

**SB 882 Advisory Council  
Meeting Minutes  
January 30, 2026**

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

**In-Person Location for Public Participation:**

**Elihu M. Harris State Office  
1515 Clay Street, Auditorium  
Oakland, CA 94612**

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

**Parliamentarian Johnson** called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council to order at approximately 9:01 am on Friday, January 30, 2026. The in-person location was at the Elihu M. Harris State Office, 1515 Clay Street, Auditorium, Oakland, CA 94612.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll.

**Present:** Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, and Members Olwyn Brown, Elizabeth Burt, Dr. Lauren Libero, Christina Petteruto, and John Robinson were all present remotely.

**Absent:** Members Rick Braziel and Assistant Chief Emada Tingirides were absent.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were nine members on the Advisory Council and five members were necessary to establish a quorum. As there were seven members present, a quorum was established.

**Chair Frazier** remarked on how federal officers are treating people with IDD and suggested that the Council consider addressing interactions between law enforcement and people with mental health and IDD at the federal level once the Council's task is done.

**Agenda Item 2: Action Item: Approval of December 10, 2025, Meeting Minutes**

**Chair Frazier** asked for comments and questions regarding the minutes from the Council's December 10, 2025, meeting. There were no questions or comments from the Council.

**MOTION:**

**Vice Chair Zuniga** moved to approve the meeting minutes for the December 10, 2025 Council meeting, as presented. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

The meeting minutes were provided to the Council members prior to this meeting and the members had an opportunity to review them.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** called for discussion of the motion. Hearing no discussion, she called the roll for the vote on the motion to approve the minutes as presented.

**Ayes:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

**Nays:** None.

**Absent:** Members Braziel and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 7 Advisory Council members present and voting; there were 7 ayes, 0 nays and the motion passed.

**Agenda Item 3: Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**Member Petteruto** suggested that Council start with agenda item 10 to review background chapter first to guide discussion for other items.

**Chair Frazier** agreed with this, and hearing no objections, moved to have the Council discuss agenda item 10 first.

**Agenda Item 10: Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Background Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Background Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**Vice Chair Zuniga**, as someone who cosponsored the SB 882 legislation, discussed the legislative background that created the SB 882 Advisory Council. She mentioned the survey by the Little Hoover Commission, which highlighted training needs identified by officers for interacting with people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. She noted that the Council's work is a continuation of that work.

**Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Kelly Burns** clarified that agenda item 10 has multiple topics and that it would be beneficial to return to it at the end of the meeting. She then noted that subcommittee recommendations were grouped by chapter (background; crisis response models and system interventions; and training) to discuss similar topics by theme and noted the proposed recommendations document that was provided with the meeting materials for ease of reference.

**DAG Burns** also noted that similar recommendations were combined, but where wording showed how different subcommittees approached a recommendation, those versions of the recommendations were included for discussion at this meeting. She noted that multiple, one, or some recommendations can be included in a motion, and Council members can voice disagreement regarding recommendations mentioned.

**DAG Conway** noted he will be presenting live notes, with a table with numbers to reference and keep track of the recommendations.

**Chair Frazier** asked if the Background Subcommittee would present on that item.

**Member Burt** noted that the recommendations for the Background section would instead be guiding principles to set the tone for the recommendations throughout the report, using California Health & Human Services and Department of Developmental Services practices as their guiding principle. She noted budgetary constraints and wondered about possibly prioritizing recommendations so that more advocacy could be provided around fewer items. She also noted that paragraphs before “By investing in...” should be moved to the applicable recommendation section.

**Member Petteruto** voiced focusing on what the Legislature can do, that money is a consideration, and that the subcommittee wanted these to be principles and not recommendations. She also noted that recommendations should be clear and actionable, not general ideas. She thanked **Member Burt** for her contributions and noted that the training non-negotiable recommendations might fit better under the Training section, that Background should be overarching, then include other principles within individual areas.

**Chair Frazier** echoed concerns about the Legislature implementing and funding the recommendations and suggested prioritizing a few items to be suggested over a few years, and adding a funding mechanism to avoid having an unfunded mandate if the report’s recommendations are passed through the Legislature, which would disproportionately affect rural communities.

**Member Petteruto** added that the Council could identify key priorities, and other items could be included in the report discussion as future areas to explore, or best practices.

**Chair Frazier** noted that he and **Vice Chair Zuniga** discussed with staff the possibility of having a joint meeting with the Public Safety Committee, Senate, and Assembly to present portions of report as private citizens to pursue priorities with legislators.

**Member Burt** noted that she thought the data evaluation section should be under Data Evaluation instead of Background and asked whether one of the recommendations involved creating a position or structure as an example. She also wondered about the specificity of their asks to the Legislature. **Chair Frazier** explained his understanding that, when the Legislature intends to propose a bill, the author will draft language, send it to Legislative Counsel for input, and then have a second chance to review the proposed language.

**Member Burt** suggested: (1) adopting the guiding principles first; (2) moving training recommendations to the training section; and (3) making data evaluation its own separate recommendation.

**DAG Conway** noted that staff’s recommendation would be to reach consensus regarding the guiding principles but not necessarily make a motion so that the Council can go back to the guiding principles after discussing everything, then summarize that they discussed guiding principles, then move to items 3 and 6 to implement the changes **Member Burt** recommended.

**DAG Burns** noted that items can be moved in the report without a motion since report organization hasn't been approved by the Council yet. She encouraged that feedback and noted the only things that need to be approved today are the recommendations.

**Chair Frazier** echoed that and moved to Agenda Item 3.

**Agenda Item 3: Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**DAG Burns** noted that recommendations could be changed, and that there are some duplicative recommendations for discussion. She noted that the recommendations for this section fall under partnerships; programs and services; and funding. **DAG Conway** noted that for note-taking and ease of tracking, the recommendations on the screen were numbered in a table.<sup>1</sup> After conferring with the Council, **Chair Frazier** read the below recommendations, which were subsequently discussed.

*Partnerships*

1. Law enforcement agencies should collaborate with community/non-law enforcement entities to allow for more natural, regular, non-emergency interactions between community members and law enforcement officers. Examples:
  - 1a. Host community events with law enforcement officers to build trust, reduce fear, and allow families to practice positive interactions in a safe environment. For example, agencies can have individuals with disabilities visit police stations and chat with law enforcement officers (e.g., "Meet the Police" days, sensory-friendly safety fairs) or have officers visit individuals with disabilities at various locations such as day programs, regional centers, regional center vendors.
  - 1b. Agencies, with community partners, can organize community events where natural conversations can occur, such as a community park, and officers and individuals do activities together (such as assigning buddies and playing games together).
2. Law enforcement agencies should create programs or focus existing community outreach programs on community members with disabilities to encourage more natural, regular, non-emergency interactions.
3. Foster law enforcement awareness of/connection with regional centers and county departments of behavioral health. Establish and maintain a library of sample memoranda of understanding between law enforcement, regional centers, and county departments of behavioral health.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Council has posted those notes to the January 30, 2026, Council Meeting Materials in both clean and track changes formats at <https://www.oag.ca.gov/sb882/meetings>.

## Discussion

**Member Dr. Libero** requested merging of 1a and 1b and 2 with more specificity regarding whether legislators would facilitate or promote law enforcement hosting events as mentioned above, and what is the Legislature's actionable item.

**Member Robinson** suggested a requirement to volunteer for this.

**Member Burt** agreed with **Member Robinson** and **Member Dr. Libero**, that she thought this was a best practice, not an ask for the Legislature, but if this is something the community wants to see, the Council could provide examples that show low or no cost ways to implement this, not as a formal recommendation, but law enforcement could still use it.

**Chair Frazier** agreed with **Member Dr. Libero**. **Member Burt** noted that this could not be mandated but is highly advised as a best practice to increase positivity in conjunction with this report, and echoed **Member Dr. Libero** that there are law enforcement agencies that already do this. He confirmed these recommendations would be best practices as **Member Burt** mentioned, asked for thoughts on **Member Robinson's** question.

