

**SB 882 Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2026**
Video Recording Available at: <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882>
**In-Person Location for Public Participation:
300 S Spring Street, Room 1706
Los Angeles, CA 90013**

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

DAG Ben Conway called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council to order at approximately 9:01 am on Monday, March 16, 2026. The in-person location was at the Ronald Reagan Building, 300 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90013.

DAG Conway 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: Vice Chair Zuniga and Assistant Chief Emada Tingirides.

DAG Conway 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.

Agenda Item 2: Action Item: Approval of January 30, 2026, Meeting Minutes

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

Chair Frazier asked for comments and questions regarding the minutes from the Council's January 30, 2026, meeting. **Member Burt** expressed her thanks for the minutes, and there was no further discussion.

MOTION:

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

DAG Conway called the roll for the vote on the motion to approve the minutes as presented.

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

Abstain: Member Braziel.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga, and Member Assistant Chief Tingirides.

DAG Conway stated that there were 7 Advisory Council members present and voting; there were 6 ayes, 1 abstention and 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

DAG Kelly Burns provided a summary of the last meeting and noted additional feedback after the meeting from the Council. She also explained that the report recommendations and report draft in its entirety would be voted on by the Council during this meeting.

DAG Conway noted DOJ staff's recommendation to vote by chapter instead of having a final vote at the end for all recommendations. Report review was divided into three agenda items: "Background," "Crisis Response Models & Other Systems," and "Training." **DAG Burns** also noted that recommendation changes, which are visible on the SB 882 video recording, were indicated in two ways: changes that were made before the posting deadline were highlighted in yellow, and changes made after the posting deadline were indicated with red font and strikethrough.

Recommendations that are pending review by the Council or were approved as recommendations have been included in the minutes for reference.

Recommendations for Further Consideration

26. Encourage inclusion of people with mental health conditions and IDD on civilian oversight boards regarding use of force.

27. Systemically integrate calls for service with Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) for 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.

Adopted Recommendations

14. Investigate and identify data-driven strategies to help address workforce shortages among law enforcement agencies, 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. For example, loan repayment, scholarship, and internship programs developed through the California Department of Health Care Access and Information for students and graduates working in health and behavioral health professions.

15. Require IDD-competent behavioral health treatment capacity in all new Proposition 1 (2024) (Prop 1) and Behavioral Health Continuum Infrastructure Program (BHCIP) funded facilities. California should require that all behavioral health treatment facilities funded under Prop 1 and the BHCIP, which together represent a historic \$13 billion state investment, demonstrate the ability to serve individuals with IDD who have co-occurring behavioral health needs. Prop 1 and BHCIP are projected to create at least 6,800–11,150 new residential treatment beds statewide, marking the largest expansion of behavioral health capacity in California’s history. To ensure these investments are equitable and accessible, the State should establish IDD-competent treatment standards for all grantees and licensed operators. These standards should require facilities to:

- Accept individuals with co-occurring Autism/IDD and mental health conditions and prohibit exclusion based solely on disability, consistent with federal and state civil rights laws.
- Demonstrate operational capacity to serve individuals with Autism/IDD, including staff trained in communication supports, sensory aware crisis response, positive behavioral strategies, and de-escalation techniques.
- Incorporate physical and environmental design features that support sensory regulation and behavioral stabilization.
- Coordinate with Regional Centers, county behavioral health departments, and other disability-serving entities to ensure continuity of care.
- Embed IDD-competent requirements directly into funding agreements, licensing conditions, and California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) operational standards, ensuring California’s behavioral health expansion—funded through Prop 1 and strengthened by BHCIP—finally includes individuals with Autism and IDD, who have historically been among the most frequently excluded from crisis, inpatient, and residential care.

16. 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 made available for real-time access to all Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP), Computer Aided Dispatch Systems (CAD), and field first responders.

- 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.

- Ensure CAD reports that are distributed to the public, including researchers, appropriately differentiate officer-initiated interactions with members of the SB 882 population from dispatched calls for service.

17. Consider the following funding streams to support these recommendations:

- Priorities or special grants for smaller departments especially in rural areas, including opportunities for joint regional trainings;
- An increase in the SETNA surcharge for wireless phone plans;
- Proposition 63/Mental Health Services Act funds.

Discussion

Crisis Response Models and Other Systems

DAG Burns for **26**: noted that for this recommendation and in other places, clerical edits were made to have language consistency throughout the report.

Member Burt: asked whether this recommendation would be implemented at the state or local level, and whether it would fall under a mandate.

Member Braziel: noted that how it is implemented would depend on the agency, and recommended that this one stay a recommendation, not be a best practice.

