. We can have more information on existing policies available soon.
31. Replace "reform" with "strengthen and enhance..."
32. No objection.

33. Page 2, line 68, add "...and alcohol..." to "...enhancement of drug..." On line 71, the word "reactivation" seems to be a very fitting term. Can we change the section to "Environmental Design and Reactivation of Public Spaces?"
34. The meaning of line 72 is vague. It might relate to previous lines that the TF is setting aside. Can the TF come back to this?
35. In the motion, line 72 will not be agreed to and the TF will address that later. It is not deleted from the document and it is not included in the motion as a tentative agreement.
36. No objection.
37. Line 74, what if we change the wording "...the Task Force believes..." to "...the Task Force finds..." Also apply this to all places within the document.
38. No objection.
39. Line 89, make sure that "reprogramming" is changed to "reactivation." To clarify, this is because reprogramming is a little more vague than reactivation, which implies a positive use of public spaces.
40. Apply this throughout the document.
41. No objection.
42. Page 3, line 127, consider "...the Task Force recommends an outreach/social marketing campaign in coordination with County Health and the schools, towards parents and children to decrease drug abuse..."
43. No objection.
44. In order to not limit the previous suggestion, consider stating "County partners."
45. No objection.
46. In the spreadsheet under the Youth Programming section, recommend "Instruct the Parks and Recreation Department to develop an outreach strategy that targets underserved youth with a goal to involve them in more parks and recreation programs." This is because the Parks and Recreation Department waits for people to come to them, rather than proactively going to individuals. It should stand-alone so it does not lose its emphasis.
47. The Parks and Recreation Department does have a scholarship. Councilmember Terrazas set aside \$10,000 for this. At the time, it was not fully taken advantage of. Outreach would be important here.
48. Include that the language both be in English and in Spanish for this scholarship.
49. FoPr does a really good job administering the programs there, however, the City is not promoting them very well.
50. Still on the Parks and Recreation addition, the outreach program should lower barriers to entry. Two barriers that have not been mentioned are the location of programs and the hours/duration of programs. Language has been added.
51. In this same recommendation, include language that reaches out to some local non-profits.
52. This language could be "...reaching out to non-profits to provide scholarships..."
53. It does not necessarily have to be a scholarship, just some sort of funding.
54. If the TF is reaching out to non-profits, shouldn't we be addressing businesses as well? This is because non-profits seem to have target groups, where businesses would not.
55. Ensure that future Parks and Recreation plans include ability to expand parks and availability of facilities.
56. No objection.
57. Amend the last section, to make the long range Parks and Recreation plan more clear. Insert "...appropriate facilities for demographic trends and increased percentage of participation."
58. No objection.

59. Like the issue of businesses and non-profits to be separate. It seems to be a three pronged approach, and if it is not addressed that way, it could get lost in the City Council.
  60. No objection.
  61. Would like lines 99-105 on page 3 to be set-aside until later. There is no tentative agreement on these and they will not be included in the motion.
  62. No objection.
  63. The motion passed to proceed with the narrative as discussed.
- IV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 8
1. Would like to see Pacific Avenue included in recommendation 8.
  2. There is a study on Pacific Avenue recently and its design (particularly the direction of traffic). It could be applicable to this.
  3. Does the report address areas of high crime rate? Is there anything with emphasis on specific crime? Would prefer to keep recommendation 8 as it is with the addition of Pacific Avenue.
  4. The CPTED report on the San Lorenzo Riverway is not specifically addressed in this report. It has been broken up into different areas. However, the recommendations are already in the report and would like to see that directly referenced.
  5. No objection.
  6. Still in regards to recommendation 8, use the language "... developing CPTED strategies to address high crime rates."
  7. No objection.
  8. In recommendations 8 and 9, add the term "external" to "review."
  9. No objection.
  10. Consider changing "review" to "audit." This would be a programmatic audit.
  11. In reference to recommendation 8, would like to see something regarding an increase in public youth included. This recommendation should not just focus on safety for the sake of safety (e.g. building fencing) but in a sense that promotes a positive use of the area.
  12. In recommendation 8, consider changing "...for safety with specific emphasis on areas of high crime rates..." to "... to minimize illegal behavior and promote positive use...."
  13. No objection.
  14. Motion carries with amendments for item 8.
- V. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 9
1. Not sure where recommendation 9 has come from. Motion to delete this recommendation.
  2. No second. A motion to amend is made.
  3. Why should the transportation hub be called out if the TF has already listed Pacific Avenue as a focal point?
  4. The project focusing on the metro center in downtown would have a large enough impact on public safety that it deserves our attention.
  5. What does new transit hub actually refer to?
  6. The Santa Cruz Metropolitan District is currently rethinking the multi modal transit center on Pacific Avenue.
  7. Recommendation 9 should be amended to recommendation 8 to "Instruct the City to work with the Metro Department to ensure that the hub has all of the necessary safety precautions."
  8. This is an opportunity to put public safety as an important highlight during the rethinking of the hub.
  9. Recommend taking an external expert to review those plans.

