Meeting Minutes

September 18, 2025

Video Recording Available at: https://oag.ca.gov/sb882

In-Person Location for Public Participation:

One America Plaza
600 W Broadway Unit 1800
Room 1851
San Diego, CA 92101

Members Present: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, and Member Christina Petteruto. Members attended the meeting remotely.

Members Absent: Member Emada Tingirides, and Member John Robinson

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order, Welcome Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

Parliamentarian Doreathea Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council to order at approximately 9:01 am on Thursday, September 18, 2025, at the One America Plaza, 600 W Broadway Unit 1800, Room 1851, San Diego, CA 92101.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, and Member Christina Petteruto.

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides and Member John Robinson

The Council members attended the meeting remotely and members of the Department of Justice (DOJ) staff were present at the In-Person Location for public participation, at One America Plaza, 600 W Broadway Unit 1800, Room 1851, San Diego, CA 92101. At the time the roll was called, each of the members indicated that there was no one in their presence over the age of 18.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **7** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was established.

Agenda Item 2: Welcome Council Member Robinson

DAG Ben Conway introduced newly appointed Council Member John Robinson and explained that because of the timing of his appointment, Member Robinson was unable to attend this meeting due to a prior commitment. He also shared a statement provided by Member Robinson that expressed his excitement to begin working with the Council.

Agenda Item 3: Approval of April 1, 2025 Meeting Minutes

Chair Frazier asked for comments and questions regarding the minutes. Hearing none, (after clarification from the Parliamentarian), Chair Frazier asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the meeting on July 15, 2025.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to approve the meeting minutes for the July15, 2025 Council meeting as presented. This motion was seconded by **Member Braziel**.

Hearing no discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides, Member Robinson

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **7** Advisory Council members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays.** The motion passed.

Agenda Item 4: Discussion and Potential Action Item: DOJ Update on Status of Council Members' Reviews of Law Enforcement Trainings

DAG Ben Conway encouraged the Council to complete the training evaluation form and informed them that there will be additional training evaluation opportunities in October.

Agenda Item 5: Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by Gabriella Celeste, JD, Policy Director, Schubert Center for Child Studies, Case Western Reserve University

A video of this presentation, and accompanying video clip will be posted on the SB 882 Advisory Council website.

Summary of Presentation: This presentation and accompanying video component were provided by Gabrielle Celeste, Policy Director of the Schubert Center for Child Studies. The video discussed scenarios regarding youth interacting with Cleveland, Ohio police and provided strategies for more positive interactions. Ms. Celeste's accompanying presentation discussed how Cleveland, Ohio (and Ohio as a state) came to focus on police interactions with youth following a federal DOJ investigation in 2013, and multiple incidents of negative outcomes for youth when interacting with police. One of the issues discussed was that youth, especially Black youth, were perceived as older than they were, and were more likely to experience police violence. Cleveland, and Ohio state now have a youth category when documenting police interactions, youth-specific policies, and a statewide standard ("Standard 11") that requires police practices that are developmentally appropriate. Diversion options are encouraged for youth, with arrest seen as a last resort.

Discussion:

Member Burt began with a question on law enforcement agencies using the standards Ms. Celeste had discussed.

Ms. Celeste clarified that ninety percent of Ohio law enforcement agencies were using one or more of the standards; not necessarily all thirteen standards. She estimated that about 50 agencies use all of the standards.

Member Burt asked whether there is a requirement about officers attending training or did the policies just need to be there.

Ms. Celeste explained that the policies and training requirements were "not an entirely connected process."

Member Burt asked whether there is mandatory training on this topic.

Ms. Celeste explained that it is mandatory, but they don't have to do it as a part of the initial training. This is separate from the police department itself requiring training as a part of its policy. If you adopt use of force standards or youth standards, that does require mandatory training. What that looks like depends.

Member Burt asked about online versus in person training.

Ms. Celeste explained that, before COVID, Ohio did everything in person. Now they also use online trainings.

Chair Frazier asked **Member Braziel** whether he was observing parallels between Ohio and in California leading to the betterment of these interactions.

