



PUBLIC SAFETY CITIZEN TASK FORCE PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

5:00 p.m.

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

MINUTES

- I. Chair Reyes Call to Order
 1. Meeting called to order at 5:00 p.m. by Chair Reyes.
 2. Sixth meeting of the deliberative/legislative process.
 3. Task Force members absent: Reyna Ruiz

- II. Opening Discussion and Approving the Minutes for November 6, 2013
 1. A motion to approve the November 6 2013 minutes is made and seconded.
 2. The motion carries.
 3. The TF needs to address the document titled “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations.” This document is the narrative component that highlights the top 17 recommendations that were adopted the night previous.
 4. Other documents need to be addressed after the “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” document.

- III. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page One Lines 8-10
 1. There are no additions or deletions.

- IV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page One Lines 12-17
 1. There are no additions or deletions.

- V. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page One Lines 19-23
 1. There are no additions or deletions.

- VI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page One Line 25
 1. There are no additions or deletions.

- VII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page One Lines 27-34
 1. There are no additions or deletions.

- VIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page One Lines 36-43
1. There is a typo on line 38. “Proper” should be changed to “properly.”
 2. The change is accepted.
- IX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page One in its Entirety
1. A motion to approve the first page of the “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” document is made and seconded.
 2. The motion carries unanimously.
- X. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Two Lines 48-54
1. On line 52, what is the language “while the study is underway...” directly stating? Does underway mean immediately?
 2. Yes.
- XI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Two Lines 56-60
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Two Lines 62-74
1. On line 66, the language “non-residential neighborhoods” is used. Didn’t the TF previously use a different term?
 2. The term “property” was used.
 3. On line 62, the term “implore” is used. This term seems unnecessary. Perhaps the term “insist” would be more appropriate here.
 4. That language is accepted without objection.
 5. On line 66, the language seems to state that the SSP can go to a County owned non-residential property within the City. That is what the situation already is. There needs to be more specific language to clarify this confusion.
 6. Consider language that includes “County owned commercial property that is not near residential neighborhoods.”
 7. Consider “unincorporated areas.”
 8. That may not be possible.
 9. It is unclear if the County owns commercial property, it may be better to focus on zoning restrictions.
 10. Consider the language, “Area not adjacent to residential area.”
 11. Originally, there were references to specific examples. These examples included alcohol outlets, medical marijuana dispensaries and firearm dealers and their proximity to schools and residential areas. Language from preexisting zoning restrictions could be applied to this recommendation.
 12. Consider looking at current zoning policy for medical marijuana dispensaries that require the stores to be a certain distance from residences. The language here is preexisting and specific.
 13. Is the language in these lines directly out of a recommendation? The language now seems more verbatim.
 14. There is a notion that the TF wants SSP to be moved outside of the City. Did this language not make it in?
 15. Consider the language “Relocate SSP to County owned property located in non-residential areas.”

16. This language passes without objection.
17. Between tonight and the meeting on November 20th, the staff will locate inconsistencies and correct them.
18. In the second sentence, the intention seems to find a better way to identify SSP needles. However, the language is confusing.
19. Sometimes the syringes that are turned into the SSP have no relation to the SSP at all. This could be positive or negative.
20. Consider the language "...account separately for syringes without identification tags..."
21. This friendly amendment is accepted.

- XIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Two Lines 76-78
 1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Two Lines 80-82
 1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Two Line 84
 1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Two Lines 86-90
 1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Two Line 92
 1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Two Line 94
 1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Two in its Entirety
 1. A motion to approve the second page of the "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" document is made and seconded.
 2. The motion carries unanimously.
- XX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Three Lines 95-98
 1. On line 95, consider replacing the term "caused" with the language "related to..."
 2. The language here is taken verbatim from the recommendations.
 3. Consider using the substitute term "influence."
 4. If this was accepted, that would require the TF to return to the recommendation and change it.
- XXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Three Line 100

