



PUBLIC SAFETY CITIZEN TASK FORCE PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

6:00 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 6:05 p.m. by Chair Reyes.
2. Third meeting of the deliberative/legislative process.
3. Task Force members absent: none

II. Approval of October 23, 2013 Minutes

1. October 23, 2013 Minutes approved with four abstentions.

III. Discussion about Straw Poll

1. Each recommendation will be called for a straw poll. If there is a unanimous agreement/disagreement, then that recommendation will later be added or struck to or from the final product. If there is one disagreement with a recommendation, that recommendation will later be discussed and deliberated.
2. The intent of the straw poll is to quicken the process.
3. Once the entire document has been combed through, then the staff will return the report with diagrams and categorical buckets to the TF. This is to ensure that the TF is addressing every category with recommended systems and that the recommendations are diverse for all four categorical buckets.
4. This process is a good idea. It will help narrow down our options and put a strong emphasis on certain points.
5. There are 85 recommendations. Is it the TF's goal to make recommendations that are reasonable and realistic or recommendations that reflect a wish list of what the TF would like to happen disregarding their likelihood. More direction is needed in order to proceed more efficiently and cohesively. What is the desired end result of the report?
6. At this point, aim the recommendations towards the wish list idea. Then the recommendations can pass through the City Council and Attorney's office where they can be better refined.
7. The TF does not seem to be in coherence regarding its final product.
8. Everyone's desire for the end report might be different. There will likely need to be some leeway. We have to acknowledge that the TF is compiled of 15 very different people.

9. There should be some sort of an agreement within the TF in regards to what direction we should take to get to a cohesive end result. If the TF is fighting over 85 recommendations instead of five or ten, then the whole process will be diluted.
10. The straw poll will help reduce redundancy.
11. The TF needs a transparent process to go through this list. A discussion about buckets, tallying, etc. should be considered.
12. The importance of ranking should not be a priority at the moment.
13. The straw poll is the TF's chance to express its desire to address different recommendations.

IV. Straw Polls and Discussion

1. There is at least one objection to recommendations 18 through 20. They will be addressed later.
2. There is no objection to recommendation 21. It will be included in the report by agreement.
3. There is at least one objection to recommendations 22 through 25. They will be addressed later.
4. There is no objection to recommendation 26. It will be included in the report by agreement.
5. There is at least one objection to recommendations 27 through 29. It will be addressed later.
6. There is no objection to recommendation 30. It will be included in the report by agreement.
7. There is at least one objection to recommendations 31 through 46. They will be addressed later.
8. There are no objections to recommendations 47 and 48. They will be included in the report by agreement.
9. There is at least one objection to recommendations 49 through 53. They will be addressed later.
10. There are no objections to recommendations 54 and 55. They will be included in the report by agreement.
11. There is at least one objection to recommendations 56 through 63. They will be addressed later.
12. There is no objection to recommendation 64. It will be included in the report by agreement.
13. There is at least one objection to recommendations 65 through 85. They will be addressed later.
14. Can the TF address the items that have previously been reviewed?
15. The TF can go back through the past items and strike anything desired.
16. A motion is made to conduct a straw poll on all of the recommendations in regards to striking them. This is seconded.
17. The same process for the last straw poll will be used for this one. However, a raised hand signifies a desire to keep a recommendation (whether for discussion or approval).
18. The motion is passed
19. Recommendations 19 through 85 are all kept for future discussion or approval.

V. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 18

1. A motion to approve recommendation 18 is made and seconded.
2. Remove the sentence "Plans may include mandated..." through "library access, etc.)" and keep "... to provide for enhanced accountability and recidivism reduction." This is because most of those examples will be very difficult to