Member Petteruto: noted that the recommendations have been based on what the legislature can do, and due to this, recommended that **26** be a promising practice. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Braziel** agreed with this suggestion.

Member Burt and **Chair Frazier** discussed potentially moving or keeping promising practices in the executive summary section. **Member Burt** suggested moving them to streamline that section, while **Chair Frazier** noted that it could be helpful to have them in that section to make legislators aware of other avenues, and as information for literature created by legislators.

Member Braziel for **27**: recommended that recommendation **26** be removed because it was already being implemented in the CAD system. **Chair Frazier** agreed, and the recommendation was removed.

There were also grammar and wording updates that the Council approved for recommendations **14** and **15**.

DAGs Burns and **Conway** for **16**: mentioned CJIS feedback that requested clarification regarding the responsible party and provided sample language to address this feedback for the Council's review.

Members Petteruto, Dr. Libero, and Burt discussed this item, noting that they recalled additional action was needed by the legislature to implement the Manny Alert Act feasibility study, but that they would also like **Vice Chair Zuniga** to provide feedback.

Member Burt agreed with **DAG Burns** suggestion to authorize the DOJ team to follow up with **Vice Chair Zuniga** to confirm language for this item since she was absent from the meeting.

Members Burt, Braziel, and Robinson discussed **16b**. **Member Burt** initially moved to strike it due to the CAD system already capturing these data, and **Members Braziel and Robinson** requested it be kept in to provide research parameters. **Member Burt** then requested that it be moved to best practices since it was for researchers and not legislators. After additional discussion, **Member Robinson** and **Chair Frazier** agreed with this request.

The Council also approved a change in description from “Best Practices” to “Potentially Promising Practices” since “Best Practices” means something distinct in research that does not match what the Council wanted for that section.

FIRST MOTION:

Member Libero moved to amend the March 6, 2026, Proposed Recommendations document with the language that the Council agreed upon during public discussion as to clerical amendments throughout, with substantive amendments to 16 and 26, deletion of 27 and addition of 30. These numbers are for reference only. This motion was seconded by **Member Robinson**.

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

Ayes: Chair Frazier, and Members Braziel, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson

Nays: None

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown and Assistant Chief Tingirides

Parliamentarian Doreathea Johnson stated that there were **6** Advisory Council members present and voting. A majority vote of 4 was required to pass the motion. There were **6** ayes, 0 nays and the motion passed.

DAG Conway asked for a short break to allow staff to confirm proposed language for the second motion to adopt the amended motion, which **Chair Frazier** approved.

Break

Reconvene Meeting; Roll Call to Re-establish Quorum

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 10:09 A.M. and **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll to reestablish a quorum.

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

Members absent, at the time Roll was called: Vice Chair Zuniga and Members Brown and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

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 six members present, a quorum was re-established.

SECOND MOTION:

Member Burt moved to adopt the proposed recommendations, as amended, identified as numbers 14, 15, and 16 in the March 6, 2026, Proposed Recommendations document. The numbers used were for reference only and not intended to be a part of the recommendations themselves. This motion was seconded by **Member Dr. Libero**.

Chair Frazier noted previous discussion of the motion. Hearing no further discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, and Members Braziel Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Brown and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 6 Advisory Council members present and voting; there were 6 ayes, 0 nays and the motion passed.

Agenda Item 6: 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 **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** provided feedback in between meetings that was incorporated into these recommendations. DAG Burns suggested that the Council could move forward with discussing the recommendations, and **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** could provide her feedback later in the meeting if she attended. **Chair Frazier** noted agreement with this suggestion.

Recommendations for Further Consideration

28. Ensure that training for peace officers includes the range of the SB 882 population's diagnoses including people with multiple conditions.

29. Encourage POST to:

- Review and strengthen the content of Learning Domains 20 and 37, as well as other courses related to skills that must be refreshed and practiced ("perishable skills"), in consultation with subject matter experts, including, but not limited to, staff with clinical expertise from the Department of Developmental Services, staff with clinical expertise in serving the SB 882 population from 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. Review required hours of training related to Learning Domains 20 and 37 and adjust as necessary to meet the review findings.