1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Line 102
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Lines 104-107
1. Is the language in the first sentence taken directly from a recommendation?
 2. No.
 3. Consider strengthening the language. On line 104, remove the term “effective” and replace it with the term “essential.” It adds important emphasis.
 4. There are no objections.
 5. Instead of saying, “reduce future crime,” consider using the language, “reduce future criminal behavior...”
 6. There are no objections.
- XXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Line 109
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Lines 111-118
1. On line 111, replace the language “recommends to...” to “recommends...”
 2. There are no objections.
- XXVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Lines 119-125
1. On line 121, there is a grammatical inconsistency.
 2. This will be fixed.
- XXVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Lines 126 and 127
1. On line 127, the bullet point should instead be a sentence.
 2. Is there a reason that youth programs are capitalized?
 3. It seemed to call out a recommendation for youth programming.
- XXVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Line 129
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XXIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Line 131
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XXX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Lines 133-137
1. In the second sentence, on line 134, the language does not seem inclusive enough. Consider the additional language “We saw specific numbers that said a City our size should have a specific number of officers.” The language needs to be revised, but should follow the intent.

2. Consider the actual language, “Average police force for a City of 60,000 residents is 150 officers.”
3. Do you know where this information came from?
4. Yes.
5. Can that study be cited?
6. Yes.

XXXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three Lines 139 and 140

1. There are no additions or deletions.

XXXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Three in its Entirety

1. A motion to approve the third page of the “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” document is made and seconded.
2. The motion carries unanimously.

XXXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Four Lines 141-146

1. The first portion of the sentence on line 141, should state, “Currently there are no gaps in service or coverage, however,” and capitalize “this.”

XXXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Four Lines 148-152

1. On lines 150-152, the information here seems to relate to the number of repeat offenders (which ranges around 3,000). This should be called out, for it is worth highlighting.
2. There are no objections.
3. The exact number should be inserted into the document later.
4. The number of citations and arrests seem to have merged. They should be addressed separately and clarified.
5. There are no objections.
6. Add the term “a” before “significant portion...”
7. Consider addressing percentages of citations and arrests.
8. Can the staff refer back to the appropriate minutes?
9. If the information is there, yes.
10. It is difficult to understand the rationale of isolating the homeless from other individuals, especially when panelists spoke of a wide range of contributors. Housing statuses should not be singled out in this circumstance.
11. Consider comparing the percentages of housed individuals verses un-housed individuals.
12. When this recommendation was first written, it was in reference to the City staff’s testimony from the first or second meeting. They used specific percentages of those who considered themselves homeless.
13. The information is not for calls for service it is only for arrests. This should be clarified.
14. It is important to identify the public nuisance issues and how serious they are. Despite this, it does not seem appropriate, or necessary, to identify the status of only one type of people.
15. Is this information stating that the TF witnessed a disparity in calls for service and crimes committed by those identified as homeless?

16. On line 149, the calls for service are at an all time high. If the TF removes someone's housing status, should we remove all other statuses?
17. On line 150, consider the alternate language, "Calls for service are at an all time high, and if individuals themselves report as homeless (homeless, indicate that they live at 115 Coral St., and/or transient) account for..." and insert the percentage that was previously stated.
18. This alternative language could work. Ensure that County, City, and other addresses are delineated from each other to avoid singling out someone's housing status.
19. That will be added.
20. There are no objections.
21. The staff will insert the percentages.
22. The TF is trying to highlight that there is a disproportionate amount of crime committed by people who are homeless, live at 115 Coral St or are transient. In 2013, there were over 3,500 arrests between only 146 individuals who identified as homeless. The problem is not that these individuals are homeless, it is that there is a disproportionate amount of crimes being committed between residents, visitors and homeless.
23. Without objection, the precise data will be inserted. On line 155, beginning with "clarify homeless ID" no data is needed on that.
24. The TF should still refrain from focusing on peoples' statuses.
25. It is easy to understand the hesitancy to use the term "homeless," however, in lines 180-185, crimes such as deposits of public waste, multiple offenses of public camping, etc. are discussed. These crimes address homelessness. This is a sensitive issue, but it needs to be included in the document.
26. In the beginning of line 150, consider the language "Public nuisance, quality of life crimes and repeat offenders put a heavy strain on Santa Cruz's resources. While the Task Force recognizes that not all homeless or transient individuals are committing crimes in our community, calls for service are at an all time high with individuals that self report as..."
27. The paragraph that discusses illegal camping, etc. does not directly cite homelessness.
28. Are people who have residences illegally camping?
29. The sensitivity is appreciated. Statuses have not distracted the TF so far, however, the founding document from the City Staff Report includes the term "transients." Due to that, it may not be a bad idea to include the term "homeless." This should be voted on.
30. A motion to approve 148-155 as appearing on the screen is made and seconded.
31. The motion carries with three no votes.

XXXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Four Lines 154-157

1. There are no additions or deletions.

XXXVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Four Lines 159-163

1. Change the language "serious health concern" to "serious public safety concern..."
2. There are no objections.

XXXVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Four Lines 165-169

1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XXXVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Four Lines 171 and 173
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XXXIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Four Lines 175-179
1. On line 175, what is trying to be said? Several critical SCPD priorities have been identified by the TF. The sentence should read as the TF is identifying the priorities.
 2. Those changes are accepted.
- XL. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Four Lines 181-186
1. On line 183, replace “offences” with “offenses.”
 2. On line 183, “depositing” should be replaced by “deposit.”
 3. Is the broken window model one of the recommendations that was prioritized last night?
 4. It is how a recommendation was described in the conversation.
 5. It came across that it was a separate recommendation.
 6. Was line 185 part of our recommendations?
 7. Yes, it was item 49.2.
- XLI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Four Line 188
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XLII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Four in its Entirety
1. A motion to approve the fourth page of the “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” document is made and seconded.
 2. The motion carries.
- XLIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Lines 190-195
1. On line 193, didn’t the TF discuss cultivation and processing of marijuana?
 2. Yes.
 3. Wasn’t the word “medical” used as well?
 4. Yes.
 5. Reference “illicit use” as well.
- XLIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Line 197
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XLV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Lines 199-204
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XLVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Lines 206-213

1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XLVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Lines 215-219
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XLVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Lines 221-222
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- XLIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Line 224
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- L. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Five Lines 226-229
1. The term “under-serving” is unclear.
 2. The TF is saying that the Criminal Justice System is not doing the best job that they could be doing. There does seem to be a better way to phrase that, though.
 3. Consider the language, “...should be held accountable for their contribution to the high crime rate in Santa Cruz.”
 4. Consider the term “failing” as a substitution to “under-serving.”
 5. Is the entire Criminal Justice System to blame?
 6. The bench was held in mind.
 7. If intent only concerned the bench, then the appropriate language would include “Santa Cruz County Courts.”
 8. Is that the intent of the TF?
 9. It seems like the jail system is also to blame.
 10. That would then be the Santa Cruz County Courts and the Santa Cruz County Sheriff.
 11. Are there any others?
 12. Yes, probation.
 13. Probation would include the Santa Cruz County Probation Officer.
 14. Include the language “Santa Cruz County Courts have failed the community...”
 15. Can the TF include language, such as “...have failed the community in their role as part of the public safety continuum?”
 16. Not comfortable with saying the TF finds that the Santa Cruz County Courts failed the community. It is unclear if that is the desired message to be sent out. Currently there is no alternative language, however, there is a major problem with using the term “failed.”
 17. No one in the Criminal Justice System can be held accountable for failing in total. The Criminal Justice System should be held accountable for how they address low-level crimes and drug offenses.
 18. Consider substituting the term “failed” with “compromised.” Failed seems to be vague and inaccurate.
 19. Consider the language, “Santa Cruz County Courts have compromised the public safety of the community...”
 20. Consider adding “...through their sentencing practices...” to the end of the previous friendly amendment.
 21. This language is agreed upon.
 22. Should “...in their role in the Criminal Justice System...” be removed?
 23. Yes.