10. Perhaps take the preamble to recommendation 8 and insert it in the beginning of 9. Also include the language “external review” that was also used in recommendation 8.
  11. Do the City’s representatives that are sitting on the metropolitan board have the expertise to fully prioritize safety elements in the new process?
  12. It consists of City Council members, County Supervisors and private transit operators on the board. They would help oversee this project.
  13. The motion carries with amendments for item 9.
- VI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 10
1. Where it says “City-wide lighting improvement project, can we include green (high-efficiency) designs?”
  2. Object, because the TF should focus 100% on public safety and not get distracted by other subjects.
  3. Can we include the language “if possible...?”
  4. This could interrupt other recommendations.
  5. A caucus is called.
  6. Keep the language “high efficiency design...”
  7. Suggest removing the second bullet point.
  8. What exactly is the last bullet point, “City promotion of recreational programs in greenbelt areas with illegal encampments,” referring to?
  9. This is in reference to the multi-use trail that was recently implemented in Pogonip. It seems to have been very successful.
  10. Perhaps remove the language “illegal encampments” because there should be a promotion of recreational programs regardless if there are illegal encampments or not.
  11. No objection, that language is deleted.
  12. In the eighth bullet point, include the language “residential and...” before “commercial areas.”
  13. Also include “Neighborhood Revitalization Strategic Areas.”
  14. What is the meaning of the sixth bullet point stating “Increased collaboration and financial support of volunteer cleanup efforts.”
  15. There are certain community service groups that do community cleanups. When they remove the trash to the dump, they are fined. The City should try and coordinate with their efforts to help support their efforts.
  16. This should perhaps be directly stated in the bullet point; otherwise this point is too vague.
  17. There is more than one group that is in reference here.
  18. Would it be substantial to add examples?
  19. Perhaps increase City “coordination” instead of “collaboration...”
  20. Consider including coordination with social services.
  21. Perhaps use the term “outreach” to help cover a broader spectrum of coordination.
  22. Would the language “social services outreach” work?
  23. There should be a City mechanism to help establish a support system for volunteer individuals and groups. This way individuals can avoid potential harm, for they could be entering potentially dangerous situations. The City should supply some sort of information, oversight, etc.
  24. This bullet point should be flagged and the staff should return to it later.
  25. In the opening for recommendation 10, where it says “implementation of study recommendations,” are those the same studies as the external review referred to in recommendation 8?
  26. Yes, that is the intent.
  27. That should be directly referenced to clarify.

28. Motion is passed with amendments for recommendation 10.

VII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 11

1. The link between the data and survey that will be conducted and how it will affect City policy is not apparent.
2. The argument that the City is a magnet for criminal activity, however, that argument is not very persuasive. Perhaps this item will help add some substance to that argument, regardless if it helps confirm or deny it.
3. How would the City survey individuals' criminal activities and their place of residence?
4. Perhaps consider ending all of the bullet points that are undesirable.
5. The City added some particular questions to the Community Assessment Project survey. What does the City ask?
6. There is no determination for knowing how long someone has lived in Santa Cruz through CAP.
7. Doesn't the homeless census ask that?
8. No, it asks if an individual is a resident of the County.
9. What is the relevance to public safety with this question? This is not apparent unless it is directly related to criminal behavior.
10. Consider having the City take on this project another time. Homeless services are a County responsibility.
11. An addition to these services should be a requirement for some type of an identification card. This would allow the collection of information.
12. This is currently in process.
13. Through the nature of discussion, it sounds like the TF might want to strike recommendation 11.
14. The language would be struck and replaced with new language.
15. The connection to public safety is still a matter of concern here.
16. The motion to approve the new language for this recommendation is passed.
17. The discussion on this topic should be reopened later.

VIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 12-14

1. These next recommendations are very controversial. Keep in mind that they are a summary of what has been received so far.
2. Is the needle exchange program part of the County's Strategic Plan?
3. It does not seem so, because the County is working on alcohol and drug treatment. The needle exchange is operated out of the Health Services Agency; it is a totally different department.
4. In recommendation 14, consider striking the language "...regarding the future of needle exchange."
5. Recommendations 12 and/or 14, the verbiage needs to be reworked because the City has no control over the program. The wording needs to reflect what the TF wants the City to do in the realm of what it can do. The TF cannot simply state "end needle exchange."
6. What is the direction you are taking in this issue?
7. In the event that the TF moves forward with this point, for recommendation 12, consider some sort of language that captures the idea of the City Council influencing the County regarding the future activities of the needle exchange program.
8. Direct the staff to have two other new pieces of work so far. This will include a look at the four buckets (who is responsible for implementing what programs). Secondly, this will include an inventory including the systems (criminal justice, etc.) and what they will consist of. From a systems point of view, the needle

exchange is a County Health Services project and therefore that information would be included.

9. This would be a visual representation of what the TF has done and heard so far.
10. It would better allow the TF to pick up the pace as well.
11. Personal Comment: I believe that the needle exchange program is a public health tool. However, the public's outcry over inappropriately discarded needles cannot be ignored. The 1-1 needle exchange was shocking. It is not a true 1-1 exchange, it seems like a lot of needles are being exchanged.
12. The County has only released a three-month report regarding the needle exchange. Unfortunately, this does not seem like a sufficient amount of time to provide an accurate evaluation of the SOS program.
13. A motion to make a substitute for items 12 and 13 with the following language: "Instruct the City staff and Council to work with County and the third and fifth district Supervisors' offices, to 1) ensure best practices are in place for needle exchange programs, 2) prevent additional needle exchange programs from operating or opening within the City of Santa Cruz and 3) mitigate impacts of existing needle exchange program to the City of Santa Cruz's public spaces and neighborhoods."
14. This is because telling the City Council to get rid of the needle exchange within its borders is unrealistic. The TF should recommend that the Council work very aggressively and proactively with the County and the Board of Supervisors to ensure this is done in the best possible way.
15. The language in items 12 and 13 would be struck and replaced with the language just mentioned if the motion is passed.
16. Objection, the language in recommendation 12 should include "...ending needle exchange and ending SOS within the City's borders." It does not have to say what the County can do otherwise, but believe that the City has the power to control its own borders. The City is dealing with an epidemic of hypodermic drug use. It is in fact one of the underlying reasons why the TF was formed. There needs to be some bold statements to combat mentioned issues. Exchanges of needles should be ended by both private and public entities in the City. The impression from literature seems to be that a lot of research was done when it was very difficult to get a hold of needles. Now needles are easy to get a hold of and are extremely cheap relative to hypodermic substance abuse. The public health impact may be minimal, but the message that this recommendation would send would be widely impacting. Perhaps not all of the TF's recommendations need to be politically feasible in their entirety.
17. The motion now ignores all language regarding the needle exchange and instead states: "End the needle exchange, including SOS, in the City of Santa Cruz."
18. The current understanding is that SOS is currently operating at the Emeline Center, which the City has no jurisdiction on what occurs in that property.
19. If this is the case, use recommendation 12, as just stated, to send a message.
20. Disagree. Perhaps this is not the message the TF or the residents want to send.
21. Closing the needle exchange program does not seem to be a viable option, it needs to remain available.
22. Consider adding the term "distribution" to the end of the sentence that that the focus is now on needle exchange distribution. It appears that SOS does not distribute within the City, though it does practice home deliveries. The language would include "End needle exchange distribution, including home delivery by Street Outreach Services (SOS), in the City of Santa Cruz.
23. Reluctant to send a message that cannot possibly be accepted. It seems to undermine the TF's work.