**DAG Conway** noted that Council members were nodding affirmatively to these comments, and asked whether recommendations 1 through 3 would be best practices. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Robinson** confirmed that these items would be noted as best practices.

**Member Burt** noted for the Background section, that they discussed bringing in real life cases of how law enforcement interactions are impacting families, possibly having those narratives throughout the report in square call-outs. She also voiced possibly having one of these narratives be the last section of the report, but was unsure if that would be beneficial for a legislative report.

**Chair Frazier** responded that in reports, the wrong amount of information is not enough. He requested state data that tabulated bad interactions, and metrics for tracking improvement to do things better. He emphasized being concise, and ensuring they have data that corresponds with the stories.

**Member Burt** noted that to also address **Member Robinson**, the narratives would be interspersed throughout the report, instead of in just one section.

**Chair Frazier** appreciated **Member Robinson** sharing his real-life experiences, perspective, and input while on the subcommittee with him.

The Council proceeded to the Programs and Services recommendations, (4 through 10) which were read by **Chair Frazier**.

### *Programs and Services*

4. Investigate and develop strategies to help address workforce shortages among law enforcement, regional centers, and county departments of behavioral health, and their

vendors. Invest in creating educational, licensure, and recruitment pathways to becoming a behavioral health crisis responder.

5. Address the statewide bed shortage for people in acute crisis, especially availability of beds for people with IDD who should never be denied services on the grounds of a co-occurring disability.
6. Implement the Manny Alert Act per the recommendations of the November 2020 Manny Alert Act (AB 911) Feasibility Study of a Self-Registration Database for 911 Calls Final Report, including a funded voluntary statewide registry that is connected to all law enforcement agencies' and dispatchers' computerized systems.
  - a. Fund and require local law enforcement agencies and 911 dispatchers to utilize wireless emergency alerts to notify the public to be on the lookout for missing persons with IDD (including notice to check pools and bodies of water, or freeways). Such funding could come from a modest increase in the Emergency Telephone Users Surcharge from the State Emergency Telephone Number Account (SETNA) for wireless phone plans.
7. Consider adopting Blue Envelope system or lanyard system (voluntary system where people with IDD can self-identify so officers know). Translate to common community languages.
8. Encourage inclusion of people with MHD/IDD on civilian oversight boards regarding use of force.
9. Systemically integrate calls for service with officer-initiated stops so that law enforcement is aware whether a given interaction was initiated by a family member who has called for help for a relative or whether an officer comes across the scene by other means. This typically occurs with Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) and the Council recommends promoting this benefit.
10. Study response models that have been implemented by agencies that triage calls. For example, in Sacramento County Sheriff's Department response model, dispatchers determine which calls require a law enforcement response and which ones require a service-provider response (e.g., mental health provider) instead of law enforcement. Dispatcher determines, for example, whether to call fire department, California Highway Patrol, local government (e.g., traffic light not working), mental health providers, etc.

### **Discussion:**

**Member Dr. Libero for 9:** She requested clarity regarding what it meant to integrate calls. When the subcommittee was asked to address this, she noted that this was **Member Braziel's** recommendation, who was absent.

**DAG Conway** noted that the term may be referring to screening calls as to whether a family member or bystander is calling in.

**Chair Frazier** requested that recommendations by **Member Braziel** be addressed when he is back.

**Member Burt for 4:** She wondered if it was a recommendation (for the Legislature) and suggested possibly including something about the licensure. She noted this item was vague and requested more information.

**Member Dr. Libero** noted this might be a merged recommendation between two subcommittees. The first sentence from her subcommittee was broad for the Legislature to determine where to invest. She noted the Children and Youth Behavioral Health Initiative (CYBHI) that had loan repayment programs and internships to boost the behavioral health workforce. The intent was to have the Legislature look into strategies similar to that to address workforce shortages with law enforcement, Regional Center services and behavioral health services.

**Member Burt** requested that the CYBHI be mentioned in the recommendation so that they can call out a model that works. **Member Dr. Libero** agreed.

**DAG Conway** and **Member Burt** discussed the process of language revisions, that recommendation line edits could be made during the meeting and that everything for recommendations ideally should be resolved that day with a motion.

**Vice Chair Zuniga** noted that the recommendation was to add the HICAP model language that **Member Dr. Libero** referenced and suggested that **Member Dr. Libero** provide language. **Member Burt** agreed with this suggestion.

**Member Robinson** asked whether the Council was trying to find a model to refer back to or creating a new education or license.

**DAG Conway** noted that **Member Dr. Libero** could speak to the model referenced and noted that the Council is trying to identify what is working in the retention and recruitment efforts.

**Member Dr. Libero** wondered if the recommendation should be that the Legislature look into models, or that they recommend the Legislature implement workforce buildings strategies and be specific that the recommendations be tailored for law enforcement, Regional Centers, behavioral health and IDD/mental health?

**Member Dr. Libero** clarified that she was referring to what the Department of Healthcare Access and Information (HCAI) has been doing. She noted they worked on health workforce supply, that it is a data driven program with several initiatives and scholarships for people in specific fields, most in health or in behavioral health. She noted a shortcoming with those programs is that the incentives are broad; students can get loan repayment, but this isn't an incentive for doing behavioral health work that is focused on IDD. She noted wanting to see those initiatives targeting this population.

**Chair Frazier** noted that the Department of Research could adopt that and provide a conclusion, and the Council could direct them to do that research to find where the necessities are, commission a study. He wondered if that was a possibility.

**Member Petteruto** liked the idea of highlighting a program that appears to be working. She suggested “for example” at the end of the recommendation and note programs the Council recommends. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Dr. Libero** agreed with the changes suggested. **Member Burt** also requested that acronyms be spelled out then have the acronym.

**DAG Conway** asked for clarification from the Council members and revised **4** accordingly with track changes.

**Member Dr. Libero** requested to send something to **DAG Conway** in the chat. **DAG Conway** confirmed it would be a part of the public record but that would be fine.

**Member Burt for 5:** This is addressing the statewide bed shortage. She noted that she is dealing with this locally, and that most don’t understand that behavioral health centers routinely discriminate against people with autism and IDD. She mentioned that she just called a center in her area that said specifically they will not accept people with autism and IDD (and this was confirmed in their materials). She mentioned that this challenge is not unique, that there is no system for tracking beds for this population, and that California is investing 13 billion dollars in new beds and mental health. Her suggested language is requiring that these agencies who receive these funds: (1) accept people with autism and other IDD; (2) demonstrate their capacity to serve this population; and (3) coordinate with Regional Centers to ensure there is care after discharge, and embed those requirements in the funding. She noted that while others may not realize what a big issue it is, she noted the impact this has on affected families.

**Member Dr. Libero** and **Member Petteruto** both confirmed that they have also witnessed this practice and agreed it is discrimination. **Member Petteruto** requested that clarifying language be added to note that funds already addressing the bed shortage not be used in a way that is discriminatory towards people with IDD.

**DAG Conway** requested that **Member Burt** provide her language for **5** so that can be potentially added, she confirmed she would email it to staff.

**Chair Frazier** summarized, confirming that if someone has autism/IDD they are excluded from the treatment programs just for having a dual diagnosis?

**Member Burt** confirmed yes, they deny, and there is no resource for these families. She shared that in her area hospitals tell families “Don’t bring your child/adult back here even in a behavioral emergency.”

**Chair Frazier** noted that county jail is a last resort, and thanked **Member Burt** for bringing this issue forward.

**Vice Chair Zuniga** added that it was on **Member Dr. Libero's** wish list, and that in trainings they attended law enforcement were asking where to take these individuals and noted that there aren't enough beds. **Vice Chair Zuniga** noted this as a huge piece to address in the Council's recommendations.

**DAG Conway** read aloud the language **Member Burt** had emailed him and to the live notes document.

**Vice Chair Zuniga** and **Member Dr. Libero** agreed with this language. **Member Dr. Libero** also requested that everything be kept and appreciated the specificity of the new language.