Member Braziel stated that he was not familiar with Ohio's standards, but that the Council could look into those. The key question is what can be done to make an interaction positive so that people want to interact with the police instead of running from them.

Ms. Celeste added that both Ohio and California are local control states—the states cannot always force change, but can set expectations and provide grants along with best practices, to encourage law enforcement agencies to adopt such standards. And that Ohio law enforcement agencies are engaging in this push.

Chair Frazier noted the distinction between rural versus urban departments, the culture of an agency, and that training is related to funding. He gave the example of a school resource officer program in the Bay Area that provided models for positive interaction.

Member Libero asked whether youth were involved in policy making.

Ms. Celeste responded that youth were "very active" in drafting policy. Ohio included youth providers and youth groups and incorporated their feedback. They also used paid youth to act out scenarios and act as ambassadors to lead programs, such as those youth in the video she presented.

There were no additional thoughts or questions. **Ms. Celeste** put a report in the chat. That report will be cited in the next revision of the List of Resources Referenced by Advisory Council Witnesses that will be posted on the SB 882 Council website.

Agenda Item 6: Break

Agenda Item 7: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 9:35 A.M. and called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto.

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides. Member John Robinson

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **7** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

Chair Frazier moved to agenda item number eight.

Agenda Item 8: Presentation by Lieutenant Donald Anderson, San Francisco Police Department, Officer in Charge, Crisis Intervention Team & Hostage Crisis Negotiation Team

A video of this presentation will be posted on the SB 882 Advisory Council website.

Summary of Presentation: Lieutenant Donald Anderson and **Fire Chief April Sloan** provided a presentation regarding San Francisco police fire department's process for responding to crisis calls. After an incident in 2001, they trained 900 officers in a new course about intervention training. This training was discontinued in 2009 due to budget reasons, but is still relevant since a 2010 study noted that 5 of 15 officer involved shootings included individuals with mental health challenges. Currently there is a 4-day mental health awareness course, that teaches giving space and time in these calls, and force is used less than 1% of calls. Sloan is working to expand training related to IDD. The street crisis response unit is taking more of those calls, and there are less detentions for mental health issues.

Discussion:

Member Burt asked whether their departments had figured out autism and alternative destinations.

Chief Sloan explained that they did not have an autism-specific destination. But she noted that there are alternate destinations for ambulances and where street crisis can take people. They further partner with Golden Gate Regional Center to respond to calls when there is a known regional center consumer.

Lt. Anderson added that their Start Program tries to engage with individuals over the phone as responding to house, start tries to handle a lot of these calls without law enforcement when possible.

Member Brown asked how 911 calls are routed and gave the example of some calls from Oakland being routed through the California Highway Patrol.

Chief Sloan explained several factors that could go into such a dispatch decision and added that, in 2022, dispatchers took on screening of weapons and violence.

Chair Frazier asked whether they had any data on the breakdown of mental health and the IDD population on calls.

Chief Sloan explained that for compliance reasons, they track behavioral health but not actual or suspected diagnoses.

Lt. Anderson added that they are piloting a model based off a program in Santa Cruz, where families can go to a website and put any of their loved ones in there. If they have symptoms, triggers, information that would be helpful for first responder to that location, families offering that data, our dispatch attaches that information to calls, whether police or fire, will have that information ahead of time.

Chair Frazier asked about availability of emergency beds and how repeat individuals are handled.

Chief Sloan explained that the fire department has been tracking this issue and working with local resources because of a highly acute population that are involved in these repeat calls, but that bed capacity remains a problem.

Chair Frazier closed by noting the importance of the regional centers and the California Department of Developmental Services.

DAG Conway noted for the record that Member Tingirides joined the Council meeting remotely at about 11:32am.

Agenda Item 9: Presentation and potential Action Item: Presentation by Marianne Halbert, Programs Manager, CIT International

A video of this presentation will be posted on the SB 882 Council website.

Summary of presentation: Marianne Halbert, JD, gave a presentation regarding CIT International. They saw a CIT gap in rural areas of Indiana, and emphasized having people with lived experience a part of the process of creating CIT teams, policies and more to provide their insights, identify gaps. Ms. Halbert noted it is important to see people outside of the crisis they met them in. This decreases stigma, increases empathy, and lets officers know that how they respond to people in crisis has an impact. She also discussed the Ernie and Joe Crisis Unit, that hearing lived experience stories build buy in, and recommended including people with lived experience not just in the trainings, but the systems.