24. The other language, that does not recommend eradicating needle exchange programs in their entirety, is the most realistic approach to this problem.
25. Perhaps the City should encourage best practice options and accountability of those who use needles.
26. If the motion to recommend eradicating needle exchange programs within the City does not pass, then that amendment may be added to the previous motion.
27. Maybe being politically correct is not the appropriate approach to the needle exchange problem.
28. The first motion is not based off of political correctness. It simply wants to approach the issue from a realistic standpoint. Both sides view the current issue as being equally crucial to public safety.
29. Part of what the TF needs to do is consider how the media will represent their decisions. This action will get reported outside of Santa Cruz. Also, it is not uncommon for the City Council to partake in foreign affairs.
30. What is the public safety outcome that will occur after ending needle exchange? It is difficult to find a direct link between the needle exchange and the inappropriate discarding of hypodermic needles. In fact, if the needle exchange program were to go away, where would individuals safely discard their used needles? Eradicating the program could in fact increase the number of inappropriately discarded needles.
31. Perhaps the TF should not attempt to ban the needle exchange program, but instead focus on impacting home delivery within the City. The Language could include “Ban needle exchange distribution including home delivery by Street Outreach Services (SOS) in the City of Santa Cruz,” as substitutive language for the motion.
32. This is accepted.
33. A motion can only be passed if there is a majority vote (eight votes out of fourteen members). The threshold is eight votes regardless of absences.
34. A motion to table is made. It should wait until there are more TF members present.
35. The motion to table fails, the votes are tied at five yes and five no votes.
36. Now the TF members are looking at the substitute motion.
37. Every county has some sort of needle exchange program administered. The City cannot get rid of it. The Council can take more of a stand if we take the first substitute motion and include an opening statement that condemns the current program in the way that it currently operates. The TF can look at potentially moving the program out of the City or at least out of a residential area.
38. If there are absences, it will be difficult to pass any type of controversial recommendations. What would be a proper recommendation? It appears the TF entered their decision on the majority threshold naïvely. Can absent individuals vote through phones, email, etc.?
39. No, absent members cannot vote through those means.
40. The substitute (ban) motion fails to pass with four in favor and six against.
41. The first substitute motion is now at hand.
42. Consider including language that addresses the desire to have a true 1-1 ratio exchange. Even though what is in place is considered 1-1, it is actually not.
43. Also include language that encourages individuals to consider alternative treatment options.
44. Best practices do not describe a true 1-1 exchange, because of medical exceptions. If the TF wants to ensure best practices, directly state “a true 1-1 ratio.”
45. Consider the following language: “Ensure best practices that reduce unintended consequences including illegal behavior.”

46. Instead of using the language “illegal behavior” state “discarding needles in public places,” or something along those lines.
  47. This language seems appropriate to allow the Council to aggressively address and mitigate these issues.
  48. Use land-use policy to prevent or limit future needle exchange issues.
  49. Consider adding a color stripe/identification tagging to needle exchange needles to increase accountability of outgoing and incoming needles.
  50. That would be acceptable if it was proven that that is the best way to address accountability with a needle exchange program.
  51. Use the language, “Ensure best practices are in place for needle exchange programs to mitigate impacts to the City’s public spaces and neighborhoods.”
  52. This motion is well crafted, however, it is also a business as usual measure. It does not send a message that the City is changing its mindset on this issue.
  53. Can the sentiment to end the needle exchange program be expressed in the narrative?
  54. This seems to be appropriate.
  55. No objection.
  56. The substitute motion for recommendation 12 passes with eight yes votes and two no votes.
  57. Strike recommendations 13 and 14.
- IX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendations 15-17
1. The TF will present to the City Council at 7 PM on Tuesday December 3<sup>rd</sup>.
  2. A motion is made to table items 15-17 until the next meeting.
  3. The motion passed and the motion is tabled.
- X. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendations 18 & 19
1. A motion to strike recommendation 18 is made. The two recommendations cannot be related. Also, unsure of the meaning of discretionary services. How would one find out if a person has paid their municipal code violation? It does not seem realistic.
  2. It both seems unrealistic and unconstitutional.
  3. Discretionary services are distinguished from services where there is an entitlement if you meet eligibility requirements under state or federal law.
  4. This recommendation seems to be directed towards certain services.
  5. Two years ago, the City undertook a revamping of community programs. It underwent a whole realignment that the programs that the City funded. There is already a social services committee with council members on that committee. This would ensure that work is done within the desired values.
  6. Motion to strike is defeated with seven yes votes and three no votes.
  7. Perhaps other language can be attained.
  8. Recommendation 18 seems to be a part of recommendations 15-17 and should be added to the previous motion to be tabled.
  9. The motion to table recommendation 18 fails with seven yes votes and three no votes.
  10. The last two points of the recommendation are problematic. The recommendation may need to be reworded.
  11. A safety net service is not a discretionary service.
  12. The intent is to refrain from federal services. It may be more sufficient to use the language “non-government mandated.”
  13. The City funds some community programs, which can often only be a miniscule part of the operations of the agencies. The City can express its values through its budget. However, the City cannot control another agency. They may defund them, but they cannot dictate their actions.