- enforce. Also, recommending to end some of the services (such as the emergency shelter) is pretty serious and perhaps overstepping ethical and moral boundaries.
3. Objection. Without examples, this recommendation is too vague. The examples are not necessarily those that would be addressed, they are just ideas.
 4. The City Council cannot make a treatment plan for an individual. The language that is moved to be struck should be struck.
 5. The language in the recommendation does not require the examples to be used or implemented.
 6. A concern over the library, shelter, or strategic group would be unrealistic to approach.
 7. A fundamental disagreement with having an external body dictating or mandating an organization in regards to their programming is expressed. The motion is agreeable while the examples are not.
 8. The recommendation does not seem enforceable. Most of the people exhibiting criminal behavior should be placed in probation. Perhaps the City Council should address the court about probation and stay-aways. Having a team convene to order stay-aways from certain places (not relevant to the geographical locations of their criminal behavior) violates their constitutional rights. This punishes individuals for a status and not for a crime.
 9. Developing a team like this should be the responsibility of the County. Consider language such as “Direct the City to work with the County to develop a strategic team...”
 10. A motion to strike the word “City” and replace it with “County” and at the end of the same sentence strike the word “community” and replace it with “City” is made.
 11. The recommendations are being made to the City, not the County. Some form of collaboration between the two bodies should be considered.
 12. The motion should be amended to include the language “City and County to collaborate...”
 13. Also consider adding the language “recommend to...”
 14. This will not be accepted as a friendly amendment.
 15. A motion is made to strike the language that was just discussed.
 16. The word “may” is permissive. Therefore, those examples are not in stone, they are simply considerations.
 17. Consider using a feasible example, such as limiting library access.
 18. There is a problem with scapegoating one program. Perhaps the idea about limiting library access is actually worth considering.
 19. Does the group that would convene for this include social service boards? It seems that social services could be withheld.
 20. Consider letting the staff provide clarification on these details.
 21. The spirit of the recommendation is that the team will have the capacity to mandate their programs.
 22. The teams may or may not to take action. The recommendation permits discretion.
 23. What is mandated enforcement?
 24. Mandating enforcement can be enforcement of the law. This recommendation still seems illegal, unless the individuals receiving stay-away orders have committed crimes there.
 25. The motion is to amend the language “Recommend the City and County to collaborate to develop a strategic team (enforcement, criminal justice, drug treatment, social service providers) to identify individuals exhibiting behaviors and crimes most harmful to the City. Strategic team will develop an intervention

and accountability plan on a case-by-case basis for each offender. Plans may include mandated enforcement, sentencing and social service adjustments to provide for enhanced accountability and recidivism reduction.”

26. The motion failed.
27. Now the previous motion is in discussion (which includes the same language and the examples).
28. What is the intent behind including the day services, HSC, etc.?
29. The rationale is for the community to cease providing services to detrimental individuals who are not trying to better themselves. It could be considered a zero-tolerance approach.
30. It does not seem that the TF or the Council have the authority to consider this. This does not seem realistic, especially because the service providers would likely not support this.
31. It seems to be a major problem that so many of the services are within the City.
32. It is an assumption that everyone is on probation. The recommendation only includes suggestions for consequences.
33. The TF should trust the Council and the Supervisors to not implement any recommendations that could be illegal or reckless. The TF does not have the time or the resources to check the legality or reality of every recommendation.
34. The TF needs to send a broad message to the community representing what they have learned throughout the educative process.
35. Consider rewording this recommendation, allowing the City to work with the County.
36. This recommendation might not have any teeth, but it would have a voice.
37. The team in question should be developing plans on a case-by-case basis. The team may decide for more or less services. Recommend returning to the original motion.
38. The language “crimes most harmful to the community” is addressing the responsibilities of the police, not the team.
39. The motion fails to pass.
40. A motion to direct staff to reword this recommendation is made.
41. The recommendation is tabled and will be reworded with the assistance of an educated and experienced TF member.

VI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 19

1. A motion to strike this recommendation is made.
2. The motion passes and recommendation 19 is struck.

VII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 20

1. A motion to strike the recommendation is made.
2. The motion passes and recommendation 20 is struck.

VIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 22

1. A motion to approve recommendation 22 as it appears on the spreadsheet is made and seconded.
2. What is a housing first model?
3. The housing first model addresses the challenges of homelessness by providing the homeless with housing first, then focusing on their other needs. This is with the intent to help the homeless get their life back together.
4. Include “Santa Clara program” so it is apparent that it is not the TF’s words.
5. A motion is made to strike all of the words before “RDA/Housing” and add “and County” after “...within the City...” Also, in the beginning of the sentence, add

“Recommend that the City and Planning departments...” This is because the City should not bare the burden of all of the problems occurring within its borders.