There were no questions from the Council regarding this presentation.

Chair Frazier moved to the next agenda item, which was the lunch break. Chair Frazier announced that the Council would be in recess until 1:20 p.m.

Agenda Item 10: Lunch

Agenda Item 11: Reconvene Meeting; Roll Call to Re-establish Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at about 1:20PM and called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides, Member John Robinson

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **7** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

Chair Frazier moved to agenda item # 12: Presentation, Discussion and Potential Action Item.

Agenda Item 12: Presentation by Megan Buckles of Disability Rights California

A video of this presentation will be posted on the SB 882 Advisory Council website.

Summary of Presentation: Megan Buckles, an attorney from Disability Rights California, gave a presentation regarding police interactions with people with disabilities, and provided statistics about how likely negative outcomes are for people with disabilities and Black people that interact with police. Ms. Buckles also examined alternatives to law enforcement training such as diverting mental health calls to non-law enforcement response, having co-responder teams, stronger community-based organizations. She described a settlement in Tulare County, which heavily relied on law enforcement response for youth and adults with mental health crises, expanded community-based services, mobile crisis teams, school behavioral health services, a peer respite home, 20 new supportive housing units and other options besides law enforcement response. Other programs and solutions mentioned were "Mental Health First" programs in Oakland and Sacramento and traffic enforcement reform.

There were no questions from the Council regarding this presentation.

Agenda Item 16: Presentation, Discussion, and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff on Preliminary Draft Sections of Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council, Pursuant to SB 882

Because public comment had been noticed for 2:15PM but it was not yet that time, **Chair Frazier** advanced the meeting to this item.

DAG Kelly Burns first explained that Agenda Item 16 is intended to be a time to discuss the current draft report of the SB 882 Advisory Council, (a copy of that draft is posted on the SB 882 Council website) while Agenda Item 17 was a time to discuss potential recommendations and creating a process for the Council to further develop recommendations.

DAG Conway shared his screen, showing the table of contents of that draft report.

Member Burt asked whether there would be an executive summary or digest given the length of the document.

DAG Burns explained that there will be but that it is written last once the Council knows what the report content and recommendations are.

Member Burt further asked whether the Council wanted to distinguish, for example, behaviors stemming from autism versus those from mental health.

DAG Burns agreed to do that and asked for any resources to help draw those distinctions.

Member Petteruto asked to define the terms like "behavioral health condition" at the beginning. She wanted to be clear that the Council draws a distinction, maybe some recommendations apply to both, but I want to be sure that we are distinguishing between the two. She also noted that, in the background, they are written together when there is a difference between the state hospitals that were closed down and the creation of developmental centers.

DAG Burns shared that "behavioral health conditions" was used as a placeholder joint term but that staff want language like that to be a Council decision.

Chair Frazier referred back to Member Burt's question and agreed that the legislature will not read the whole thing, so the executive summary is essential. He suggested a joint public safety committee hearing to present it to more members.

DAG Conway noted that it was 2:15 p.m., the posted time for public comment, and asked Chair Frazier to transition back to Agenda Item 13: Public Comment.

Agenda Item 13: Public Comment

DOJ Staff Trini Hurtado explained the public comment process.

DAG Conway stated that no members of the public were currently present in person nor were there any hands raised virtually.

Agenda Item 16: Report Discussion (continued)

The Council returned to Agenda Item 16 while awaiting any public comments.

Member Braziel suggested that staff and the Council look for more recent data in light of modern testing methods. Otherwise, it looks like there is a huge jump in prison and jail populations when the people were there, they just had not been identified.

Chair Frazier added that as policies and procedures were implemented, data metrics showed that interactions got better.

Member Burt asked Chair Frazier about the level of detail at which the Legislature will review the report.

Chair Frazier suggested that if they had a hearing by the public safety committee and determine bullet points to show them. He further suggested that barriers may be a topic during Agenda Item 17.