**Chair Frazier** asked if there was a timeframe noted for the number of beds projected to be added to behavioral health centers.

**Member Burt** noted that it is done in rounds and some of earlier rounds have been built. She wasn't sure if they all were completed. She also noted that the language should specify that this should apply to all beds, not just new ones, that instead of asking for a number of beds set aside for this population, that people with autism and IDD be fairly considered for all available beds.

**Member Dr. Libero** agreed that setting beds aside for people with autism and IDD did not seem to be the right strategy when talking about community inclusion and desegregation, that if this is a state-funded resource, it should be available to everyone.

**Chair Frazier** asked, isn't that the intention of ADA? **Member Dr. Libero** confirmed that it was.

**Member Robinson** commented on the importance of ACBS and home- and community-home care services

**Chair Frazier**, and **Members Burt** and **Dr. Libero** discussed and confirmed that language should be added to apply these inclusion requirements retroactively to all facilities funded via Proposition 1 (2024).

**Member Petteruto** provided background regarding Proposition 1: that the second round of \$800 million in funding for facilities is set to be awarded spring 2026, that she was unsure if the recommendation changes anything, and that while some strings can be attached, the funding agreements will likely be in place before the report is ready.

**Chair Frazier** asked whether this [Proposition 1] is in the Governor's proposal to be funded, and with the funding amount mentioned. **Member Dr. Libero** tentatively confirmed this.

**Member Petteruto** also noted that per Proposition 1, all counties are to implement new 3-year comprehensive behavioral health services plans beginning in 2026. She noted that might give the Council more time to focus on.

**DAG Conway** coordinated revising this recommendation per the Council's feedback and replaced the initial version of recommendation 5 regarding statewide bed shortages with the more detailed version that was discussed during the Council meeting; these edits are reflected in the separately posted notes.

**Member Burt** for 7: regarding Blue Envelope, she requested that it be moved to best practices both to showcase where it is working well and due to the potential cost.

**Member Petteruto** noted that that the Autism Society was opposed to the Blue Envelope program due to how the legislation was written. She asked **Member Burt** to expand on that and what a good Blue Envelope system might look like.

**Member Burt:** the Autism Society Inland Empire worked for two years gathering community input on what would make a successful Blue Envelope program. They noted it is completely voluntary, a blue envelope would be provided for people with communication disabilities who drive, and lanyards, and other items for voluntary identification would be provided via donations from local Regional Centers. The organization also provided training for law enforcement involved in it, and for families. She noted that usually law enforcement pays for the Blue Envelopes, in-kind donations were also submitted, and the program costed approximately \$400,000 in her area, would be an investment if applied to other counties, and preferred that their recommendations have funding attached. She requested that this item be a best practice and clarified that the other legislation was well intentioned but that leaving Blue Envelopes for people to pick up without training would dilute the hard work that went into the county's efforts.

**Member Petteruto:** agreed to move this recommendation to best practices or as a consideration for the future due to it needing to be more than printing a blue envelope. She also suggested a local approach. **Chair Frazier** confirmed that this item would be moved into best practices.

**Member Burt** for 8: she was not sure about civilian oversight boards for use of force and requested more information.

**Vice Chair Zuniga** mentioned a civilian oversight board in Modesto. She noted that they are local and funding can be adopted along those lines. She recommended having somebody (related to SB 882) on those boards.

**Member Burt** requested that this item be a best practice since it would be local.

**Member Petteruto and Chair Frazier** agreed with this recommendation.

**Member Brown** requested that the Council wait for **Member Braziel** and **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** for their feedback.

**Member Burt** noted she doesn't know much and requested that this item be held until **Member Braziel** and **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** can provide their feedback.

**Chair Frazier** confirmed this item could be held.

**Member Burt for 9:** noted this one would be held to hear from **Member Braziel**.

**Member Burt for 10:** this seemed like a best practice as it was missing an ask (for the Legislature) and she was unsure whether to add an ask or move it to best practices.

**Chair Frazier** noted that a potential ask would be a huge cost and probably not be adopted. He recommended suggestive language and providing examples as shared earlier. He noted support for it but considered the financial reality.

**Member Petteruto** confirmed that recommendations are falling into 3 categories: recommendations right now for the Legislature, best practices for law enforcement or local government, and things for the Legislature to consider for the future. **Chair Frazier** agreed and noted that these items in addition to recommendations could be shared with the Public Safety Committee in the hearing, which can inspire legislators to carry some of the ideas forward in new legislation.

In response to **DAG Conway**, **Member Petteruto** requested that the Council circle back to **9** and **10** after reviewing all the recommendations at the end of the meeting, and **Member Burt** confirmed that the Council is waiting for **Member Braziel's** feedback.

**Vice Chair Zuniga for 9:** this falls in line with the Manny Alert Act and references when a third party calls in that doesn't know what's going on. She deferred to **Member Braziel** or **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** in terms of where this would fit, that it may be an addition to the Manny Alert piece and may be repetitive.

**Member Burt:** agreed and wondered if this recommendation be integrated into the one regarding the CAD system.

**Vice Chair Zuniga:** agreed that this should be integrated with the CAD recommendation, and that they confirm whether **Member Braziel** and **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** agree with that decision.

**DAG Conway** clarified revisions movement for **9** that would now be a subpart to recommendation 6, 6b so that legislature sees it as connected to, and a progression of the *Manny Alert Act*.

**DAG Burns** requested a break to avoid a break right before lunch. **Chair Frazier** moved for the Council to break at 10:55 a.m. and return at 11:05 a.m.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Break**

#### **Agenda Item 5: Reconvene Meeting; Roll Call to Re-establish Quorum**

**Chair Frazier** called meeting back to order and **DAG Conway** called the meeting to order.

**DAG Conway** called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 11:08 A.M. and called the roll to reestablish a quorum.

**Members present, at the time the Roll was called:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

**Members absent, at the time Roll was called:** Member Assistant Chief Tingirides and Braziel.

**DAG Conway** stated that there were nine members on the Advisory Council and five members present were necessary to establish a quorum. As there were seven members present, a quorum was re-established.

**Agenda Item 3 (continued): Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**Chair Frazier** read the funding recommendations, items 11 through 14.

*Funding*

11. Advocate for funding opportunities for training to improve interactions between law enforcement and persons with MHD/IDD, for example, to allow officers to use virtual reality training and expand technology-based training opportunities.
12. Evaluate and enact legislation to provide financial resources to schools, regional centers, and community groups so that students with disabilities, individuals who receive services from regional centers, and their family members or guardians can receive training and resources on how to safely interact with law enforcement officers. For example, individuals and family members can receive guidance on the difference between calling 911 or utilizing another resource and what information the caller should provide to help alert and notify of any disability-related needs.
13. Provide special grants for each county to operate 24/7 mental health crisis teams to respond to non-crime related 911 and 988 calls.
  - a. Require IDD training for these county mental health crisis teams.
  - b. Require IDD as a topic in Medi-Cal Mobile Crisis Training and Technical Assistance Center (M-TAC) required core trainings.
14. Consider the following funding streams to support these recommendations:
  - a. Priorities or special grants for smaller departments especially in rural areas.
  - b. An increase in the SETNA surcharge for wireless phone plans.
  - c. Proposition 63/Mental Health Services Act funds.

**Discussion**

**Member Dr. Libero** suggested moving and condensing **11** and **12** with the Training for Community recommendations (31 through 33). After reviewing those recommendations, **Member Dr. Libero** requested that **12** be moved to be added to the Training for Community recommendations. **Chair Frazier** agreed.

**DAG Conway** also confirmed for **Member Burt** that these items could be moved for discussion later.

**Member Petteruto** requested that **11** be moved to the law enforcement training recommendations section, and that funding items be connected to items that they are related to. Member Petteruto noted that **14** were relevant to previous discussions.

