



# City of Watsonville

"A Community of Opportunities"

July 24, 2017

The Honorable Judge John Gallagher  
Santa Cruz Superior Court  
701 Ocean Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Honorable Judge Gallagher:

In response to Foreperson Rocco Chappie's request to Chief of Police Honda of our Police Department for response to the Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury Report regarding *Assessing the Threat of Violence in our Public Schools*, I am enclosing the Grand Jury Response as accepted by the Council of the City of Watsonville at its July 11, 2017, meeting.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Beatriz Vázquez Flores  
City Clerk

Enc. Grand Jury Response

c: Chief of Police Honda  
Police Captain Rodriguez



**The 2016–2017 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury  
Requires that the**

**Watsonville Chief of Police**

**Respond to the Findings and Recommendations  
Specified in the Report Titled**

**Assessing the Threat of Violence in our Public  
Schools**

**by August 14, 2017**

---

When the response is complete, please

1. Email the completed Response Packet as a file attachment to [grandjury@scgrandjury.org](mailto: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](mailto:grandjury@scgrandjury.org).

## Findings

**F5.** Seven of the ten districts have a specific threat assessment plan; those districts without a plan are less able to respond effectively to threats. All of these reported that local law enforcement was aware of their plan.

**AGREE**

**PARTIALLY DISAGREE** – explain the disputed portion

**DISAGREE** – explain why

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

**F10.** Not all local law enforcement agencies have personnel trained in assessing threats of school violence, leaving them less able to assist schools.

**AGREE**

**PARTIALLY DISAGREE** – explain the disputed portion

**DISAGREE** – explain why

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

## Recommendations

**R5.** The CSO and Chiefs of Police should ensure a law enforcement representative, preferably a School Resource Officer, be made available to school districts drafting or revising a threat assessment plan. (F6, F8)

- 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 common practice, our SROs are heavily involved in school district initiatives, including safety planning, attendance review, and truancy abatement. Both are also involved in preventative initiatives with community partners, such as Pajaro Valley Prevention and Student Assistance and the Probation Department, through programs such as BASTA.

In terms of threat assessment planning, we also find great value and importance in collaborating with the school district. It is imperative that our SROs are made available to their respective schools and the school district for threat assessment planning. Most recently, both of our assigned SROs attended a meeting at the County Office of Education in March that was attended by county-wide school and public safety officials to begin coordinating a standardized threat assessment plan that could be deployed by all jurisdictions within the county. Our SROs will continue to take part in this initiative moving forward.

**R8.** The County Sheriff and the Chiefs of Police should ensure their respective law enforcement agencies attend periodic training in assessing threats of targeted school violence. (F10)

- 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:**

Ongoing training is a priority for all of our staff, including SROs. In March of 2017, one of our SROs attended a two-day training (*Effective Response to Student Threats of Violence Using an Evidence-Based Method*) at Cabrillo College that focused on student threats of violence to self and others, conducting effective threat evaluations, and cyber threats, amongst many other topics.

Last October, one of our SROs attended a “School Resource Officer” school, while the other SRO is scheduled to attend the same school in July of 2017. Additionally, one of our SROs, along with another Officer and two Sergeants attended a seminar titled *Civilian Response to Active Shooter Events* in September of 2016. Each of these courses included elements of threat assessment training.

Finally, a training opportunity was presented to school staff at both Pajaro Valley and Watsonville High Schools titled *Campus Emergencies, Prevention, Response, and Recovery*. Our hope is that staff from both schools and both of our SROs can participate in this training later this year.

## 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.**