- Review and integrate IDD and mental health conditions across learning domains where appropriate with special attention given to de-escalation training. Review and incorporate IDD and mental health-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.
- Review and integrate training on the SB 882 population's diagnoses including people with multiple conditions. This should include for example, but not limited to, a range of mental health conditions, IDD, people with both a mental health condition and IDD, and people with other multiple disabilities (like people who are Deaf Plus).
- Review and integrate training on interacting with the SB 882 population in different settings with potentially different interactions. For example in settings such as a home or residence, a business establishment, or in an open public space, interactions may be different.
- Review minimum requirements for POST-certified trainers who provide courses in Learning Domains 20 and 37 as well as perishable skills related to the SB 882 population, in particular people with IDD. For example, the Legislature could provide the California Department of Developmental Services and/or DHCS/California Mental Health Services Authority (Cal MHSA) an annual allocation to provide train-the-trainer courses for POST-certified trainers related to IDD and law enforcement. Such an allocation to Department of Developmental Services and/or DHCS/ Cal MHSA should include one full-time staff and funds for limited-term, intermittent consultants to serve as co-trainers/panelists to provide a lived-experience component.
- Set a minimum number of hours for perishable skills training related to the SB 882 population for officers.
- Ensure law enforcement personnel are familiar with potential behaviors regarding "wandering"/lost adults and children who are members of the SB 882 population. POST should be encouraged to include "wandering" behaviors across learning domains that involve or could potentially involve the response to and investigation of missing persons.

- Review and ensure appropriate training for dispatch on handling calls that may involve an individual or caregiver of a person in the SB 882 population or bystander—what to screen for, prompts they can present, criteria for sending out law enforcement and how to code it. This could cover, for example, missing person reports and persons experiencing crises. This guidance should be developed in consultation with subject matter experts, including, but not limited to, staff with clinical expertise from the Department of Developmental Services, staff with clinical expertise from 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

30. Develop and promote community training programs as the “flip side” of officer training, ensuring that the SB 882 population and their families learn how to respond effectively to stressful law enforcement interactions.

- Ensure training includes lived experiences of people with mental health conditions and IDD.
- Have law enforcement train people in the SB 882 population how to interact with law enforcement. Develop and implement safety trainings for (1) youth/adults in the SB 882 population and their families; and (2) direct support staff specific to interacting with law enforcement and emergency services.
- Key components:
 - o Teach how to self-identify (e.g., Blue Envelope or lanyard systems).
 - o Explain what to do during a traffic stop or peace officer interaction. Emphasize safety steps, such as not automatically reaching into a wallet—instead, ask the officer when it is safe to move your hands.
 - o Offer guidance on managing your own stress signals and staying calm during high-pressure situations.
 - o Encourage role-play and scenario-based practice for individuals and families to build confidence.

Adopted Recommendations

18. Provide special grants for each county to operate 24/7 mental health crisis teams to respond to non-crime related 911 and 988 calls.

- Require IDD training for these county mental health crisis teams.
- Require IDD as a topic in Medi-Cal Mobile Crisis Training and Technical Assistance Center (M-TAC) required core trainings.

19. Provide a one-time allocation to the California Department of Developmental Services to fund regional centers that do not yet have one to develop an ongoing service that provides safety training for individuals and direct support professionals specific to interacting with peace officers and emergency services (including local law enforcement agencies where possible). These skills may include: wandering prevention, emergency response, seeking help, and communication tools for high-stress situations. The Department of Developmental Services should develop guidance to regional centers about which billing codes to use for these services for uniform reporting.

20. Develop legislation requiring the California Department of Education as the lead agency to develop a statewide, evidence-informed safety curriculum—requesting 6 collaboration from the California-based University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service; Regional Centers; Special Education Local Plan Areas; disability advocacy organizations/self-advocates; communication/behavior experts; POST; and law enforcement agencies—to support special educators in teaching functional safety skills through developmentally appropriate communication.

- These skills may include wandering prevention, emergency response, seeking help, and communication tools for high-stress situations.
- The curriculum should be voluntary, rights-affirming, culturally responsive, and accessible for students with diverse disabilities.
- The curriculum should encourage the engagement of school resource officers or local peace officers where feasible.
- Once developed, the California Department of Education and Special Education Local Plan Areas should disseminate the curriculum and professional development statewide.
- The legislation should require Individual Education Program teams to discuss the availability of support, resources, and information on how to interact with peace officers and how to address wandering/eloping.

Discussion:

Recommendations **28** and **29** were discussed. **DAG Burns** noted that terms were updated in **28**, that verbiage was updated in **29**, and that language was added to include perishable skills courses in the recommendation. **DAG Burns** noted that in addition to clerical edits, the substantive changes to **29** were made to acknowledge what POST is already doing, and to include information about “wandering” across learning domains that involve investigating missing persons, and that a video from POST about wandering was also included.

Member Braziel noted that he is planning to discuss the Council’s report with POST at their next meeting in June, and that the link is to the POST trainings page that is

accessible to the public and has a video on wandering. **Member Burt**, who reviewed the video, appreciated the resource.