**Member Burt** for **13a** and **b** also requested these be moved to training recommendations as well.

With Council approval, **DAG Conway** moved **11**, **12**, **13a** and **b** as requested in the notes document.

**Vice Chair Zuniga**, **Member Petteruto** and **Member Dr. Libero** discussed where recommendation **14a** should be placed in the report, given that the content involved training, but also funding considerations for rural agencies. **Chair Frazier** also voiced support for rural agencies.

**Member Robinson** proposed a solution of having rural agencies train with larger ones to address the resources issue.

**Member Dr. Libero** appreciated his input and that it was a possibility, but also noted that rural places may need to pay to send officers to get trained, and also may not have enough people to send officers for training and cover shifts.

**DAG Conway** revised **14a** to include **Member Robinson's** comment to include optional sharing of resources.

**Member Burt** requested revisiting this item again at the end of the meeting. **DAG Conway** and **Chair Frazier** confirmed this can be done.

**DAG Conway** provided a recap:

- **4** on workforce development, **5** on bed capacity, **6** and sub bullets on the Manny Alert Act implementation, and **14** on funding being considered as Recommendations.
- Other recommendations were noted as best practices or waiting on additional feedback from absent members.

**DAG Burns** noted the next items are the training recommendations and advised that the Council consider this item until the stated lunch time and return to provide time for public comment after lunch.

**Agenda Item 6: Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Training Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Training Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**DAG Burns** noted that these recommendations fall under law enforcement training content and delivery, as well as process and training for the community.

**Chair Frazier** read recommendations 15 through 24:

*Content of Training for Law Enforcement or Other Government Personnel*

15. Develop training for law enforcement on the spectrum of diagnoses including people with multiple conditions.
16. Require POST to:
  - a. Update the content of Learning Domain 37 and in consultation with subject matter experts, including, but not limited to, the Department of Developmental Services, the Department of Health Care Services, organizations with expertise in the SB 882 populations, and people with lived experience as a person in the SB 882 population or a family member or caregiver of such a person.
  - b. Increase required hours of training related to Learning Domain 20 from 16 to 20 hours, with the 4 additional hours focused on de-escalation techniques and principles specifically in the context of the SB 882 population.
  - c. Increase required hours of training related to Learning Domain 37 from 15 to 20 hours, with the 5 additional hours focused both on interacting with people with IDD and on practical exercises.
  - d. Require specific training for POST-certified trainers who provide Learning Domain 37 courses. Alternatively, provide DDS annual allocation to provide train-the-trainer courses for POST-certified trainers related to IDD and law enforcement. Allocation to DDS to include one full-time staff and funds for limited-term, intermittent consultants to serve as co-trainers/panelists to provide a lived-experience component.
17. Advocate for policy and curriculum reform.
  - a. Recommend that POST formally integrate MHD/IDD considerations into de-escalation standards and include subject matter experts in curriculum review processes.
  - b. Initiate discussions with POST and academic partners to support curriculum updates and research.

18. Require the California Office of Emergency Services to develop training for dispatch on handling third party calls that may involve a caregiver—what to screen for, prompts they can present, criteria for sending out law enforcement and how to code it. This guidance should be developed in consultation with subject matter experts, including, but not limited to, the Department of Developmental Services, the Department of Health Care Services, organizations with expertise in the SB 882 populations, and people with lived experience as a person in the SB 882 population or a family member or caregiver of such a person.
19. Integrate MHD/IDD into de-escalation training. Embed MHD/IDD-specific scenarios and considerations into POST learning domains, emphasizing time, distance, and family involvement. Additionally, embed information and strategies for differentiating causation of certain behaviors requiring law enforcement response, and how different causations may impact intervention strategy, where helpful and appropriate. Trainings should include how to identify potential physical or mental conditions.
20. Consider including in training options for decision-making that include complete disengagement. Study agencies that have adopted these policies, such as San Francisco Police Department, which has a disengagement policy that establishes protocols for disengage from a barricaded/isolated subject. (See SFPDDGO\_5\_24\_20230606.pdf)
21. Add Autism/IDD-specific modules to CIT training, focusing on differentiating autism meltdowns from psychiatric crises, strategies for de-escalation, and communication in both contexts.
22. Train for different settings with potentially different responses, e.g., if CFS (call for service) is at a residence v. in the street. Responses may be different.
23. Ensure trainings cover culture and local history of interactions and how those can lead to escalation. For example, having law enforcement officers share information on family members who are in the SB 882 Population to build trust and understanding among officers.
24. Collaborate with subject matter experts, including professionals who work with people with MHD/IDD and community advocates, to co-develop training modules.

**Discussion:**

**Member Burt** asked whether **Member Braziel** and **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** would be joining after lunch. **DAG Conway** indicated that **Member Braziel** had an all-day conflict, and they had not heard from **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides**.

**Member Petteruto** asked about how much of the recommendation content is legislated already (requirements for Learning Domain 37 and 20 as examples), and what is required of POST right now in terms of hours spent on a specific topic. She wondered whether it makes sense to make requirements in this way and was unsure about how to evaluate them.

**Member Burt** agreed and requested that the related training background paragraphs be moved to training to highlight that portion in the training section. **DAG Conway** confirmed the Council's approval and made the revision in the notes document.

**DAG Burns** noted an expertise gap without law enforcement present during the meeting and suggested that if the Council could come as close today on the language as possible and have specific questions for those members, that would be helpful to facilitate revisions in March. She noted the recommendation language will be finalized by the end of that meeting.

**Chair Frazier** agreed with **Member Petteruto** and requested clarification regarding what is already required for 16 and the sub bullets.

**Member Burt for 15** discussed revising wording with **DAG Conway** to clarify the targeted population to the SB 882 population and wanted clarification about whether these trainings would only be POST-certified, or if the Council's recommendation could allow for non-POST entities (i.e. parents and other non-experts) to develop trainings that law enforcement could attend. **Chair Frazier** noted that this seemed to be a question for Member Braziel.

**Member Burt** asked if questions regarding the recommendations would be kept in the document. **DAG Conway** noted that this document was just tracking recommendation changes, but that DOJ staff are noting things to follow up on.

**Member Burt for 16:** Learning Domain 37 in the academy curriculum was just updated in July 2025, so she recommended adjusting the wording to keep that in mind. She also had a question to the subject matter experts: This is the academy, and they are learning a lot in a short amount of time. How much effort or exposure should they have to this population initially versus later in their career?

**Member Dr. Libero to Member Burt:** noted that it was beneficial to have both. Learning Domain 37 is the largest chunk of required training that is specific to SB 882 population. She noted that the Summer 2025 revision had content that was largely the same and still had some very problematic language. It made her question whether POST is relying on SMEs to update the content. Her impression was that the answer was probably no.

**Member Burt** asked whether the Council needs to define what a SME is. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Dr. Libero** agreed with this proposal.

**Member Dr. Libero's** intent was including DDS, DHCS to review the content and correct it. Regarding required hours, she noted the penal code specifies Learning Domain 37 has to be at least 15 hours, and Learning Domain 20 has to be at least 16 hours. She noted that this was an existing legal requirement, and this would be requiring an increase in that in the statute (regarding **16b** and **c**).

**DAG Conway** proposed modifying the language in the notes document per the Council's discussion, and **Member Dr. Libero** confirmed that was correct.

**Member Burt** agreed with **Member Dr. Libero**, and noted that in her experience with DDS, they are not always a subject matter expert. She wondered how to define somebody who has this expertise that is not just a person from that department. **DAG Conway** suggested phrasing for this, and **Member Burt** agreed with it. She also added that because both populations are served she wants to ensure that individuals have experience in both (mental health and IDD), and that the experience is not heavily weighed one way or the other. **DAG Conway** made the requested revisions in the notes document.

**Chair Frazier** asked for training as a whole whether the recommendations are for new people or for refresher courses too. **Member Dr. Libero** noted that expanding to refresher courses would need to be added in.