6. The motion carries with no objection.
7. A motion to integrate recommendation 23 into 22 is made. This is because the two recommendations are so similar. This motion includes striking 23 after the two have been combined.
8. Consider including the language “...and encourage investment in best practice programs, including...” after the words “...to support...”
9. What are the best practices? Are there best practices?
10. Consider adding the term “recognized” before the language “...best practices...”
11. Perhaps include “HUD” after the term “recognized” and “such as 180/180.”
12. The motion carries unanimously.

IX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 24

1. A motion to change the language for recommendation 24 to “City to coordinate with faith-based and other organizations to operate social services programs, (soup feeds, overnight shelter, RV parking, etc.) that ensure public safety is not unintentionally jeopardized,” is made.
2. Consider striking the language “...not unintentionally jeopardized...” and replacing it with “...impacts to the community are minimized...”
3. Also consider including the language “...government and non-government...” and eliminate the term “...other...”
4. What are the expectations from coordination?
5. It should be mentioned throughout the rest of the report that the area that recommendation 24 covers is an area that the City needs to focus on and be aggressive with.
6. The motion carries.

X. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 25

1. A motion is made to approve recommendation 25 without amendment. The motion is seconded.
2. The purpose of this recommendation is to encourage individuals to donate their money to services as opposed to giving it to panhandlers.
3. Consider language that supports why it is important to support certain services as opposed to directly handing money over to an individual.
4. Perhaps that information should be published for the public.
5. Consider the language, “Recommend that HSC or drug/alcohol treatment donation mobile applications be available and promoted by outreach by the City and others, so people can donate funds rather than support panhandlers.”
6. Who is this recommendation directed towards? In other words, who would be taking action with this recommendation?
7. The TF is recommending that the City work with some private entity to identify and select existing applications to develop mechanisms for community members to develop effective charities that help the homeless. This is in opposition to giving money directly to the homeless.
8. The language is rewritten as “The City to develop and publicize self-supporting alternatives to giving money to panhandlers. Programs will include a mobile application and other possible ways of donating, such as web-based. Proceeds of programs will go to proven effective programs to support people who are homeless, mentally ill and substance abusers.”
9. The motion passes with one objection.

- XI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 26
1. After the term “SUD” included the language “domestic violence, bullying, sexual assault...”
 2. Also include the language “Make a priority for the City to engage with marginalized and underrepresented communities in education/outreach programs.”
 3. That is not accepted as a friendly amendment.
 4. The TF has spent a disproportionate amount of time on criminals, instead of the victims. An added component should include sexual assault, domestic violence, bullying, etc.
 5. A proposal to strike the recommendation fails.
 6. The motion passes unanimously.

- XII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 27
1. A motion to approve the item with the additional language, “Recommend that the City conduct outreach with marginalized and underrepresented communities...” with a reference to communities who were incapable of attending the TF’s meetings is made and seconded.
 2. Consider the friendly amendment: “...as it relates to public safety, especially those that were not in attendance,” at the end of the recommendation.
 3. Also, consider adding “...at the TF meetings,” to the very end of the last amendment.
 4. Overall language should consist of “Recommend that the City develop an effective outreach plan to reach marginalized and under-represented communities in education/outreach programs as it relates to public safety, not limited to, but especially those that were not in attendance at the PSTF meetings.”
 5. Allow the staff to remove any redundant and unnecessary language.
 6. It does not seem that this is in the best interest of public safety. If the TF strays too far from public safety while focusing on other topics, the TF might lose some efficacy. This seems beyond the purview of the TF’s mandate.
 7. This recommendation seems more of a long-term solution.
 8. The intent of this recommendation was for the TF to take special care to reach underrepresented and marginalized communities, especially in terms of education and crime prevention.
 9. The recommendation seems too vague and should be reworked.
 10. Consider working with the staff to reword the recommendation.
 11. The recommendation is tabled without objection.

- XIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 28
1. Recommendation 28 is struck.

- XIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 29
1. A motion is made to approve this recommendation without amendment. The motion is seconded.
 2. What is the intent or goal(s) of this recommendation? Santa Cruz Neighbors is one of the most effective community groups.
 3. This recommendation is just intended to act as an encouragement to get more people to join neighborhood groups. Does the TF want a City-wide effort to join Barrios Unidos or Take Back Santa Cruz? This recommendation is vague, which clouds its intent.