Member Robinson asked about the difference between use of the terms peace officer and law enforcement officer. **Member Braziel** explained that peace officer is the term used in the penal code.

Chair Frazier and **Members Burt, Robinson, Petteruto, and Braziel** discussed **28** to determine how to clarify the diagnosis reference and specify who will be responsible for the recommendation. **Member Braziel** suggested moving **28** as a sub bullet to **29** to indicate that POST would be responsible for the recommendation. After discussion, the Council decided to reference IDD and mental health conditions separately, to include dual-diagnosis in this recommendation, and to move **28** to **29**.

Member Burt for **29**, suggested more specificity for the bullet point to “train for different settings with potentially different responses.”

Member Braziel, for **29** recommended rephrasing the bullet point to “as opposed to an open public space” instead of “in the street” to be more inclusive of various public settings. He also suggested revising that bullet point to state “potentially different interactions” instead of “potentially different responses” to encompass both the law enforcement and individual sides of the interaction.

Agenda Item 4: Break

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

Parliamentarian Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order and called the roll to reestablish a quorum.

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

Members absent, at the time Roll was called: Vice Chair Zuniga and Member Assistant Chief Tingirides.

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

Discussion (Continued)

DAG Burns, on **30**, incorporated feedback from **Member Robinson** to include that individuals with IDD and mental health conditions are involved in developing these policies.

Chair Frazier and **Members Petteruto, Braziel, Robinson, and Burt** discussed **30**. requested further clarification for **30** and whether it is specifying that we ask only law enforcement to train on the relevant topics.

Member Petteruto clarified that there are already two adopted recommendations that are specific to the school curriculum another that recommends that the regional center provides training. She echoed **Chair Frazier's** asked which entity would be taking the lead on developing and promoting this training program.

Member Braziel did not recommend that law enforcement take the lead on developing training, as there are already pre-existing agencies that have experience with these specific communities and provide guidance on interactions with law enforcement.

Member Robinson confirmed that there are external groups that provide training to law enforcement on these topics.

Member Burt asked if **30** would be a request for funding or if it would be categorized as a promising practice as there are currently preexisting community groups that are doing this work.

Member Petteruto asked **Member Burt**, for the groups that are already leading this training, if she was aware of where or how these groups receive their sources of funding.

Member Burt responded that in her organization, they utilize private foundations for additional funding. She also did not believe that requesting for additional funding should be a priority as a recommendation and suggested moving it to a promising practice or removing it completely.

Chair Frazier highlighted that these advocacy groups also have established trust and rapport with law enforcement agencies.

Member Petteruto agreed with **Member Burt's** suggestion of moving **30** to promising practices and opposed the suggestion of removing it entirely as there is a portion of the population that is not a recipient of regional center services. She agreed that it is not the most appropriate time to request funding and to develop entirely new training.

Chair Frazier and **Member Braziel** suggested rewording the language to "encourage community/law enforcement partnerships to train people in the SB 882 population" to better reflect the change of **30** from its original recommendation status to its promising practices status. **30** was moved to be a potential promising practice.

DAG Burns, on **19** of adopted recommendations, provided proposed alternate language for Council to review.

Member Petteruto provided more context for the suggestion, explaining that the proposed alternate language was invented to ease implementation in consideration of the current budget situation. **Member Braziel** agreed with **Member Petteruto's** explanation.

Chair Frazier mentioned that this approach may also allow further opportunities to develop a funding strategy or trailer bill.

Chair Frazier, and **Members Robinson** and **Burt** discussed recommendation **20**. **Member Robinson** requested to move it to best practice. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Burt** agreed, noting that someone could take action on it in the future.

FIRST MOTION:

Member Robinson moved to amend the March 6, 2026, Proposed Recommendations document with the language that the Council agreed upon during public discussion as to clerical amendments throughout, with substantive amendments to numbers 19, 20, 29 and 30, and deletion of 28. These numbers were for reference only. This motion was seconded by **Member Braziel**.

Chair Frazier asked for discussion of the motion. Hearing no discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson

Nays: None

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga, and Member 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.

The Council elected to wait for **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** to hear her input and finalize the vote on adopting recommendations.

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 Burns noted that, similar to previous recommendations, yellow is for edits that were made between the last meeting and the posting deadline (the Data Subcommittee made substantive edits), and red line edits were edits made after the posting deadline leading up to the March 16 meeting.