**Vice Chair Zuniga** noted that for POST trainings, SB 29 and 11 required 15 hours for current and maybe 20 hours for new recruits, and there was language in there for reoccurring education. She noted that she never saw that fully implemented.

**Member Burt** added that their law enforcement was certified under "perishable skills" to renew every few years, but that there are many courses that can be taken to fulfill that requirement.

**Member Petteruto** added that as part of perishable skills as a lawyer, there are a certain number of hours that need to be taken with specific categories and wondered if that could be implemented.

**Member Robinson** shared his experiences with officer training and confirmed that a certain number of hours are required for refresher training. **DAG Conway** revised **16e** to set a minimum number of perishable hours for officers per Council discussion.

**Chair Frazier** noted the importance that nonperishable skill training be implemented, and that it should be easy to implement.

**Member Burt** for **16d**: requested that the training for people who teach Learning Domain 37 be expanded to instructors who teach other courses like Learning Domain 20 so that officers get the right information regardless of the class they take, and that this class be taught by a subject matter expert. **DAG Conway** added **20** to **16d** to address the Council's feedback.

**Chair Frazier** wondered whether perishable skills would be adaptable to a course to train trainers.

**Member Burt** also asked whether this course should be a separate sub-bullet.

**Member Dr. Libero** wondered whether this would involve having a POST-specific required course, or an optional course funded by the Legislature, and whether DDS would potentially provide the training.

**Member Petteruto** added that if DDS were to provide the training, they could note an annual funding allocation to DDS for this training. **Member Dr. Libero** agreed.

**Member Burt** asked whether this training would have to be done forever, and if a full-time position would need to be created for it. **Member Dr. Libero and Member Petteruto** agreed.

**Chair Frazier** asked to clarify which recommendations would move forward at the current meeting.

**DAG Conway** also asked for clarification regarding **16**, and **Member Burt** requested subject matter expert input to confirm whether mental health is fully integrated into CIT training, or whether additional integration is needed.

**Member Dr. Libero** noted that based on trainings reviewed the bulk of hours were on mental health and the content was better (**Member Burt** agreed with this). She identified gaps specific to IDD. **DAG Conway** revised the language to note specifically the gap for IDD in CIT training with approval from **Member Dr. Libero**.

**Chair Frazier** also noted that neither mental health nor IDD were identified in one of the trainings he attended.

**Member Burt** requested that **17a** and **b** be merged with **16**.

**Member Petteruto** wanted to clarify whether **17** is referring to de-escalation training specifically, and whether they should have a separate recommendation for that training. **DAG Conway** confirmed that Learning Domain 20 is use of force and de-escalation (and separate from Learning Domain 37).

**Chair Frazier** noted that since Learning Domain 37 and 20 have to be amended through legislation, that the recommendations that mention them should move forward as recommendations for the legislature.

**DAG Burns** noted that **Vice Chair Zuniga** needed to step away for the rest of morning session and would return in the afternoon.

**DAG Conway** confirmed with the Council (**Member Burt** agreed), and revised **16a** to include Learning Domain 20 and 37.

**Member Burt** also noted that they are waiting for clarification on **15** in terms of whether the trainings would be just from POST or more general, and clarification for **18** regarding whether the Office of Emergency Services handles those trainings. **DAG Conway** noted DOJ staff are looking into this inquiry. **Member Burt** also noted she had heard of an autism-specific dispatcher training hasn't been able to confirm whether it exists.

**Member Burt** for **17b**: regarding discussions with POST and academic partners, she wasn't sure if this was a part of the subject matter expert Council that was previously discussed. **DAG Conway** suggested combining **17b** and **16d**, and **Member Burt** elaborated on her thoughts regarding the combining of those recommendations. She wanted the recommendation to capture any training to do with the SB 882 population, to confirm who is verifying that information.

**Member Petteruto** also asked whether the perishable skills, are always through POST (and noted the current language currently only notes POST). She also wondered whether officers have the option to train with the National Tactical Officers Association, who she attended a training with.

**DAG Conway** suggested **Member Braziel** could provide input and that the wording could be revised to include POST provided, POST certified, and non-POST provided trainings.

**Member Petteruto** the current wording works, and she just wanted some additional clarity regarding the scope.

**Member Dr. Libero** noted that if something wasn't required by the penal code, it would be difficult for the Council to have control over. **Member Petteruto** agreed and noted requiring whatever POST is covering would be a huge accomplishment, and the current wording is sufficient. **DAG Conway** summarized the discussion, that items for non-POST entities would be considered best practices, and recommendations for POST would go to the legislature.

**Chair Frazier** voiced not wanting to limit the recommendation to POST and wanted other people to provide their subject matter expertise to law enforcement. **Member Dr. Libero** agreed.

**Member Burt** asked whether there is an introduction paragraph about POST, and **DAGs Conway** and **Burns** confirmed that is in the report.

**Member Burt** for **18**: clarified that POST credentials dispatching and wondered about wording for examples that would warrant a 911 call for individuals who may be missing and/or escalating. **Member Dr. Libero** agreed, and **DAG Conway** implemented these changes in the notes document. **Members Burt, Dr. Libero** and **Robinson** were discussing additional examples to add and decided to wait for **Vice Chair Zuniga's** input after lunch. **Members Burt** and **Dr. Libero** also requested additional revisions to **18** which were

discussed, approved and implemented, and **DAG Conway** added this additional language per Council discussion to the notes document.

**DAG Conway** noted **19** was similar to **16**. **DAG Burns** also noted that POST references in the report are more spread out now and noted something more descriptive could be added into the background as to what POST is and what it does. **Member Burt** agreed to this, and **DAG Burns** noted this will be added to the background section.

**Member Burt** requested the Council break for lunch and revisit recommendation **18** after lunch and public comment.

### **Agenda Item 7: Lunch Break**

### **Agenda Item 8: Reconvene Meeting; Roll Call to Re-establish Quorum**

**Parliamentarian Johnson** called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 1:30 P.M. and called the roll to reestablish a quorum.

**Members present, at the time the Roll was called:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

**Members absent, at the time Roll was called:** Members Assistant Chief Tingirides and Braziel.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were nine members on the Advisory Council and five members present were necessary to establish a quorum. As there were seven members present, a quorum was re-established.

### **Agenda Item 6: (Continued) Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Training Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Training Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**Members Burt** and **Dr. Libero** asked for **Vice Chair Zuniga's** input, and she approved the current working for recommendation **18**, POST training for dispatch. Then **Chair Frazier** moved to **Agenda Item 9** for public comment.

### **Agenda Item 9: Public Comment**

**Chair Frazier** introduced public comment and provided the public comment guidelines.

There was one public commenter, Jessica Kramer, Founder and Director of Reach SD Senior and Disability Advocacy. She noted the organization works on developing these trainings for law enforcement. She noted that 5150 holds have been inappropriately used, agencies are familiar with 5150 and 418 policies, but not the senior and disability

victimization policy. This lack of familiarity leads to overutilization of 5150 holds, that does not examine that there are potential financial and resources limitations to meeting basic needs (which is a component of having a “grave disability”). She argued these instances are not being triaged effectively. Her recommendations were to re-examine policy 418 which characterized disabilities as limiting and teaches law enforcement to have that mindset and those parameters when assessing for 5150 holds, which she argued as dangerous for the disability population. She also requested instead of SB 882 population, to consider using mental health disability because mental health is a disability and for uniformity with this already available term.

**Chair Frazier** transitioned back to **Agenda Item 6** while keeping the public comment period open for members of the public to comment if they wished. Public Comment officially ended at 1:57 P.M.

**Agenda Item 6: (Continued) Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Training Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Training Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**Member Burt for 16:** she requested that **19** be merged with **16**, and after discussion, would be a second sub-bullet for **16a**. She also requested additional input regarding revising language, and suggested that **20** was a best practice, not a recommendation. Other Council members agreed.

