

Report of the
**SB 882 Advisory Council on Improving
Interactions Between People with Intellectual and
Development Disabilities and Law Enforcement**

April 2026

Executive Summary

Executive Summary

The SB 882 Advisory Council on Improving Interactions between People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and Law Enforcement (Council) presents this report to the Legislature as required by Senate Bill No. 882 (2021-2022) (SB 882). SB 882 established the Council to evaluate existing training for peace officers specific to interactions with “the intellectually and developmentally disabled community” and with “individuals with mental health disorders,” and to identify gaps in such training. The Council was also directed to make other recommendations to the Legislature that it deemed appropriate to improve outcomes between law enforcement and individuals who have a mental health condition or individuals who have an intellectual or developmental disability. SB 882 provided for the Council to operate for two years and for California Department of Justice (DOJ) staff to support the Council’s work.

The Council first met on April 15, 2024, and used multiple methods to gather and evaluate information to fulfill its charge. The Council met thirteen times over the course of two years and heard testimony from 38 witnesses who were members of impacted communities, law enforcement agency representatives, researchers, service providers, and legal and other experts. To understand the scope of existing training and research, the Council reviewed literature related to training types and efficacy, crisis response models, the general system of care for people with mental health conditions or intellectual or developmental disabilities, and other relevant topics. The Council, with the support of DOJ staff, developed a survey for law enforcement agencies to share information about the trainings in use across California and law enforcement’s experience with and impressions of those trainings. Council members also observed trainings offered throughout the state that covered interactions with people with mental health conditions and intellectual and developmental disabilities, and tracked features of the trainings and their impressions of training efficacy across several measures.

The Council identified the following topic areas for this report and collaborated to make recommendations to improve interactions between law enforcement and people with mental health conditions and intellectual and developmental disabilities:

Background: This report sets forth background information relevant to the development of the Council’s recommendations, including historical trends that have led to law enforcement’s role as a primary responder to crises related to mental health or intellectual and developmental disability; available statistics and research regarding the frequency and outcomes of interactions between law enforcement and individuals with mental health conditions and intellectual and developmental disorders; the rights of individuals with mental health conditions or intellectual or developmental disabilities; and an overview of California’s system of care to which law enforcement often provides impacted civilians with linkages after an encounter with law enforcement. Existing research demonstrates that people with mental health conditions or intellectual and developmental disabilities are more likely to have encounters with law enforcement and are more likely to experience uses of force in these encounters. The system of care to which such individuals may be connected, in turn, varies by region, and some individuals may experience barriers to or gaps in their access to services.

Crisis Response Models and Systems Interventions: The Council reviewed information about multiple crisis response models with varying levels of involvement from peace officers. This report provides an overview of the crisis response models and other systems interventions in use in California and in other jurisdictions across the country, as well as what is currently known about the efficacy of these models. Different jurisdictions in California use different, and sometimes multiple, crisis response models, including the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) model that relies on specially trained peace officers, co-response models involving a mixed first-responder team that includes both peace officers and clinicians, or civilian-led response teams guided in full by clinicians, peers, or other service providers. The variety of models, among other factors, makes it difficult to research efficacy. Research is mixed as to whether these models result in fewer arrests of and uses of force against people with disabilities. However, research indicates that these crisis response models are better received by the community than a response from peace officers alone, and that community members are more likely to be connected with helpful services when they are assisted by agencies using CIT or alternative models of interaction. This section of the report also describes other elements of crisis response, including dispatch systems and peer support.

Training: The Council gathered a wide range of information regarding law enforcement training related to individuals with mental health conditions or intellectual or developmental disabilities, including types of training available, training modalities, and the efficacy of trainings. As with research regarding crisis response models, the variety of type and quality of studies makes it difficult to draw consistent conclusions from the research regarding the

efficacy of law enforcement training, and more research is needed linking training to improvements in concrete elements of the interactions between people with mental health, intellectual, or developmental disabilities and law enforcement. However, some themes do emerge, and are consistent across the Council’s literature review, training observations, and law enforcement agency survey. Trainings employing active techniques such as role-playing and realistic simulation appear to be more engaging and more effective as learning tools. Law enforcement agencies can make good use of virtual reality and other technologies to deliver this type of training. And trainings delivered by individuals and family members who are impacted by mental health, intellectual, or developmental disabilities are also particularly effective and well-received by both community members and the peace officers themselves. Finally, more trainings should be developed to support community members in understanding and becoming more comfortable with peace officers.

Throughout this process, the Council confronted the tensions between the nascent state of the research, the desire to improve training, and evidence that the best way to improve the safety of these interactions is to implement systems that reduce their occurrence in the first instance. The Council therefore has included different types of recommendations appropriate to a developing field of study. First, the Council has developed guiding principles for its recommendations. The Council has also identified promising practices for law enforcement agencies, service providers, community members, and others to consider as they implement existing programs. Finally, the Council has made a series of recommendations to the Legislature that the Council believes can be implemented now to improve interactions between law enforcement and people with mental health conditions and intellectual or developmental disabilities. Among these is a recommendation to create structures to continue to learn and innovate in this area after the Council ceases to operate, in order to evolve alongside systems of care that are actively changing, respond to ongoing research findings, and evaluate the efficacy of proposed and newly implemented interventions on an ongoing basis.

The recommendations of the SB 882 Advisory Council are set forth below and at the end of each chapter.

[Final text to be entered after March 16 & 19, 2026 meetings of the Council, as follows:

1. *Final Guiding Principles*
2. *Final Potential Promising Practices, Data*
3. *Final Potential Promising Practices, Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions*
4. *Final Potential Promising Practices, Training*
5. *Final Recommendations, Data*
6. *Final Recommendations, Crisis Response Models and Other Systems Interventions*
7. *Final Recommendations, Training]*