14. Targeting one organization does not seem like the correct approach.
15. The City cannot necessarily tell a nonprofit what they may or may not do with their budget.
16. If there is a practice that is effecting or within the City limits that the TF finds to be detrimental, it may suggest that practice ends.
17. The HSC receives a lot of frustration primarily because it is very public. Due to this, the TF needs to address that dynamic in some way. There is also concern over practices by church groups and other organizations.
18. The TF needs to stay focused on what the City can realistically do. There are avenues the City can pursue to address services and programs that are enabling certain behaviors. There is a concern over watering down solutions. This recommendation should not be struck, however, it needs to be reworded.
19. What problem is the TF actually trying to solve? There possibly should be a temporary table to the motion
20. There seems to be no accountability in this issue.
21. Recommendation 18 tries to gain some traction on people who have multiple unpaid violations and failures to appear in court. It addresses the concern over a lack of accountability. The work exchange contract is also an additional attempt to help some individuals by providing them with the dignity of work.
22. Simply an identification card is not sufficient to improve safety standards in and around homeless shelters. Even the addition of a picture to the identification card would significantly increase security.
23. Could the TF table recommendations 18-20 and ask staff to improve and refine the language?
24. The intention of recommendation 20 is different than 18 and 19. The intention is to bring transparency to the process and save some money for the City.
25. That is fair. What about focusing on recommendations 18 and 19 then?
26. If the TF is going to table these two recommendations, their legality should be questioned.
27. No members of the TF want the social programs to go away. However, the small percentage of individuals that the City is enabling that has left the public with a bad taste in their mouths. At some point the TF needs to address some type of wording to show that changes do need to occur.
28. Suggest TF members with opposing viewpoints try and rework the wording on recommendations 18 and 19.
29. No objection. Though, consider phrasing the wording in such a way that it tries to talk about the TF's expectations. Two words that should be reinforced are "accountability" and "transparency."

#### XI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 20

1. A motion is made to strike recommendation 20.
2. This recommendation does not seem related to the TF's public safety mission.
3. The application for the community programs does have questions about leveraging and resources. There is some measure if a program is leveraging resources.
4. There are a lot of adult social services that children rely on. If you remove that safety net for the parents, their children will suffer. Perhaps the City should direct its sources towards youth and substance abuse treatment for a period of two years. This might allow enough time to witness an impact and measure its success. Currently it feels like the City is failing its youth.
5. How does the TF make a big statement without harming children?
6. Instead of saying "no" programs, use the language "phase out" programs.

7. The City is not fully funding any social service programs. Programs are seeking grants and alternative sources of funding. Because of this, there are a lot of programs that would be negatively impacted by this. This recommendation does not seem well thought out. The services that will be impacted need to be identified. What programs is the City providing funding to?
8. The “phase out” language might enable that process.
9. Most social services agencies are doing everything they can to get as many grants as possible. The connection between these programs and public safety is not very clear.
10. The intention of this recommendation was to help take away the troubles with lessening funding. The money that goes to the Human Care Alliance, there certainly are no easy cuts, though there could be a defunding of the Homeless Service Center and could put that money towards the City’s youth. The youth are underserved. There are no clear lines here, and this in itself could impact youth. This could simply be a temporary solution. The City is at a point where it needs to take the limited resources it has and make sure that it is getting to the entities that need them most.
11. Disagree, the idea of the safety net as being vital is important to pay attention to. A process where community programs are directed according to their evaluations should be considered.
12. Some language that could work for this recommendation includes “Ask the City to prioritize funding for specific programs.” This would reward specific programs that follow a specific process that drives towards desired outcomes. The language should be incentive related that rewards certain types of programs that have positive processes.
13. The nexus between recommendations 20 and 21 and public safety is that there is not enough money for the social service sector to do their job effectively. If there were, the TF would not be around the table currently. It is an attempt to dramatically boost social services in the City.
14. There is a flaw in that logic. The case is not entirely revolving around money for social services.
15. There is intent to increase the whole pot (for funding) rather than remove some of the safety net.
16. The motion to strike fails.

## XII. Closing Comments

1. Keep November 6<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> on your calendar, as the TF will meet through those dates.
2. The TF will have to make an assessment on the progress that has been made tonight. Next meeting will have to continue where it was left next week.
3. The TF must finish at least one round before it can really progress.
4. The TF is facing its most difficult task, and it is doing well.
5. If the TF were able to move through the document tonight, the TF would return with system diagrams and the buckets. Because the TF did not accomplish this, it would not be a good use of staff time to prepare those diagrams and buckets. Unless if there is any objection the staff will follow all of the direction on the various items discussed tonight and the TF will continue next meeting where it left off tonight.
6. Neither the diagram nor the buckets will be prepared for the next meeting.
7. No objection.

**Adjournment** -- The Public Safety Citizen Task Force adjourned from the public meeting of October 23, 2013 at 10:05 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for October 30, 2013, 6:00 p.m., Santa Cruz Police Department Community 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 minutes.*