**Members Burt, Dr. Libero** and **Vice Chair Zuniga** discussed **21** and noted that since CIT was a separate entity (**DAG Conway** also confirmed this), the Council would not have any legislative authority over them. This recommendation was noted as a best practice.

**Member Burt** noted that **22 through 24** seemed to be a part of training. **Members Dr. Libero** and **Petteruto** also discussed and agreed that with revisions made previously **24** was no longer needed and could be removed.

**Member Petteruto** also suggested moving **23** to best practices due to it involving encouraging workplace culture and voluntary disclosure. **Vice Chair Zuniga** and **Chair Frazier** agreed, and this item was moved to best practice. And **22** was integrated with **16** as a third sub-bullet for **16a**.

**Chair Frazier** requested a summary of the recommendations that are moving forward so far. **DAG Conway** confirmed that **15, 16** (**19** was integrated into **16**), and **18** were held for feedback from **Members Braziel** and **Assistant Chief Tingirides**, and **17 and 20 through 24** were either moved to best practices or cut in the notes document per the Council’s discussion. Then **DAG Conway** read recommendations **25–30**.

25. Develop field-ready resources and make them accessible via QR codes, mobile apps, and patrol vehicle desktops. For example, this could include: (1) training bulletins on black letter law; (2) best practices for different situations; (3) if/then guides; (4) relevant protocols.
26. Create a centralized training hub/library.
  - a. Target audiences: law enforcement, medical professionals, non-profits, facilities like group homes and Regional Center vendors.
  - b. Library to include: trainings, recommendations, and sample policy language other agencies can access.
  - c. Access: Include mobile training units that can be “checked out” especially for smaller and rural agencies.
27. POST Training Portal: Encourage all agencies to learn how to use the POST training portal for standardized access.
  - a. POST Training. Suggest POST continue to review third party trainings/products and link to POST training portal where appropriate.
28. Micro-learning at briefings: Integrate short video reviews (e.g., YouTube body-cam footage) to discuss real scenarios, what went well, and what could be improved. (For example, third-party videos, scenes on the news through third-party sources, in-house videos, or other agencies’ incidents of community concern, other agencies posting of events.)
29. Self-paced, interactive training modules featuring scenario-based decision trees, accessible through a secure online portal. Officers can complete these modules asynchronously, making it convenient for rural departments and those with varying schedules. To keep engagement high, the training should include realistic decision-tree scenarios where officers make choices and receive immediate feedback on outcomes. These branching pathways adapt to responses—providing extra resources for incorrect choices and unlocking advanced content for correct ones. Combined with interactive quizzes and knowledge checks, this approach ensures officers are actively engaged while reinforcing best practices through real-world decision-making. Consider hosting these on the POST portal for easy access.
30. Leverage technology, including simulation technology.
  - a. Expand the use of virtual reality. Encourage/explore use of virtual reality to enhance training (e.g., goggles or participation in a video game simulated setting). Develop statewide mobile training units available to smaller agencies, and bodycam-based platforms like Pro-Forma to simulate real-world encounters involving individuals with MHD/IDD.

- b. Virtual Reality (VR) Training: Provides immersive, scenario-based experiences that enhance decision-making and retention (Brown et al., 2023). While not yet standardized as a best practice, VR provides immersive, scenario-based experiences that enhance decision-making, de-escalation skills, and situational awareness. [Early research and pilot programs demonstrate improved engagement and knowledge retention among officers, particularly in high-stress or complex scenarios.]

## **Discussion:**

**DAG Burns** noted DOJ Research Services feedback, requesting that the Council be specific in terms of where a training hub would be housed, that funding be attached to it, and that recommendations that involve AI note compliance with AI technology policies. Additional feedback from DOJ staff was that wording be adjusted to note generally increasing simulation training generally so that agencies that have technology access issues are still recommended to partake in those kinds of trainings. **Chair Frazier** requested that this feedback be provided to the Council in writing or incorporated into the recommendations for review.

**Member Brown** noted that **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** has information about putting these recommendations into practice and recommended discussing this item with her further.

**Chair Frazier** noted a VR component and the learning impact it had in a training he attended, and he requested that it be a structural component for these trainings.

**Member Petteruto** voiced concern about the monetary aspect for **30** and requested to potentially put it in the future consideration category due to monetary considerations, and that it can be evaluated when more research has been done to evaluate it. She also recommended sharing resources between departments for item **26** as a best practice.

**Member Burt** also wondered whether these training items were suggestions or meant to be recommendations.

**Chair Frazier** noted that these recommendations should be implemented in a phased in approach, both to recognize that it will take time to implement them and be a cost. **DAG Conway** requested clarification on how to implement this feedback, and **Chair Frazier** noted that he wanted “when feasible” added to provide timing flexibility. **Member Petteruto** added that to her this aligns with the category of “for future consideration”.

**Member Burt** for **25**: requested feedback about the cost and whether the pamphlets would be used.

**Member Petteruto** for **25**: recommended as a best practice and the Council agreed.

**Member Petteruto** recommended **26** as a best practice, and **Member Burt** recommended it as a long-term item (for future consideration).

**Chair Frazier** for **27** and **27a**: noted some agencies don't know how to use a portal and wondered about agencies struggling to access it.

**Member Burt** for **27**: **Member Braziel** shared that this issue wasn't a how, but agencies not utilizing POST to its fullest. **DAG Conway** revised language to note maximizing POST resources, and per agreement of the Council, this item was noted as best practice.

**Member Burt** for **28, 29** and **30**: noted, and the Council agreed that these would be best practices. **Member Burt** also noted that sometimes there will be a human operator combined with AI, and **Chair Frazier** encouraged training integrating real life to be phased in.

**DAG Conway** read **31a through c, 32 through 33**, as well as **11 and 13** that had been moved from above.

### *Community Training Recommendations*

31. Develop and promote community training programs as the “flip side” of officer training, ensuring persons with IDD and their families learn how to respond effectively to stressful law enforcement interactions.
  - a. Ensure training includes lived experiences of people with MHD/BD.
  - b. Have law enforcement train people in the MHD/BD community how to interact with law enforcement. Develop and implement safety trainings for (1) youth/adults with behavioral health conditions and their families; and (2) direct support staff specific to interacting with law enforcement and emergency services.
  - c. Key Components:
    - i. Teach how to self-identify (e.g., Blue Envelope or lanyard systems).
    - ii. Explain what to do during a traffic stop or police interaction. Emphasize safety steps, such as not automatically reaching into a wallet—instead, ask the officer when it's safe to move your hands.
    - iii. Offer guidance on managing your own stress signals and staying calm during high-pressure situations.
    - iv. Encourage role-play and scenario-based practice for individuals and families to build confidence.
32. Provide a one-time special allocation to 21 regional centers to develop an ongoing service that provides safety training for individuals and direct support professionals specific to interacting with law enforcement and emergency services (including local law enforcement agencies where possible).
33. Evaluate and enact legislation to integrate into the education system and curricula training and skills on how students can safely interact with law enforcement and interactions with law enforcement officers generally.

- a. Any legislation should include positive and structured interactions with School Resource Officers so that students with disabilities can get used to interacting with officers and have continuity from school setting to other settings. For schools without School Resource Officers, interaction with officers can still be part of curriculum where officers and educators work together to teach students how to safely interact with officers.
  - b. Any legislation should consider requiring that experts be involved in developing the curricula. For example, a speech pathologist can develop a signal that helps individuals communicate non-verbally with law enforcement officers that they are experiencing a crisis. Once a signal is developed, educators can educate individuals and officers to utilize the signal.
  - c. Any legislation should consider requiring the integration into Individual Program Plans or Individual Education Plans skills and tips on how to interact with law enforcement (without necessarily having law enforcement come to plan meetings).
  - d. Evaluate and enact legislation that requires the training of private security officers, especially those who are able to carry a firearm, in the same manner police officers are trained, during or after certification
11. Advocate for funding opportunities for training to improve interactions between law enforcement and persons with MHD/IDD, for example, to allow officers to use virtual reality training and expand technology-based training opportunities.
  12. Evaluate and enact legislation to provide financial resources to schools, regional centers, and community groups so that students with disabilities, individuals who receive services from regional centers, and their family members or guardians can receive training and resources on how to safely interact with law enforcement officers. For example, individuals and family members can receive guidance on the difference between calling 911 or utilizing another resource and what information the caller should provide to help alert and notify of any disability-related needs.
  13. Provide special grants for each county to operate 24/7 mental health crisis teams to respond to non-crime related 911 and 988 calls.
    - a. Require IDD training for these county mental health crisis teams.
    - b. Require IDD as a topic in Medi-Cal Mobile Crisis Training and Technical Assistance Center (M-TAC) required core trainings.

