



Grand Jury Response from Watsonville Police Department

1 message

Beatriz Flores <beatriz.flores@cityofwatsonville.org>
To: grandjury@scgrandjury.org
Cc: David Honda <david.honda@cityofwatsonville.org>

Thu, Sep 27, 2018 at 1:31 PM

Dear Ms. Flynn:

Please find the attached Grand Jury Response from the Watsonville Police Department Police Chief Honda. I will be mailing the hard copy to Honorable Judge Gallagher this afternoon.

Don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Beatriz Vázquez Flores

City Clerk

Office 831-768-3040
Direct 831-768-3042
Fax 831-761-0736

275 Main Street, Suite 400
Watsonville, CA 95076

beatriz.flores@cityofwatsonville.org

Business Hours: 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday - Thursday and 8:00 am to 12:00 pm Friday.

If you want to go quickly, go alone. If you want to go far, go together. ~ African proverb

MentalHealthCrisis_WCoP_ResponsePacket 7.3f.pdf
112K



**The 2017–2018 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury
Requests that the
City of Watsonville Chief of Police
Respond to the Findings and Recommendations
Specified in the Report Titled
Mental Health Crisis
Seeking An Integrated Response
by July 16, 2018**

When the response is complete, please

1. Email the completed Response Packet as a file attachment to grandjury@scgrandjury.org, and
2. Print and send a hard copy of the completed Response Packet to

The Honorable Judge John Gallagher
Santa Cruz Courthouse
701 Ocean St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Instructions for Respondents

California law PC §933.05 (included [below](#)) requires the respondent to a Grand Jury report to comment on each finding and recommendation within a report. Explanations for disagreements and timeframes for further implementation or analysis must be provided. Please follow the format below when preparing the responses.

Response Format

1. For the Findings included in this Response Packet, select one of the following responses and provide the required additional information:
 - a. **AGREE** with the Finding, or
 - b. **PARTIALLY DISAGREE** with the Finding and specify the portion of the Finding that is disputed and include an explanation of the reasons therefor, or
 - c. **DISAGREE** with the Finding and provide an explanation of the reasons therefor.
2. For the Recommendations included in this Response Packet, select one of the following actions and provide the required additional information:
 - a. **HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED**, with a summary regarding the implemented action, or
 - b. **HAS NOT YET BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE**, with a timeframe or expected date for implementation, or
 - c. **REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS**, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for that analysis or study; this timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report, or
 - d. **WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.

If you have questions about this response form, please contact the Grand Jury by calling 831-454-2099 or by sending an email to grandjury@scgrandjury.org.

Findings

F1. The 24-hour Crisis Intervention Training course has given law enforcement responders additional tools for dealing with people in crisis, resulting in less use of force.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F2. Adding more mental health liaisons and increasing their hours of availability would increase the benefit of this program to law enforcement and people in crisis.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F3. Having law enforcement be the primary responder to non-threatening 9-1-1 EDP calls reduces the overall availability of law enforcement to the community.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F4. The Mobile Emergency Response Team (MERT) is not accessible through 9-1-1, resulting in overuse of law enforcement.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

Although MERT is not accessible through our 9-1-1 system, it may or may not result in an overuse of law enforcement. When a call for service is received and dispatched there are numerous questions that are asked to assess the risk involved for any first responder, but there are many factors that may affect the caller's response and perception of the event. It is difficult to determine the level of threat or imminent threat to life until someone who is trained arrives on the scene to evaluate. So, from a safety perspective an officer will most likely be dispatched to a call with MERT until the threat level has been determined, not changing or lessening the use of law enforcement.

Recommendations

R1. The County Health Services Agency and the County's five law enforcement agencies should create a plan to make mental health liaisons available to respond to 9-1-1 EDP calls at all hours in all jurisdictions. (F2)

HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED – summarize what has been done

HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE – summarize what will be done and the timeframe

REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)

WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

The concept of having a mental health liaison available 24/7 is an admirable idea, but realistically, our City and our department does not have the staffing resources or the financial bandwidth to implement such a concept at this time. However, the City will continue exploring funding and grant opportunities, including partnerships with the County's Health and Human Services Department, with the hope of expanding the mental health liaison program in the future when it is financially feasible to do so.

R2. The County Health Services Agency and the County’s five law enforcement agencies should create a plan to make MERT available to respond to 9-1-1 EDP calls at all hours in all jurisdictions. (F3-F5)

HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED – summarize what has been done

HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE – summarize what will be done and the timeframe

REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)

WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

As in F4 the concept of implementing a plan to make MERT available 24/7 is good; however, law enforcement would still need to respond to evaluate any potential safety concerns prior to MERT responding. Creating a plan to make MERT available to respond to 9-1-1 EDP calls at all hours in all jurisdictions would fall mainly on the County and their ability to expand its program. It is my understanding the County has stated they have no plans to expand the MERT program or implement changes to their response protocol.

R3. The County Health Services Agency, the County's five law enforcement agencies, and Santa Cruz Regional 9-1-1 should develop a dispatch plan that classifies 9-1-1 EDP calls as threatening (the subject presents a danger to others) or nonthreatening (the subject does not present a danger to others). (F5)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

As stated in F4, even with a strict protocol and numerous questions asked, it is difficult for anyone to evaluate the threat level via phone. There are many variables that cannot be accurately accounted for until a trained professional can speak to such person face to face. The current protocol utilized by Santa Cruz Regional 9-1-1 does evaluate the threat level of a person in a mental health crisis and relays that information to the responding officers. If we create a new classification it would not change the information dispatch already relays to responding officers. A law enforcement officer would need to be dispatched to “nonthreatening” calls as a safety precaution regardless.

R4. Santa Cruz Regional 9-1-1 should dispatch MERT with a law enforcement liaison in response to non-threatening 9-1-1 EDP calls. (F5)

HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED – summarize what has been done

HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE – summarize what will be done and the timeframe

REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)

WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

Fiscal and staffing limitations aside, the mental health liaison teams should be expanded. Ideally, there would be enough teams to cover most hours. The liaisons with along with their law enforcement partners respond and conduct the on-scene assessment. The MERT would be available to respond if deemed necessary by mental health liaison team’s assessment; having a co-dispatched MERT response would not necessary.

Penal Code §933.05

1. For Purposes of subdivision (b) of §933, as to each Grand Jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
 - a. the respondent agrees with the finding,
 - b. the respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.
2. For purpose of subdivision (b) of §933, as to each Grand Jury recommendation, the responding person shall report one of the following actions:
 - a. the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action,
 - b. the recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation,
 - c. the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of the publication of the Grand Jury report, or
 - d. the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.
3. However, if a finding or recommendation of the Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a County department headed by an elected officer, both the department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her department.
4. A Grand Jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the Grand Jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the Grand Jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.
5. During an investigation, the Grand Jury shall meet with the subject of that investigation regarding that investigation unless the court, either on its own determination or upon request of the foreperson of the Grand Jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.
6. A Grand Jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the Grand Jury report relating to that person or entity two working days prior to its public release and after the approval of the presiding judge. **No officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to the public release of the final report.**