24. The inabilities of Santa Cruz's Court system should be addressed head on.
25. What is the intent of specifically stating low-level crimes?
26. They are non-violent crimes.
27. Suggest specifically stating "non-violent crimes" then.
28. This has been inserted.
29. A call to question (while using the term fail) is made.
30. There is an objection. The TF needs to provide a sense of appropriate communication. Using language, such as "failed," will not promote cooperation. Consider the language "Santa Cruz County Court's sentencing practices relating to non-violent and drug offenses have contributed to the public safety challenges in our community." This is a substitute motion.
31. There are violent crimes that seem relevant. Perhaps stating "nonviolent crimes" is no the proper way to address this issue.
32. This motion does not address the substitute language.
33. The motion fails.
34. A motion to amend is made. Keep all the language intact and add, "Santa Cruz County Courts, through their sentencing practices, have contributed to public safety challenges our community is facing." This motion is seconded.
35. It appears that this language is too soft. The Courts have seemed to continuously be a problem. Consider adding the term "significantly" before "contributed." There should be more emphasis.
36. This is accepted as a friendly amendment.
37. A call to question is made.
38. The motion fails.
39. Consider the language "The Public Safety Task Force finds that the courts have failed the community as it relates to criminal sentencing." Strike the rest of the language following this.
40. A call to question is made.
41. The motion carries.

LI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Five Lines 234-236

1. Include the term "will" after "issuance."
2. The addition is accepted.

LII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Five in its Entirety

1. A motion to approve the fifth page of the "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" document is made and seconded.
2. The motion carries.

LIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for "Highest Priority Policy Recommendations" Page Six Lines 237-239

1. Add the term "to" before "appear."
2. There are no objections.
3. Should the terms "collaborative oversight and appropriate funding" be added?
4. No.
5. A motion is made to add "accountability, collaborative oversight and appropriate funding."
6. The motion carries.
7. Did the TF agree on the wording for the recommendations?
8. Only for semantics.

9. The recommendation regarding the presiding judge seems completely different than previously discussed.
 10. That sentiment has been expressed multiple times.
- LIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Six Line 243
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Six Lines 245-248
1. On line 245, make sure the language regarding “should” is consistent. It should be changed to “directed...”
 2. There are 17 recommendations on this sheet. Why is that?
 3. Let the TF finish this paragraph then address that.
- LVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Six Lines 250-260
1. On line 250, replace “County” with “Board of Supervisors.”
 2. On the previous section, on line 247, include the term “area.”
 3. Keep in mind there was very little time to prepare this document. There is now time to return to the document and address minor discrepancies.
 4. Small and clear discrepancies will be changed without the help of the TF.
- LVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Page Six in its Entirety
1. A motion to approve the sixth page of the “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” document is made and seconded.
 2. The motion carries.
- LVIII. Discussion Regarding the “Highest Priority Policy Recommendations” Document and the Next Document
1. The narrative that supports the recommendations has just been approved. It is unnecessary to ensure that all of the recommendations are there.
 2. A motion is made and seconded to approve the narrative document that supports the report.
 3. Later tonight, the TF will vote on this document, which will allow some simple changes to be addressed by staff.
 4. A concern over where the secondary recommendations will go is addressed. Direction needs to be given on that.
 5. The document is too large and cannot be combed through line by line. If there are issues, they need to be raised.
- LIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Report Narrative, Page One
1. The historical section should be removed. This section seems irrelevant and distracting. A motion to strike the language beginning “As far back...” and extending through and including the paragraph that begins “Over a century later...” is made and seconded.
 2. This language establishes that the City faces long-standing problems.
 3. A discussion stating that Santa Cruz is not the only community facing these issues may be more appropriate and relevant.
 4. The motion to strike the language fails.