4. Consider using the language “neighborhood watch groups.” The potential recommendation could read “Encourage City-wide campaign for formation of more neighborhood groups and expansion of neighborhood watch programs.”
5. This recommendation was intended to be somewhat broad; it should refrain from being too specific.
6. Any form of community group seems to increase public safety.
7. When the City used to effectively work with neighborhoods, they would address specific and relevant challenges within individual neighborhoods.
8. Neighborhood service teams would be the best existing organization for the City to work with in this case.
9. Consider the language, “Revitalize the Neighborhood Services Team to actively collaborate with all existing neighborhood groups to collectively address issues impacting neighborhoods throughout the City.”
10. A concern that the NST might be nonexistent.
11. It is still existent, however, it needs to be revitalized.
12. While the NST was more active, it did great things. Unfortunately, it has disappeared over time.
13. What is the NST?
14. It was formed under the City Manager’s office. It solved problems throughout the community in a very effective manner.
15. A caucus is called.
16. Consider the following language, “Every citizen should belong to a neighborhood group and be civically engaged. Outreach could encourage those who are not yet members. Revitalize the Neighborhood Services Team to meet quarterly to collaborate with all existing neighborhood groups to collectively address issues impacting neighborhoods throughout the City.”
17. Replace the term “quarterly” with “as needed...”
18. The motion carries without any objections.

XV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 31

1. A motion to amend recommendation 31 with the language “...both the SCPD and the City Manager’s Office, regarding...”
2. Consider changing the language to “public safety agency.”
3. What is a public safety agency?
4. Add the language “...as it relates to public safety,” at the end of the sentence.
5. Consider including “the Planning Department and Parks and Recreation” to the list as well.
6. A friendly amendment is proposed to include some more specificity to the recommendation. This could include the language “...as it relates to process inefficiencies before the language “regarding public safety.”
7. If that is stated, a message is carried that these offices have not done their job correctly. This does not seem to be the case. However, if the intent is just to ensure the offices are reviewed, that that is fine. There has not been an obvious need for this throughout the TF’s educational process.
8. Consider splitting the recommendation into two parts. If it is the priority of the City to crack down on public safety, then someone needs to come in and help these offices and agencies prioritize their resources towards public safety. It shows a need to better allocate or wholly reallocate the resources towards public safety.
9. Note that on page 21, recommendation 75, there is a conversation about a public safety commission.

10. Would rather show support for SCPD. However, external reviews do not necessarily connote any criticism. There might need to be more clarity and specificity of the recommendation's direction.
11. Consider using the language "In order to achieve maximum organizational efficiency and performance relative to public safety, it is recommended that an external review be conducted of the SCPD, City Manager's Office, Planning Dept. Public Works and Parks and Recreation."
12. The motion carries with one abstention.

XVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 32

1. A motion to approve recommendation 32 is made and seconded
2. It might not be possible for the City to fill the empty positions immediately. Hiring police officers is not a simple process.
3. Would it be worth including a timeline or timeframe in this particular recommendation? If not, would including the term "expedite" suffice?
4. Immediately filling or rushing to do so within a timeline could diminish the quality of the officers the City would hire. The use of the term "immediately" is concerning. The TF, as well as the community, want the best officers possible. Perhaps consider adding to this recommendation future funding for additional officers in the so that the City does not find itself in the same situation it is currently in.
5. Santa Cruz is well below the average even if all of its paid officers were working.
6. The TF should implore the City to get the officers up to the appropriate level. For the City to expect the officers to continue working in the environment and conditions they are currently in is not fair. This recommendation is very important.
7. The language should be left as it is, so the recommendation has teeth. Consider adding the statement "Increase force to national averages," as well.
8. Consider striking the friendly amendment. At the end of the recommendation include the statement "...and explore alternative staffing positions such as reserve officers and community service officers," to the end of the sentence.
9. Perhaps consider using the language "With the utmost urgency..." instead of immediately.
10. Currently, it seems that there is no reserve officers' agency. Their role is to fill vacancies when needed. They are effective and are sworn employees to the City, though they lack the peace officer title. Because of this, they can enforce parking, codes, and traffic violations. It better allows the police officers to focus on other issues.
11. The City already has a community officer program in effect. Consider using the term "expand."
12. Reserve officers are costly.
13. Consider weighing this recommendation as one of the most important so far. Perhaps table it for later.
14. A salary survey should be conducted. This has been an ongoing problem for roughly 20 years. Police officers train in Santa Cruz and then leave for another municipality. A seemingly continuous outflow is important and should be addressed.
15. Consider tabling the issue until Rick Martinez is at the next meeting.
16. A motion is made and seconded to table the recommendation.
17. The motion fails.
18. Consider making the salary survey a separate recommendation. This recommendation should be simple and should be expressed as a large priority.