DAG Burns thanked the Chair reiterated that staff want to hear about anything that is missing or inaccurate.

SDAG Virginia Corrigan added that this space is a good time to discuss such issues but that communications to staff are fine too.

Member Burt raised the challenge of finding actual providers, especially for people with dual diagnoses.

Chair Frazier noted that, while the Lanterman Act promises services, it does not specify quality and that there are not enough regional center workers because of funding.

Member Petteruto disagreed with Chair Frazier, in that, while the services are not always available immediately, the development in those areas is happening.

Chair Frazier responded that he thinks the developmental centers are constrained by reimbursement rates too

DAG Conway interjected that a member of the public had indicated a desire to comment.

Agenda Item 13: Public Comment (continued)

Public Commenter: Jadalphos Fraser

This public commenter mentioned being a victim of police brutality while supporting a client with IDD, and witnessing police brutality against clients with IDD. He asked whether and potentially how POST would be included in the Council's report, how officers are trained and evaluated for the role (and whether a system is in place to address officers not being able to appropriately interact with people who have IDD).

DAG Conway noted when the speaker's time expired, and referred him to provide additional comments via email at sb882@doj.ca.gov. There were no additional speakers for the rest of the public comment period, which ended at 2:36PM.

Agenda Item 16: Report Discussion (continued)

After Public Comment, the Council resumed discussion of the draft report.

Member Braziel asked about the feasibility of a density map of providers across the state and clarified that he was talking about all service providers, not just mental health.

Member Burt added that she loved that idea and suggested starting with the Department of Developmental Services. She added that knowing where providers are along with capacity would be important.

Member Braziel agreed regarding capacity. He explained the importance of showing the Legislature the gaps in the system—the need for somewhere to send people during and after an interaction.

Member Burt would also like to address the cycle of going in and out of hospital beds and being told not to bring children back to the hospital but also not to call law enforcement—where do these families go?

Chair Frazier added that part of how to improve the interaction is not encourage that cycle. But also, here are some of the detriments of care they should be receiving to stop this continuance of behavior.

Member Petteruto shared that she believes that the Department of Developmental Services is working on a statewide provider directory that could be worth investigating.

Member Libero shared that the Department of Developmental Services directory is not yet live yet, but that she could get an update on its status. She also observed that the Healthcare Act and information, does have a workforce database with a map. Though it is limited to certain kinds of healthcare providers, it could be useful.

Chair Frazier suggested that county behavioral health departments may be useful witnesses about what they have as providers.

DAG Burns moved the conversation from the Background section of the report to Crisis Response.

Member Burt raised a concern about a civilian led crisis team she heard of in Sacramento that stopped because of violence to civilians. She believed there was another one in Los Angeles. She wants to ensure that the Council gives a balanced report about what is and is not working.

Chair Frazier asked for more witnesses from families who have been impacted.

DAG Burns prompted the Council for any outreach suggestions. She noted former witness Vinny Eng whose sister had died in a law enforcement interaction. She explained that staff's efforts to find family members who were willing to speak had not been generally fruitful.

Vice Chair Zuniga offered to check with some people who might be willing to be witnesses.

Member Burt noted that crises do not always happen during business hours; availability of response teams in off-peak hours is another barrier.

Chair Frazier suggested that funding is an obstacle but that showing a cost-benefit analysis can be one way to spur investment.

DAG Burns turned to the third section on Training.

Member Burt asked Member Braziel there would be a way for POST to have a disability expert review trainings.

Member Braziel explained that POST puts subject matter experts in classes when reviewing. He also asked staff whether there was a process for alerting POST to any issues identified during the training reviews.

DAG Conway explained that the reviews were a closed loop.

Member Braziel further explained that POST can decertify a "bad" presenter. He clarified that reviews are randomly selected. He further suggested that if any material observed was inaccurate, the Council should flag it.

Members Burt, Brown, Libero, and Petteruto all noted the importance of clear, agreed-upon definitions.

Agenda Item 17: Report Recommendations

Chair Frazier began by suggesting two-person subcommittees.

Member Braziel posed a logistics question: given the nine members, two-person subcommittees could be difficult. He asked procedurally what would be required for a working group of four, for example.

