

From: [Board Of Supervisors](#)
To: [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)
Subject: Fwd: Immediate Need for Supportive Family Visitation Plan for [REDACTED]
Date: Friday, May 9, 2025 2:37:27 PM

From: melissa schilling [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 1, 2025 9:21 AM
To: melissa schilling [REDACTED]
Cc: Suzanne Yang <Suzanne.Yang@santacruzcountyca.gov>; MaryEllen Olson <MaryEllen.Olson@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Alexa Mothersole <Alexa.Mothersole@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Gloria Carroll <Gloria.Carroll@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Randy Morris <Randy.Morris@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Kimberly De Serpa <Kimberly.DeSerpa@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Immediate Need for Supportive Family Visitation Plan for [REDACTED]

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

[REDACTED] messaged us that he plans to move home when school is out in three weeks. He communicated that he had let his social worker know, his lawyer know and his teachers at school.

We need a plan in place that meets his needs and keeps the community safe.
We need behavioral and social emotional supports and a responsive framework to follow.

It would be a shame to ignore this message and let things unfold without support.
That would put us back to a year ago when there was not a crisis plan in place and we were simply responding to everything in real time with law enforcement.

-m

On Mon, Apr 21, 2025 at 10:00 AM melissa schilling [REDACTED] > wrote:
Subject: Immediate Need for Supportive Family Visitation Plan for [REDACTED]

I'm writing to express deep concern about the ongoing treatment and planning around my son, [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] has not been provided with the strategies, outlets, or pathways to maintain healthy, supportive contact with his family. This lack of connection has had visible and painful consequences. We recently learned that he escaped from his STRTP in order to come home

—seeking the comfort, care, and grounding that only his family can provide. He visited family for 5 days.

Instead of being heard or supported in this need, [REDACTED] voice was ignored. His request to visit family was met not with understanding or a constructive plan, but with punishment—specifically, by restricting his access to digital communication. Unsurprisingly, this only increased his distress and ultimately led him to go AWOL again.

He has expressed plans to come home in two weeks. This should not be treated as a threat or violation, but as a clear sign of where he finds safety and stability. He needs a plan that acknowledges the importance of his family connections and allows him to draw love, comfort, and support from the people who know and care for him the most.

What is the long-term plan here? [REDACTED] will be 18 in less than a year. We should be focused on helping him build healthy, lasting relationships that will carry him into adulthood—not enforcing artificial separations that are causing more harm than good and will soon be irrelevant.

Shame, shame to the team in charge—where is your conscience? The approach being taken by Santa Cruz County Social Services is not just ineffective; it is actively harmful. It is creating pain, trauma, and long-term damage in a young person's life during a time when healing and connection are most needed.

We are requesting a meeting to discuss a family visitation plan that supports [REDACTED] emotional well-being and development, rather than punishes his natural desire for connection. This is a critical time to listen to his voice and respond with compassion and wisdom.

Sincerely,
(Family of [REDACTED])
Melissa Schilling
Kathy Schilling
John Vigliecca
Jared Vigliecca
Alex Vigliecca
Roy Vigliecca
Beverly Vigliecca
Martin Goicoechea
Roque Tomatis
Sarah Boll
Tabitha Stroup
Rebecca King
Gunther Gettelfinger