Data Requirements and Recommendations

21. Identify a mechanism to assess the efficacy of any new ideas or programs using research. As the current Council disbands in April 2026, it recommends that the Legislature create some structure or position to perform ongoing assessment of program success. Program success includes studying whether training for peace officers related to interactions with the SB 882 population is effective in improving the population's experience in those interactions, and studying any other interventions recommended above.

This structure or position should include adequate funding for ongoing staffing and expense requirements and a clear plan for who is responsible for gathering and analyzing data and reporting results. The Council recommends this structure or position be housed in a state agency or university (e.g., Department of Health Care Services/Department of Public Health).¹

- This structure/position can oversee pilot projects for future mandated requirements, 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. Alternative project development models may prove equally cost effective, however, so the Council recommends an individual assessment for each program.
- Pilot or other research projects should include a working group of stakeholders, including people with lived experience, to establish the most appropriate data collection, analysis, and reporting requirements. Working groups should be tailored to each project so that the right collection of expertise is brought to bear on each issue.
- Data collection plans should be tested in challenging real-world conditions to identify potential failure points or unintended consequences.

Pilot projects should include a research/analysis component of the data collection and reporting to determine potential effects including unintended consequences of the pilot, and should be funded. Research team members should have experience in and an understanding of the complexities with establishing benchmarks across diverse populations and locations.

¹ For example, one successful model exists in the Ohio Criminal Justice Coordinating Center of Excellence, which is funded by the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services and is housed in Northeast Ohio Medical University. This Center of Excellence has been able to coordinate learning statewide, and issues regular reports on implementation and evolution of CIT programs throughout the state. Northeast Ohio Medical University, *Coordinating Centers of Excellence*, <https://www.neomed.edu/cjccoe/about/>.

The Council recommends that the Legislature fund research, to be overseen by this structure/position, including but not limited to the following areas:

- Study response models that have been implemented by agencies that triage calls. For example, in the 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. A dispatcher determines, for example, whether to call fire department, California Highway Patrol, local government (e.g., traffic light not working), mental health providers, etc.
- Study training options for decision-making that includes complete disengagement, and study law enforcement agencies that have implemented such policies (see Proposed Promising Practice 5).
- Study efficacy of community training programs and community outreach activities (see Proposed Promising Practice 1 and Recommendation for Future Consideration 30).

22. Identify a central, public-facing repository for data about these interactions, more likely in a public health-related agency as opposed to the California Department of Justice. This repository may be connected to the structure/position for ongoing research described above.

23. Require the California Department of Justice report annually on cases reviewed pursuant to AB 1506 (officer-involved shootings that result in death of an unarmed civilian) involving a person with IDD or a mental health condition, and include funding to support the additional work required.

24. Fund ongoing research into the following priority markers of success to ensure that the goal of any proposed change in policy, training, or practices is measurable:

- Reduction in use of force in law enforcement encounters with SB 882 population
 - Evaluate annual Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 data to ensure the SB 882 population is included.
 - Require agencies to collect perceived or reported SB 882 population encounters in their use of force reporting practices.
 - Include a research/analysis component of the data collection and reporting to determine potential correlation or causation on uses of force following any changes from training, policy, or practices. Research team members should have experience in and an understanding of the complexities of establishing benchmarks across diverse populations and locations.

- Increase in referrals to supportive services resulting from interactions with law enforcement agencies.
 - Establish a working group of stakeholders to establish the most appropriate data collection methods and reporting requirements. This may be best explored through independent research in the community about experiences with law enforcement.
 - Include a research/analysis component of the data collection and reporting to determine potential effects of referrals. Research team members should have experience in and an understanding of the available services in the region and the complexities of establishing benchmarks across diverse populations and locations.

- Building trust and relationships between law enforcement and the SB 882 population, and improving knowledge among the SB 882 population, and their family members and providers, about interventions available that are alternatives to law enforcement response.
 - Establish a working group of stakeholders to establish the most appropriate data collection and analysis in measuring trust to predetermine knowledge within the SB 882 population and identify gaps. This may be best explored through independent research in the community about prevalence of this knowledge.
 - Include a research/analysis component of the data collection and reporting to determine potential effects of the changes that may affect trust between law enforcement and the SB 882 population. Research team members should have experience in and an understanding of the complexities with establishing benchmarks across diverse populations and locations.

25. Engage researchers to assess whether the current data collection system is accurate or whether an alternate would improve data quality. 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 measure markers of success as described above.

Since officers often manage multiple tasks, data collection plans should be tested in challenging real-world conditions to identify potential failure points or unintended consequences.

Discussion:

Member Burt and Chair Frazier discussed **21**, whether the Council would have the data proposed be publicly accessible, maybe via a dashboard, and potentially a webpage for the latest data update. Member Braziel agreed with this suggestion and recommended that it be added to **22**.