**Discussion:**

**Chair Frazier** for **33**: creating a curriculum for this would involve Education Board of Supervisors and take 2–3 years according to Superintendent Thurmond, who noted he will confer with the Department of Special Education to see what can be done now and supports the idea. **Member Burt** revised that recommendation. **Chair Frazier** requested to see the draft, and it was forwarded to **DAG Conway** for incorporation. It was also noted as a long-term goal (for future consideration).

**Member Petteruto** for **33c**: if requiring in an IEP or IPP (speaking for IPP), she noted that at regional centers they have to determine the need for it on an individual basis. She noted there would be some individuals that this would not be a benefit to them and requested the Council consider revising to note requiring IPP teams to have the conversation.

**Chair Frazier** asked if she was referring to informational materials like what Los Angeles Education Department is putting together now.

**Member Petteruto** clarified that materials aren't required; the recommendation could be to require discussion of services available in that area.

**Member Robinson** agreed with giving individuals a choice when discussing services available to them.

**DAG Conway** read the revised language in the notes document that **Member Burt** provided for **33**, and the Council approved it.

**Member Petteruto** for **33c**: requested to keep bullet point about discussing with IPP. She wanted a mechanism in place so it doesn't sit on a shelf and will instead be utilized. **DAG Conway** implemented the language revisions. **Member Petteruto** also discussed with **Chair Frazier** how to revise or integrate **33c** with the new language for **33**.

**Members Robinson** and **Dr. Libero** requested that this be a recommendation for the legislature and **Chair Frazier** workshopped the language to make this adjustment and suggested other linguistics changes. **Member Robinson** also suggested having a Department of Education expert review agency curriculum and clarifying that functional safety skills will be taught with developmentally appropriate communication.

**Member Petteruto** requested to add a law enforcement expert to the recommendation and to have CDE as the lead agency coordinating this item, and that language about discussing via IEPs be kept in, so that there is a mechanism for informing families about the curriculum.

**Member Robinson** supported schools sharing information, referrals, and resources with families.

**DAG Conway** noted that University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Services (UCEDDs) are national, and there was discussion about whether they could be directed to participate. **Chair Frazier** also noted that the more perspectives involved, the more money it will cost.

**DAG Burns** noted that **Member Dr. Libero** stepped away at about 2:55 pm, and the Council still had quorum. **Member Dr. Libero** soon returned to the meeting and remained online from that point forward.

**Chair Frazier**, and **Members Dr. Libero** and **Burt** also advocated for adding wandering/elopement prevention as a topic for law enforcement training. **Members Burt** and **Dr. Libero** also shared the importance of adding that item specifically since in their experience it was not discussed at IEPs, and parents are not always notified when their child leaves school.

Recommendation **33** was revised to note that California would develop legislation, the California Department of Education would be the proposed lead agency, a law enforcement expert entity was added in, curriculum would be discussed at IEP meetings (law enforcement would not attend those meetings), adding wandering prevention as a focus, and additional language revisions were made by **DAG Conway** in the notes document, with some revisions pending feedback from **Member Braziel** and **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides**.

**Member Petteruto** for **32**: noted that at the Orange County Regional Center, they have a designated provider (START) who provides safety training. She thought it would be helpful to include similar guidelines for other regional centers in California.

**Member Dr. Libero** agreed to having a similar model and in terms of implementing, wondered if it should be a state mandate, or where they recommend that funding is provided to counties that don't have funding to implement it.

**Member Burt** proposed that the centers use community start-up funds. She also recommended criteria for the vendor that provides the training, and potentially a DDS review and approval process to ensure the people that teach it are qualified. **Member Petteruto** agreed with this and suggested language to note that they are recommending trainers with expertise.

**Member Burt** also requested that the skills mentioned in **33** also be added to **32**. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Dr. Libero** agreed with adding the skills. **Chair Frazier** also asked about tracking this training being provided, and **Member Dr. Libero** confirmed this was logistically feasible with a service or training code. **Member Petteruto** also added her regional center's experiences and suggested a sub code to track it. **Member Burt** appreciated the sub-code idea to compare what regional centers in the state are doing for the training.

**DAG Burns** interjected to check in about timing for the meeting and the remaining items to be discussed.

**Chair Frazier** requested that they review back at the top to start wrapping up recommendation review.

**DAG Conway** confirmed the additional language discussed regarding DDS for **32**, which **Member Dr. Libero** approved. Then, the Council confirmed that **31** would be a best practice, **32** and **33** would be recommendations.

Per discussion between **Chair Frazier**, **Member Robinson** and **Member Petteruto**, involvement of school resource officers in the curriculum was incorporated into **33** to integrate **33a**. **Member Burt** agreed with this change.

**Chair Frazier** and **Member Robinson** also noted their support for school resource officers in schools, their positive impact, and that it would motivate youth not to be scared of officers.

**Chair Frazier** for **33b**: noted lack of full support for Blue Envelope and issue with not having a universal way to signal/communicate for people that are verbal and non-verbal.

**Member Burt** also noted that there will be people with autism who will not self-disclose in a public way, and hence noted the importance of training to recognize autism even when someone chooses not to self-disclose. She noted support for other items and requested the Council put their energy behind those items.

**Chair Frazier** agreed that there are different opinions in autism community and to strike **33b** to vet the blue envelope program at another time. This item was stricken by **DAG Conway** in the notes document, along with **33c** that was previously integrated into **33**.

**Chair Frazier** for **33d**: noted lack of support and finances and that it was not a part of the Council's current effort. He recommended that it be stricken. **Members Dr. Libero** and **Burt** agreed.

**Member Robinson** for **12**: noted that this item was already removed, and the Council agreed.

**Member Burt** for **11**: noted this was already captured in previous recommendations, and hence was approved to be stricken. **Chair Frazier** agreed.

**Vice Chair Zuniga** for **13**: noted that this item was separate from the recommendation would augment the Manny Alert Act, since this funding was for the mental health crisis units that would respond instead of law enforcement. **Member Dr. Libero** noted that she would like the mental health crisis response teams have specific IDD training. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Dr. Libero** both requested that this be a recommendation, the Council agreed.

**Member Burt** noted for transparency that the Autism Society Inland Empire is cosponsoring AB 308 that requests County behavioral health agencies to provide training for county health crisis teams, which is currently on hold. She wondered whether she needed to recuse herself.

**Chair Frazier** and **Vice Chair Zuniga** noted that she did not need to recuse herself from voting.

**Member Petteruto** wanted clarity regarding 10 for response models, and **DAG Conway** confirmed that 10 was a best practice, then asked the Council if 13 would also be a best practice. Chair Frazier noted 13 would be a recommendation, and revising the language to allow county to train these teams was discussed and approved.

**Agenda Item 3: (Continued: Vote) Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**Chair Frazier** called for a motion to recommend the recommendations discussed during **Agenda Item 3**.

**1<sup>st</sup> MOTION:**

**Vice Chair Zuniga** moved to amend recommendations: 4, 5, 6, 6a, 6b, 14, 14a, 14b, 14c, in the Proposed Recommendations document, with the language that was agreed upon during discussion for each of these recommendations. This motion was seconded by **Member Dr. Libero**.