19. Include all language after "...national averages..." in another recommendation.
20. Include the language "It is recommended that the City make with the highest priority and with the utmost urgency..."
21. The motion carries.

XVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 32.1

1. This recommendation has been labeled 32.1 for the ease of administration throughout the rest of the evening.
2. Consider language that includes "Conduct a salary survey of SCPD and explore alternative staffing positions such as reserve officers and expand community service officers."
3. What happens once the survey is conducted? There should be some language about the result of this language.
4. Consider language "...implement recommendations..." after "survey of SCPD..."
5. Language that includes a salary that retains a higher number of officers should be added. This could revolve around some sort of employee retention program.
6. If that language is used, it may convey that salary is the only reason why officers are leaving the City. It is possible that there are other components.
7. The TF should focus on increasing the number of officers, then bettering the quality of their work environment.
8. Replace salary survey with "...employee recruitment and retention analysis..."
9. The money issue is very real. It is a serious issue for the small amount of officers the department has left.
10. Include the language, "City will set SCPD salary and benefits at a level that will improve recruitment and retention."
11. Add "...relative to market grades."
12. A disagreement with the previous statement is expressed.
13. An outside analyst should be the one to conduct the analysis of the police department.
14. The matter of bringing an outside consultant in to conduct a survey will require a meet and confer. The City cannot unilaterally decide on an issue like this.
15. It seems the City recently proposed or implemented a bonus hiring plan. Is there anything that is already happening with that? If so, was it successful?
16. The City Council approved an incentive program right before the PSTF began. It is currently in effect. It is a hardened bonus, which means that the bonus is paid at the end of a said amount of time.
17. The TF has no right determining salary and benefits for the SCPD.
18. Perhaps the TF should consider total compensation packages.
19. The language, "City will consider setting SCPD total compensation packages at a level that will improve recruitment and retention." After this statement, divide the rest of the recommendation into two.
20. This motion passes with one no vote.

XVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 32.2

1. Just as with recommendation 32.1, recommendation 32.2 is to ease the administration for the rest of the evening.
2. The language should consist of "Conduct an employee recruitment and retention analysis of SCPD compared to comparable agencies, implement, recommendations, and explore alternative staffing positions such as reserve officers and expand community services officers."
3. The motion passes with one no vote.

XIX. Administrative Discussion and Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendations 33-36

1. Consider meeting twice next week, as opposed to having this meeting run all night.
2. Perhaps the TF could meet twice during the week of November 4-9.
3. A motion is made to discuss recommendations 33-36 as a single motion.
4. The motion passes unanimously.

XX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 37

1. A motion to approve recommendation 37 with the amendment "...assets of those convicted and/or charged with sales of narcotics," to be added after "seizure laws and deleting illegal campers, etc." is made.
2. This motion is not seconded.
3. There seems to be some constitutional issues with this recommendation. Also, there are similar laws to this already. There are asset seizure laws in place. This, however, seems unrealistic.
4. Consider focusing on just drug dealers.
5. Everyone has a right to due process of property. With respect to seizure laws, it has to be related to the crime. It is a civil action, which is separate from criminal. The property that is being seized can only be related to the crime. Seizing someone's camping gear because they are illegally camping seems to be impossible.
6. There already seem to be enough laws in place that address things like this. This recommendation should be struck.
7. A motion is made to strike recommendation 37. It is seconded.
8. That motion passes.

XXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 38

1. A motion is made to approve the recommendation. This motion is seconded.
2. The City will have to figure out the specific details.
3. Using the word "reactivate" as was previously done would be appropriate.
4. The motion carries unanimously.

XXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 39

1. A motion to strike this recommendation is made and seconded.
2. Lawsuits are a suitable way of accomplishing tasks, especially in regards to this recommendation.
3. A recommendation to change the word "suite" to "explore civil litigation" is made.
4. This recommendation is very proactive in the sense that it says the TF and the City need to make others accountable for what happens within the City.
5. After "Nevada," consider adding "California" as well.
6. Consider some different language in order to clarify this recommendation.
7. Consider the use of "crime pollution externalities" and "...as defined in the literature."

XXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 40

1. You cannot incarcerate individuals for municipal code infractions.
2. Strike the language "municipal code..."
3. Failing to appear in court three times makes individuals viable for jail time.
4. Clarification is necessary.
5. Consider tabling this recommendation and returning to it next week.

6. If a violator fails to appear in court only one time, that is a misdemeanor. Three times to appear in court will signify prosecution, however, it is still a misdemeanor.
7. Consider using only “failure” instead of “three failures...”
8. There needs to be clarification on the idea of flash incarceration.
9. Short-term incarcerations would be more appropriate.
10. This appears to be redundant for the City already has a system in place for this sort of thing.
11. Recommendation 40 is struck.

XXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendations 42-45

1. Recommendations 42-45 are struck.

XXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 46

1. A motion to combine recommendation 46 with recommendation 18 is made.
2. This recommendation is similar to the strategic team that the TF discussed earlier.
3. Consider adding that this recommendation needs to be funded by the County. This should be added later.
4. The motion passes.

XXVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 49

1. A motion to approve recommendation 49 without an amendment is made and seconded.
2. A concern about having UCSC directly related in the recommendation is expressed. A different wording should be considered, perhaps including the term “collaboration.”
3. An objection is made to the recommended amendment. What is important is that the message states the campus should be responsive to what the City wants. Pressure should be put on the campus to clean up its reputation.
4. This is an opportunity for the TF to take a strong position that might be unpopular with some of the public, though it will put forth a strong message.
5. Consider striking the language revolving around Measure K.
6. The motion carries with one no vote.

XXVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 50

1. This recommendation is tabled, it will be returned to later.

XXVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 51

1. A motion to amend the recommendation with the language “The City should make this a high priority...” or some other version. This recommendation addresses a big issue.
2. This recommendation revolves around building and zoning codes. Only two people enforce these laws. It is incredibly understaffed.
3. The motion is seconded.
4. Consider combining recommendations 50 and 51. This is because they both address building and zoning laws.
5. Both 58 and the first bullet point of 56 could be included as well.
6. Recommendation 51 should stand-alone.
7. Then combine 50, 58 and the first bullet point of 56.
8. At the end of recommendation 51, add the language “...with an emphasis on violations affecting public safety in Santa Cruz.”

9. Consider adding “life-threatening and...” before the term “public safety.”

XXIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 52

1. A motion to approve recommendation 52 with an amendment is made and seconded.
2. Include the language “RV parking ordinance (ban) with hours of no parking.”
3. There is discretion with this law.
4. There are permits for RV parking on public streets; however, these vehicles are often used for storage. This recommendation is focused on illegal camping in RVs on the streets.
5. This is especially prevalent near West Cliff.
6. The signage is not enforced. A lot of the individuals who are staying in parked RVs cause a lot of public nuisance crimes.
7. A motion to amend the recommendation with the language, “Increase enforcement of municipal code violations related to RV parking in the City of Santa Cruz,” is made.
8. Consider the language, “City review and/or implement strict parking and overnight camping ordinance related to RVs on City streets.”
9. The motion passes.

XXX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 53

1. A motion to approve the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. This addresses AB 2020.
3. Include the language, “Increase police activity at recycling centers near Harvey West and Fair St.”
4. Consider adding language that revolves around recommending code enforcement or oversight.
5. A sufficient solution is to increase police presence.
6. The recycling centers are mandated by AB 2020. Instead of police presence, consider a bolstered private security staff to be a part of their contracts.
7. Will police presence even be a deterrent to show up with large amounts of cans?
8. There is a market for metals at these two facilities. This seems to facilitate theft.
9. If these centers did not exist, that theft would diminish.
10. The recycling centers must exist. Some other mechanism will need to exist to encourage that theft.
11. A majority of the people at the recycling centers do not seem to be criminals.
12. The City needs to better address these facilities somehow.
13. There is no reason that one of the recycling centers has to be in the Harvey West area. It must be in a certain radius of distribution centers.
14. It is unrealistic for the police to be worried about recyclables.
15. The motion is passed.

Adjournment -- The Public Safety Citizen Task Force adjourned from the public meeting of October 30, 2013 at 11:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 6, 2013, 5:00 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