Member Burt expressed thanks for the revisions made to the data recommendations, and **Chair Frazier** emphasized the importance of tracking progress over time with data collection as noted in **23**. **Member Robinson** appreciated **24** and asked regarding assessing data accuracy and researcher engagement. **DAG Conway** noted that recommendation **25** might address his question, and **Member Robinson** confirmed this. There were no further edits to **23** through **25**. After discussion, the Council agreed to keep the data recommendations as recommendations.

FIRST MOTION:

Member Burt moved to amend the March 6, 2026, Proposed Recommendations document with the language that the Council agreed upon during public discussion as to clerical amendments throughout, with substantive amendments to numbers 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25. These numbers are used for reference only. This motion was seconded by **Member Robinson**.

Chair Frazier asked for discussion of the motion. Hearing no discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga, and Member 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.

SECOND MOTION:

Member Braziel moved to adopt the proposed recommendations, as amended, identified as numbers 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 in the March 6, 2026 Proposed Recommendations document. The numbers used were for reference only. This motion was seconded by **Member Dr. Libero**.

Chair Frazier noted previous discussion of the motion. Hearing no further discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga and Member 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.

Guiding Principles

DAG Burns noted two changes made since the last meeting, regarding data and including people with IDD in the policy making process.

Discussion

Member Burt: regarding the people with IDD in the policy making process, she noted that in this population people who do not verbally communicate are frequently left out of the policy-making process. She wondered whether revising the language to include family members would enable their inclusion, but also mentioned the issue that family can sometimes overshadow individuals with IDD and MH. **Chair Frazier**, and **Members Robinson, Dr. Libero** and **Braziel** (and **DAGs Burns** and **Conway**) edited the language with **Member Burt**, and the additions noted accommodating people with high and complex needs, and their participation in the policy-making process.

Chair Frazier also requested that impact to community in this section also requested revision to yellow bullet to also recognize the law enforcement community and increased law enforcement safety. After additional discussion with **Members Burt** and **Braziel**, these edits were agreed on during discussion.

MOTION:

Member Robinson moved to amend the March 6, 2026, Proposed Recommendations document with the language that the Council agreed upon during public discussion as to clerical amendments throughout, with substantive amendments to the Guiding Principles. This motion was seconded by **Member Brown**.

Chair Frazier asked for discussion of the motion. Hearing no discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga, and Member 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.

Lunch

Reconvene Meeting; Roll Call to Re-establish Quorum

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 1:32 P.M. and **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll to reestablish a quorum.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Frazier, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Assistant Chief Tingirides.

Members absent, at the time Roll was called: Vice Chair Zuniga, and Member Robinson.

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.

Public Comment

Analyst Trinidad Hurtado introduced public comment and noted that written comments can be submitted to sb882@doj.ca.gov.

There was one virtual public commenter, Jessica Kramer, Founder and Director of Reach SD Senior and Disability Advocacy.

Her comments noted a challenge with accommodations being met, and that people who are experiencing homelessness or domestic violence are put on 5150 holds when there isn't a mental health component. She mentioned the current system not being able to handle someone not having a basic need met, and that beds were being taken from people that need that space. She also discussed the Blue Envelope program and requested that behavioral health be added or change verbiage to SB 882 community. She also requested that the report include mental health or behavioral health when applicable to have equity with populations that are represented in this group.

There were no public commenters at the in-person location, or additional virtual public commenters. Public comment was closed at 1:56 pm.

Discussion and Potential Action Item 6 (Continued): 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 Assistant Chief Tingirides mentioned the importance of the safety of families, individuals, and officers. She requested statewide, aligned training and protocols and training and tool access across all Californian agencies, integrating training by people with lived experience in law enforcement, and that law enforcement officers who have family members with lived experiences can share their stories and further build trust and understanding within the community.

DAG Burns provided a summary of the changes that were made to the recommendations that morning to reflect **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides'** email. **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** also emphasized the importance of the "non-negotiables": standardization of training and youth engagement. She also highlighted recommendation

20's inclusion of the engagement of school resource officers or local peace officers and approved of its addition.

DAG Burns asked the Council if they had any further suggestions or comments.

Hearing no further comments, **Chair Frazier** called for a motion.

SECOND MOTION:

Member Libero moved to adopt the proposed recommendations, as amended, identified as numbers 19, 20, and 29 in the March 6, 2026, Proposed Recommendations document, with the numbers being used for reference only and not intended to be a part of the recommendations themselves. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

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

Ayes: Chair Frazier and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, Robinson, and Tingirides.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga.