- LX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Two
1. Some of the language seems inflammatory in the second line of the paragraph beginning with “Never the less...” The language “...reached a fever pitch...” seems unnecessary. Consider “...continued to increase” as substitute language. The motion is to strike the original language and replace it with “...continued to increase...” is made and seconded.
 2. The motion fails.
 3. Is there some other language that is strong, though is not “fever pitch?”
 4. Consider “has become out of control...”
 5. Do not agree with that language.
 6. Perhaps the language “critical mass” may be appropriate. A motion to replace “...reached a fever pitch” with “reached critical mass” is made and seconded.
 7. The motion carries.
 8. In the last sentence in the paragraph beginning “Following 2011...” change “service policies of the HSA” to “management.” This motion is seconded.
 9. The motion fails.
 10. There should be more accordance on these issues. This is especially true because the TF has not directly written these words.
 11. Time is a factor and this is a way that works for the TF.
- LXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Three
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Four
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Five
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Six
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Seven
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LXVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Eight
1. There are no additions or deletions.
 2. Everything that has previously been discussed regarding transients, homeless, etc. will be rectified.
- LXVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page Nine
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LXVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 10
1. There are no additions or deletions.
- LXIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 11
1. In the paragraph beginning with “Environmental geographical factors...” in the next sentence, what exactly is considered downtown?
 2. Should the term “proximity” be used?
 3. Consider striking the term “downtown.”
 4. It is not a home to the vast majority of services. This does not seem appropriate.

5. Replace the term “downtown” with “the City.”
6. Use the language, “the City of Santa Cruz” instead of “the City.” Does the vast majority apply to everything that follows this section or just health and social services?
7. A motion to amend the language “The City of Santa Cruz is the County seat and home to the vast majority of the County’s social and health services and the Criminal Justice System, and many nonprofit social services, resulting in high concentration...” is made and seconded.
8. Consider saying “North County.”
9. There are no objections.
10. The motion to accept the language carries.
11. In the second to last paragraph, in the last sentence, “for those who responded” should be added after “issues...”
12. There are no objections.

LXX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 14

1. There are no additions or deletions.

LXXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 15

1. There are no additions or deletions.

LXXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 16

1. On the second theme, make sure the language “non-violent crime” is used.

LXXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 17

1. A concern over these testimonies being made public is raised.
2. These testimonies are very important to the document. Most people do not know what it is like to be an addict. This gives them a glimpse they normally would not have otherwise. These testimonies should help identify ways to assist these people.
3. The staff should run the language by someone who would be more knowledgeable about gang related activity.
4. Both in the first and last paragraphs, it is stated that the strong community sentiment is more prevalent here than in other towns with similar demographics. Is this something that was studied?
5. That comes from the panelists who came and spoke to the TF.
6. This statement seems like it should be more statistically fact based. The lack of support to this statement is troubling.
7. The language will be struck and replaced with the following language: “There is strong community sentiment in Santa Cruz that substance abuse and drug dealing is more prevalent here.”
8. Consider striking the term “more” in order to avoid the same statistical concern.
9. There are no objections.
10. The motion regarding the substitute language fails.
11. A motion to strike the sentence is made and seconded.
12. The motion fails.

LXXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 18

1. In the very last sentence, the sentence should appear as: “Unfortunately, most programs are insufficiently funded.” This strikes all of the language following the term “funded.”

2. The language after “funded” should be struck. The TF cannot vote on things not based on fact. Where did this language come from?
3. There was an extensive conversation about Proposition 36 previously. This conversation also touched on the lack of accountability in the Courts.
4. That conversation needs to be specified.
5. The entire document shows the staff’s attempt to compile, in totality, what the TF has addressed.
6. Consider the language “Most programs are insufficiently funded and do not provide treatment centers with adequate resources to be successful.”
7. The disagreement seems to revolve around most programs failing to provide something.
8. The motion fails.
9. A caucus is called.
10. On the bottom of page 18, a motion is made and seconded to revisit the previous motion. The previous motion is to accept the language “Most programs are insufficiently funded and do not provide treatment centers with adequate resources to be successful.”
11. The motion carries unanimously.

LXXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 20

1. There are no additions or deletions.

LXXVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 21

1. There are no additions or deletions.

LXXVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 22

1. There are no additions or deletions.

LXXVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 23

1. In the first sentence, under the term “conclusion” there is a syntactical error that needs to be fixed.
2. This will be addressed.

LXXIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 24

1. Generalize the street and area the subject lived in.
2. It previously came across that this information was going to be confidential.
3. It was, however, there was another interview where it was agreed that the information could be included in the report.
4. This section requires heavy revisions in order to protect the individual’s identity and safety.
5. Consider the language that was previously distributed to the TF members.
6. A motion to adopt the substitute language is made and seconded.
7. The individual’s anonymity is important, however, not everything needs to be deleted.
8. That has already been addressed.
9. This story is very important to tell because it gives a very informative stance on the gang issue.
10. Everything that can be used to identify the individual should be removed from the report.
11. The motion fails.
12. A motion to generalize locations and strike other identifiable language is made and seconded.

13. The ages of the individual's siblings and girlfriend should also be removed.
14. Besides those things discussed, nothing else seems to act as a potential identifier.
15. Is there liability on the TF if anything happens to this individual?
16. The TF really needs to consider protecting the identity of this individual. If there is something that could bring him great harm, it is not worth including.
17. Someone who is more involved with the gang lifestyle should make sure that all identifiable aspects of this section have been removed.
18. Do not be afraid to use overly vague language.
19. A motion to have Officer Hernandez ensure that all identifiable aspects have been removed is made and seconded.
20. A call to question is made.
21. The motion carries.

LXXX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 26

1. At the bottom of the page, consider adding the following language "Panelists agree that more structured and supervised activities in the 3 to 9 timeframe were essential for engagement with youth in a positive direction."
2. There are no objections.

LXXXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 27

1. Make sure consistent language, in regards to the term "failure," is used here.

LXXXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 28

1. At the bottom of the page, remove the term "non-violent" from the sentence "Many believe that Santa Cruz Superior Court, Jail System is essentially a revolving door for non-violent criminals." This motion is seconded.
2. The only issue with that change is that that paragraph addresses low-level crimes.
3. That is false, it also addresses those with felony convictions.
4. The motion carries.

LXXXIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 29

1. In the top paragraph, a concern over the issuance of penalties for municipal code infractions is expressed. The use of the language as Santa Cruz being a draw to criminal activity is a concern.
2. After last meeting, that statement was made by other TF members.
3. The language does not seem to be fact based.

LXXXIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 30

1. In the paragraph that begins with "This information..." consider adding, "was suggested by Judge Symons," at the end for clarification.
2. There are no objections.

LXXXV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for the Report Narrative, Page 31

1. About halfway through the paragraph, under conclusion, "Superior Court" should be used as substitute language.
2. Consider the language "Testimony received by the Task Force indicates that..."
3. Using the language "Criminal Justice System" is very broad and should be used with caution.
4. In the last sentence, replace "trusting" with "our community's support for..."
5. It has been indicated that the trust in the Criminal Justice System is low. This is a broad theme that runs throughout the TF's process. There is a lot of mistrust and actual discouragement of our Criminal Justice System and its processes.

6. Consider the term “confidence.”
7. A call to question is made.
8. The motion carries unanimously.

LXXXVI. Discussion

1. On page 21, in the second sentence, replace the term “hundreds” with “many...”
2. Consider the language “substantial number...”
3. This case was a very specific case; therefore saying “hundreds” seems false.
4. Keep the language “many others...”
5. There are no objections.
6. The document has been combed through and adopted through piecemeal.
7. In order to address the non-priority recommendations, the TF needs to begin with a motion.
8. A motion is made to, under each suggestion, order each within their categories. The remaining recommendations are included near the priorities, but in smaller font. This motion is seconded.
9. The alternative to this motion is to clump all of the non-prioritized recommendations in the appendix.
10. There seems to be a number of items that seem important despite not being priorities.
11. The vote tallies for each recommendation do not need to be included.
12. A call to question is made.
13. The motion passes.

Adjournment -- The Public Safety Citizen Task Force adjourned from the public meeting of November 20, 2013 at 9:30 p.m. This was the final meeting for the Public Safety Citizen Task Force. The Report will be addressed at the December 3, 2013 City Council meeting.

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