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

**Ayes:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, and Petteruto.

**Nays:** None

**Absent:** Members Braziel, Robinson, and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** reported that a majority vote was needed to amend the recommendations, which was **4** for this vote. There were **6** Council members present and voting; there were 6 ayes and 0 nays.

The motion passed.

**2<sup>nd</sup> MOTION:**

**Member Burt** moved to adopt the recommendation 13, 13.a, 13.b, 32, and 33, in the Proposed Recommendations document, with the language that was agreed upon during discussion for each of these recommendations. This motion was seconded by **Vice Chair Zuniga**.

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

**Ayes:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, and Petteruto.

**Nays:** None

**Absent:** Members Braziel, Robinson, and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** reported that there were **6** Council members present and voting; there were 6 ayes and 0 nay

The motion passed.

**Agenda Item 6: (Continued: Vote) Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Training Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Training Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**Chair Frazier** called for a motion to recommend the recommendations discussed during Agenda item 6.

**1<sup>st</sup> MOTION:**

**Member Dr. Libero** moved to amend recommendations 13, 13a, 13b, 32 and 33 in the Proposed Recommendations document, with the language that was agreed upon during discussion for each of these recommendations. This motion was seconded by **Vice Chair Zuniga**.

After calling for and hearing no discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion to amend recommendations 13, 13a, 13b, 32 and 33 in the Proposed Recommendations document, with the language that was agreed upon during discussion for each of these recommendations.

**Ayes:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, and Petteruto.

**Nays:** None

**Absent:** Members Braziel, Robinson, and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** reported that a majority vote was needed to amend recommendations 13, 13a, 13b, 32 and 33. There were **6** Council members present and voting; 4 votes in the affirmative were needed to pass the motion to amend. There were 6 ayes and 0 nays. The motion passed.

**2<sup>nd</sup> MOTION:**

**Vice Chair Zuniga** moved to adopt the recommendations 13, 13a, 13b, 32 and 33, as amended in the Proposed Recommendations document, with the language that was agreed upon during discussion for each of these recommendations. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

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

**Ayes:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, and Petteruto.

**Nays:** None

**Absent:** Members Braziel, Robinson, and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** reported that there were **6** Council members present and voting; Four (4 =) votes in the affirmative were needed to pass the motion to adopt the recommendations as amended. There were 6 ayes and 0 nays and the motion passed.

The items on hold for feedback from **Members Braziel** and **Assistant Chief Tingirides** were **8, 9, 15, 16** and **18**, in addition to the data recommendations. **DAG Burns** and **Chair Frazier** discussed how to proceed with the time remaining in the meeting, and the meeting was extended until 4:15 pm.

**Agenda Item 10: Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Draft Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council: Background Chapter and Recommendations; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Background Chapter Recommendations by Council**

**DAG Conway** read the newly revised data recommendations, **37-39** for the Council to consider:

37. It is important to identify a mechanism to assess the efficiency of any new ideas or programs using research. As the current Council will disband in April, the subcommittee recommends that the legislature create some structure or position to perform ongoing assessment of program success. Program success includes study of whether training for law enforcement-related to interactions with the SB882 population is effective in improving the population's experience in those reactions, and study of any other interventions recommended above.

This structure or position should analyze funding and a clear plan for who is responsible for gathering and analyzing data and reporting results.

- a. One such model is to run a pilot project, have researchers assess the efficacy of the pilot project, and make decisions about whether to institute the project more broadly, statewide or otherwise, based on the results of that research.
- b. Alternately, project development models may prove equally cost-effective, however, so the Council recommends an individualized, or an individual assessment of each program [further discussion of program options].

38. The Council has concerns regarding whether the data about officer perception that someone has a disability is accurate. Obtaining accurate data is a crucial baseline to measuring markers of success as described below.

- a. The subcommittee recommends engaging researchers to assess whether the current data collection system is accurate, or whether an alternate would improve data quality.
  - b. Because data collection usually relies on officers who have multiple simultaneous tasks to perform, the process of developing a data collection plan should include on-the-ground red teaming, or trying to apply the data collection system to difficult conditions to identify failure points.
39. The Council recommends the following priority markers of success to ensure that the goal of any reforms is measurable.
- a. Reduction in use of force in law enforcement encounters with the SB882 population issues. This will likely be a known low number.
  - b. Consider using RIPA data, but expanding to include instances of handcuffing. Increase in connection to helpful services following interactions with law enforcement. Issues. It would be helpful to name these services and who is delivering them. This may be best explored through independent research in the community about experiences with law enforcement.
  - c. Improved ability of law enforcement to respond to calls regarding wandering or lost adults and children who are members of the SB882 population. The issue, you may need new data sets, potentially in the missing person system, or independent research.
  - d. Building trust and relationships between law enforcement and the SB882 population. Reduction in internal affairs complaints about officer behavior during interactions, issues challenging to measure, improvements in knowledge among the SB882 population and their family members and providers about interventions available that are alternatives to law enforcement response. This may be best explored through independent research in the community about the prevalence of this knowledge. The Council recommends identifying a central repository for data about these interactions, more likely in a public health agency. public health-related agency, as opposed to DOJ.

**Discussion:**

**Member Burt for 37:** confirmed the revisions, that the recommendation is to run a pilot program and assess the efficiency of new ideas, and to create a structure or position to do so.

**DAG Conway** noted that many voiced trying to determine how it is working, and that it is difficult to find studies.

**DAG Burns** also noted that these are in some way recommendations to fund research with the legislature, the goal is to determine research priorities. She added DOJ Research Services feedback that pilot projects aren't always more cost effective than larger projects, and that the Council will also decide measures of success to research.

**Member Dr. Libero for 37:** three parts, first to potentially recommend a pilot project, second to address data collection items for SB 882 by law enforcement agencies regarding use of force, and third discusses how we measure our success. She added that for data collection, they might consider partnering with researchers, and about examining law enforcement data collection practices.

**Member Burt and Chair Frazier** discussed options for conducting the research, whether that would be a university project, or the Legislation Analyst office, or state auditor, which are engaged in examining results for implementation of legislation.

**Member Burt** asked for feedback from the law enforcement experts. **DAG Burns** noted that **Member Braziel** recommended that research should focus on how it feels on the ground. She suggested a meeting for the data subcommittee to provide feedback at the next meeting. **Member Dr. Libero and Chair Frazier** agreed with this idea, and the **Chair** requested recommendations from the data subcommittee at the next meeting. There was no vote for the data subcommittee recommendation items.

**Member Petteruto** proposed reviewing the revised report draft before adopting the guiding principles. **Chair Frazier** agreed and moved to Agenda Item 13.

#### **Agenda Item 13: Potential Action Item: DOJ Staff Presentation and Council Discussion on Updated Report Drafting Schedule**

**DAG Burns** encouraged Council to consider what was discussed today, the recommendations under consideration and the report draft. She requested report feedback by February 4 and noted a posting deadline of March 6 for the March 16 meeting. She also noted the last time to provide written feedback was March 12. She also noted the last meeting date is April 14. **Chair Frazier** requested that this schedule be reforwarded to the Council, and **DAG Burns** confirmed it would be.

#### **Agenda Item 14: 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**

**Chair Frazier** called for a motion to delegate authority to the DOJ to set the next meeting date.

#### **MOTION:**

**Vice Chair Zuniga** moved to delegate authority to the DOJ to set the next meeting date. This motion was seconded by **Member Brown**.

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

**Ayes:** Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, and Petteruto

**Nays:** None

**Absent:** Members Braziel, Robinson and Assistant Chief Tingirides

**Parliamentarian Johnson** reported that a majority of 4 affirmative votes were needed for this motion to pass. There were **6** Council members present and voting; there were 6 ayes and 0 nays. The motion passed.

**Agenda Item 15: Closing Remarks by Chair and Adjournment**

**Chair Frazier** noted that everyone rocked and adjourned the Council meeting at 4:16 pm.