Parliamentarian Johnson explained that a subcommittee of group would need quorum at an open public meeting to make recommendations that would go back to the full council. She further clarified that if a meeting did not have sufficient people for quorum, it would need to adjourn instead of discussing business.

Chair Frazier asked whether informational meetings were allowed as they are in the Legislature.

Parliamentarian Johnson explained that the Legislature has their own set of rules, separate from the Bagley Keene Act, that allow that process.

Member Braziel next asked who can appoint a subcommittee.

Parliamentarian Johnson explained that the Council could appoint members, or the Chair, or the Council could adopt another method.

Chair Frazier and **Members Burt** and **Braziel** suggested subcommittees in the areas of systems, trainings, and data.

MOTION:

Council Member Burt moved to form four subcommittees to develop recommendations for four specific report sections: background; systems and interventions; data; and training. This motion was seconded by **Vice Chair Zuniga**.

Discussion:

Chair Frazier called for discussion regarding the scope.

Member Braziel asked whether the motion needed to include assignments.

Parliamentarian Johnson explained that the Council could make appointments at the meeting or clarify how members will be chosen as part of the motion.

Member Braziel asked whether the Council could delegate to the Chair authority as to number and people.

Parliamentarian Johnson explained differences in subcommittee structures that could be considered, and that the structure would be something for the Council to vote on.

Member Braziel indicated a desire to amend the pending motion.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION

Council Member Braziel moved to amend the pending motion, clarifying that the subcommittees have 3 or more members as appointed by the Chair, or Vice Chair in his absence. **Council Member Burt** seconded the motion.

Discussion:

SDAG Corrigan restated the amendment and asked the Parliamentarian regarding concerns.

Parliamentarian Johnson flagged that the Council has to notice the members that are attending the meeting ten days in advance—membership cannot be floating.

Member Braziel observed that membership could be set in advance and noticed under the proposed amendment.

SDAG Corrigan inquired how flexibility could be worked into this proposal, especially if we lack a quorum for a meeting.

DAG Burns asked whether Council members who were not on a subcommittee could attend meetings and, if so, whether they could participate.

Member Burt asked whether witnesses could be invited.

Parliamentarian Johnson explained that Council members not appointed to the subcommittee can participate as members of the public, but cannot interact as Council members. She added that witnesses could be invited as it is a noticed meeting.

Hearing no further discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the amendment to the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides, Member Robinson

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **7** Advisory Council members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

The Amendment to the Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** moved to the **Main Motion,** that four subcommittees be established for four areas: background; systems and interventions; data; and training. Per the amendment, the subcommittees have 3 or more members as appointed by the Chair, or Vice Chair in his absence. Hearing no further discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides, Member Robinson

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **7** Advisory Council members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

SDAG Corrigan requested that authority be delegated to staff to schedule subcommittee meetings.

MOTION

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to delegate authority to the DOJ staff to schedule subcommittee meetings. **Council Member Libero** seconded this motion.

Hearing no discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides, Member Robinson

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **7** Advisory Council members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

Agenda Item 18: Action Item: Presenting Next Meeting Dates and Setting Next Meeting Agenda or, Alternatively, Delegating Authority to DOJ to Set Next Meeting Agenda Subject to Approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair

DOJ staff noted that the date selected was December 10, 2025, in Sacramento.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga made a motion to approve the meeting date of December 10, 2025 for the next full council meeting. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt.**

Discussion:

Member Burt: I will be in Sacramento to attend the meeting, no pressure, if anyone in Sacramento wants to meet in person, Zoom or hybrid?

Chair Frasier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and **Member Libero** offered to meet in person.

Burt asked DOJ whether it was possible to hold a hybrid meeting.

DAG Conway confirmed the meeting could be hybrid.

After hearing no further discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides, Member Robinson

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **7** Advisory Council members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays**

19. Discussion Item: Closing Remarks by Vice Chair

Vice Chair Zuniga thanked everyone for their effort, thought and the process. She mentioned that there is a lot of work ahead and behind, and she is looking forward to efforts coming to fruition.

Chair Frazier then adjourned the meeting at 4:03PM.