Parliamentarian Johnson reported that there were 8 Council members present and voting; there were 8 ayes and 0 nays.

The motion passed.

Agenda Item 13: Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff Regarding the Full Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council; Discussion and Potential Adoption of Full Final Report by Council

DAG Burns thanked the Council for their feedback on the full report and discussed the substantive proposed report draft edits with the Council. She also noted the Council could discuss and provide feedback regarding the appearance of the report in addition to substantive feedback. **DAG Conway** shared his screen with the draft report displayed for Councilmembers to follow along.

DAG Burns noted that minor additions, revisions and corrections were made in the current draft, and that graphs were adjusted and updated to reflect current data. Additionally, she noted that the Council's feedback regarding improved accessibility for the graphs would be kept in mind when finalizing the draft and that an additional graph was included to reflect RIPA's data on actions that were taken during a stop by perceived disability status.

Member Burt asked for clarification on the graph noted above regarding actions taken by law enforcement and whether the data distinguishes between an individual who was in the process of committing a crime, or if they were stopped while walking or driving.

DAG Burns clarified the actions taken and noted that the data did include individuals who may or may not have committed a crime.

Chair Frazier noted that there are several ways people with disabilities can come in contact with law enforcement and the table is helpful to include to show the different results that could occur when there is a perceived disability.

Member Burt, additionally, stated that the graph was useful in highlighting that further data is needed to identify why law enforcement had made contact with the individual.

There was also discussion of the Lanterman Act and background regarding the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) by **Chair Frazier, Members Burt, Dr. Libero, Robinson, and Braziel** with additional context provided by **DAGs Burns and Conway**.

Chair Frazier requested adding more context regarding the Lanterman Act, which was noted.

There were also data requests by **Members Burt and Robinson**.

Member Burt asked about data regarding individuals eligible for diversion via the regional center (and noted the possibility of that impacting incarceration rates in California), and asked **Member Dr. Libero** about Department of Developmental Services annual regional center data. **Member Dr. Libero** responded that she hasn't seen any related data regarding this.

Member Robinson asked about data on the disabled incarcerated population.

DAG Burns responded to **Member Robinson** that in the literature review there was some California data but not enough and so the draft applied a national lens. **DAG Conway** also raised that the CDCR report seemed to be generally more focused on mental health services. **DAG Burns** noted that DOJ staff will circle back with a response later.

Member Braziel regarding CDCR noted California's corrections being in litigation for 30 years and staff shortages resulting in a recent receivership from federal court. He agreed that although California is in a better position than the rest of the country due to having a receiver, we are not at the level that we need to be at.

Member Burt asked if corrections classified IDD and mental health together or if they were considered distinct populations.

Member Braziel referenced Dr. Lipsker's presentation from the SB 882 Council Meeting of July 2025 as potentially providing further information.

DAG Burns confirmed that Dr. Lipsker previously mentioned that there were two separate programs, but there are many individuals within both programs. She recalled that the report mentions an overlap between the two populations within corrections. She suggested that DOJ staff can circle back to Dr. Lipsker's presentation and, in response to

Member Braziel's point, provide more context on the ongoing litigation and adjust the tone in certain parts of the report to acknowledge ongoing issues with California's system.

DAG Burns proceeded with the review and noted DOJ staff applied feedback from Council members who requested additional information regarding the autism population and higher suicide risk, and updates regarding California's Prop 1 implementation of its second phase.

Chair Frazier noted Prop 1's goal to fund 5,000 residential treatment beds and additional outpatient treatment slots. In consideration of this, he asked how many residential treatment beds and outpatient slots are still needed.

DAG Burns responded that previously discussed notes can point to the current service demand by county. She offered to add more citations to expand on this and show the gap in services.

Member Burt requested clarity regarding verbiage for who is served by regional centers and after Council discussion, verbiage was agreed upon to address her concern.

Member Burt asked for clarity regarding a definition, and the police notification process. **DAG Burns** and **DAG Conway** clarified the definition in question and noted that staff can address her comments in the updated draft.

Member Tingirides suggested replacing the term "police legitimacy" with "procedural justice" for clarity, with an attached footnote further defining the term.

Hearing no further discussion on these specific areas of edits, **DAG Burns** opened it up to more general discussion that was not addressed in the draft report review.

Member Burt suggested moving the Council's recommendations to be after the guiding principles and before the potential promising practices. **Members Petteruto** and **Robinson** agreed with **Member Burt's** suggestion to increase readability.

Member Petteruto suggested organizing the potential promising practices in different categories to increase accessibility for the intended audiences so that the intended reader can easily access the information that is relevant to their group.

DAG Conway clarified that there are no longer any data-related potential promising practices as they were absorbed as data-related recommendations, and revised the section accordingly.

Member Burt and **Tingirides** discussed the draft color scheme. **Member Burt** suggested the color blue instead of the current color green for the draft color scheme, which is symbolic of law enforcement. **Member Tingirides** also suggested using the same shade of blue that LAPD currently utilizes as the baseline color, and varying shades of blue for the color palette. **Chair Frazier**, and **Members Brown, Braziel**, and

Robinson were in agreeance with her aligning the color scheme to the shade that LACPD uses.

There was also discussion of the Blue Envelope in the report draft by **Chair Frazier**, and **Members Braziel, Burt and Robinson**.

Member Burt shared her knowledge of San Bernardino County's Blue Envelope program and how it is explicitly targeted towards individuals who have communication disorders that would impact their ability to communicate with first responders or law enforcement. Although it doesn't particularly exclude individuals with mental health conditions, it is intended for community members with communication disorders for the purposes of ADA accommodation. She also noted Dr. CJ Cook's statewide research project on the program, that funding from the Department of Developmental Services has significantly contributed to rolling out of the Blue Envelope program in the Inland Empire region for both the driving and non-driving population.

Member Braziel acknowledged that the report currently includes a potential promising practice that recommends the establishment of a workgroup that would allow further investigation on the implementation of the Blue Envelope program.

Chair Frazier, and **Members Burt and Robinson** also noted criticisms of the program (privacy concerns) and that it is not widely accepted.

Member Burt also added, to address these concerns, that the program is voluntary so individuals can opt-in.

Hearing no further comments, **Chair Frazier** called for a motion.

FIRST MOTION:

Member Burt moved to amend the March 6, 2026, Draft Report to include the edits that the Council agreed upon during public discussion and the March 6, 2026, Proposed Recommendations document, as amended; proposed recommendations and proposed promising practices should be incorporated into the draft report as indicated by highlighted placeholder language in the Draft Report. This motion was seconded by **Member Libero**.

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

Ayes: Chair Frazier and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, Robinson, and Tingirides.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga.

Parliamentarian Johnson reported that there were **8** Council members present and voting; there were **8** ayes and **0** nays.

The motion passed.

SECOND MOTION:

Member Robinson moved to grant the Department of Justice authority to wordsmith and provide any harmonizing of language and stylistic or non-substantive edits to the draft report, including citations and appearance. This motion was seconded by **Member Tingirides**.

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

Ayes: Chair Frazier and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, Robinson, and Tingirides.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga.

Parliamentarian Johnson reported that there were **8** Council members present and voting; there were **8** ayes and 0 nays.

The motion passed.

Agenda Item 14: Potential Action Item: DOJ Staff Presentation and Council Discussion on Updated Report Drafting Schedule

DAG Burns stated that report drafting is now complete. DOJ staff had originally scheduled for both Monday, March 16, 2026, and Thursday, March 19, 2026, as a potential back-up date for further discussion. Because Thursday, March 19, 2026, is no longer necessary, a cancellation notice will be posted on the website.

DAG Burns reported that DOJ staff will work diligently to incorporate the Council's suggestions and will work towards finalizing the report and a final published state.

There was no further discussion.

Agenda Item 15: 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

DAG Burns stated that the next meeting on Tuesday, April 14, 2026, will be the last meeting of the Council and the time to present the published report and acknowledge the Council's work.

DAG Conway clarified that the next meeting will continue to be in a hybrid-remote format, but Council members who are available to join the meeting in-person in Sacramento are encouraged to attend. Council members may be reimbursed for travel and will be sent additional communications from DOJ staff to organize logistics.

Chair Frazier called for a motion to delegate authority to the DOJ to set the next meeting date and agenda subject to the approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair.

MOTION:

Member Braziel moved to delegate authority to the DOJ to set the next meeting date and agenda subject to the approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair.

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 and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, Robinson, and Tingirides.

Nays: None.

Absent: Vice Chair Zuniga.

Parliamentarian Johnson reported that there were **8** Council members present and voting; there were **8** ayes and **0** nays.

The motion passed.

Agenda Item 16: Closing Remarks by Chair

Chair Frazier stated that every member of the Council is moving towards making a difference in the SB 882 population's lives and is looking forward to what can be attained through the group. He confirmed that there will be no meeting on Thursday, March 19, 2026.

Agenda Item 17: Meeting Adjourned

Chair Frazier adjourned the meeting at 3:26 P.M.