

SB 882 Advisory Council Meeting Minutes

Friday, October 18, 2024, 9:00 AM

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

In-Person Location:

Elihu M. Harris State Office

1515 Clay Street, Auditorium

Oakland, CA 94612

SB 882: Advisory Council on Improving Interactions between People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and Law Enforcement/State of California-Department of Justice

Members Present: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto, Member Clifford Phillips, and Member Emada Tingirides. All Members attended the meeting remotely.

Members Absent: Member Rick Braziel.

1. Call to Order, Roll Call to Establish a Quorum, and Chair's Welcoming Remarks

The third meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council started at approximately 9:10 am on Friday, October 18, 2024. The meeting was conducted via Zoom with an in-person location for public comment at the Elihu M. Harris State Office, 1515 Clay Street, Auditorium in Oakland, California.

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

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

Member Rick Braziel was absent, and **Member Emada Tingirides** joined the meeting later after the first break.

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

2. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Action Item #2: Approve July 25, 2024 Meeting Minutes

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to approve the July 25, 2024 meeting minutes. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

Chair Frazier called for discussion on the motion of **Agenda Item #2: Approval of the July 25, 2024 Meeting Minutes**. After hearing no discussion, **Chair Frazier** asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

Nays: None

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

The Motion Passed.

3. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Discussion Item #3: Department of Justice (DOJ) Update on Legislation

Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Lucia Choi provided a summary of recent legislative summary updates to the SB 882 Advisory Council. The Supreme Court and Legislative updates were provided as an attachment to the meeting agenda. A video of this presentation will also be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#); and a digital copy of the policy summaries is available under the meeting materials section for this meeting.

There were no questions regarding this agenda item.

4. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Discussion item #4, DOJ Update on List of Resources Referenced by Advisory Council Witnesses

Supervising Deputy Attorney General (SDAG) Marissa Malouff introduced this item and indicated where the references were located on the SB 882 website. She further noted that the “Reference listing” will be continually updated as needed.

Chair Frazier thanked the DOJ for the list.

Member Burt asked about finding an autism course for dispatchers. **SDAG Malouff** mentioned that the autism course for dispatchers would be discussed during Agenda Item #7, which will cover an Overview of Materials Provided by California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. She also located course number 9210 a course about autism, on the list of POST courses.

5. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item #5: Report from the Committee on the Law Enforcement Agencies Survey

Member Libero provided the update regarding the law enforcement survey. She focused on identifying priorities for the survey and stated that the committee reviewed an initial draft and is

refining the language. **Member Libero** reported the next steps, as follows: The DOJ Research Services team has uploaded the survey to their platform, and they are currently testing it. The survey is in two parts. The first part involves law enforcement agency policies, practices regarding data collection, availability of specialized response teams, access to community-based resources, collaboration with partner agencies like mental health departments, and resource gaps. The second part focuses on how required and elective law enforcement agency trainings are relevant to intellectual and developmental disabilities and mental health conditions.

There is also space for feedback from recipients regarding the policies, practices, trainings, and resource needs. The first part of the survey should be completed by department chiefs. The second part regarding trainings will be completed by the agency's training administrator. They are currently paring back the 2nd part by looking into whether there are resources that can be used to replace some of the questions to reduce the burden on those taking the survey and increase efficiency. This might lead to collapsing the two parts into one survey. The subcommittee also discussed conducting outreach with law enforcement agencies before launching the survey to prepare department chiefs for its dissemination. In November-December, the survey should be prepped for launch, but it would be a busy time. The team is currently discussing when the best time will be and is looking at early 2025.

There were no questions or further discussion regarding this agenda item.

6. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item #8: Break. (time 9:41 a.m. – 9:50 a.m.)

7. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda item #9 and asked the Parliamentarian to reconvene the meeting and to call the roll to Re-Establish Quorum.

Parliamentarian Johnson reconvened the meeting at 9:50 a.m. and called the roll to reestablish a quorum.

Members present during the roll call following the break were: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga; Members: Brown, Burt, Libero, Petteruto, Phillips, and Tingirides.

Member Tingirides joined the meeting at the first break.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that **5** members were needed for a quorum, **8** members were present at the time the roll was called, and a quorum was re-established.

8. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda item #6: Public Comment

DOJ Legal Assistant (LA) Noel Garcia introduced public comment. The public comment time period was for 20 minutes from 9:50 a.m. to 10:10 a.m. **LA Garcia** stated that each person would be designated two minutes to speak, and that instead of or in addition to making public comments, members of the public would also be able to send written comments to sb882@doj.ca.gov. **LA Garcia** further noted that to be informed about future meetings, the public could subscribe to Council updates via: <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882>.

There was 1 public comment provided via Zoom by Dino J. Beltz. He mentioned his background as a firefighter, and experience in law enforcement. He also mentioned that as a father to a son

who is autistic with “special needs,” he developed first responder curriculum, delivered trainings in Southern California to local paramedic and firefighter programs, and discussed how these programs can best assist people who have “special needs.” A group of students from a local junior high school toured a fire department, watched them prepare for a call, and tested the trucks and equipment. He further stated that he met **Vice Chair Zuniga** at one of the training events he hosted. He indicated that he wanted to be a resource to the Council and offered to provide the training materials for the Council’s review.

Chair Frazier stated that the DOJ would contact him after the meeting to discuss further partnership opportunities.

There were no other public commenters.

Member Burt mentioned a point of order, to avoid skipping agenda item #7.

The public comment section was ended by **Garcia** at 10:10 a.m.

9. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item #7: Presentation, Discussion, and Potential Action Item: Identifying a Process for Evaluating Trainings Pursuant to SB 882

The POST materials presentation, given by **DAG Ben Conway**, were provided as an attachment to the meeting agenda. A video of this presentation will also be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#); and a digital copy of the policy summaries is available under the meeting materials section for this meeting.

Council members discussed various potential processes for evaluating existing peace officer trainings specific to interactions as required under SB 882.

Vice Chair Zuniga mentioned that the number of trainings, 209 is large. She asked how the trainings overlap to make evaluating them more uniform and suggested having the Council “conquer and divide” evaluating the trainings.

Member Tingirides stated that with POST trainings, each course outline is about a different subject, and subjects are not condensed into one outline, so it would be good to review each course, as there wouldn’t be much overlap between the courses, even if they are under the same umbrella.

Member Burt stated that the trainings under one program, like CIT, are usually similar, so they can potentially be grouped by program. She would like to determine which classes are from CIT, and which are not. She also asked how to prove the trainings’ efficacy. She mentioned potential evaluation metrics such as looking for changed behavior or attitudes (in terms of interacting with the target population), fewer shootings or hospitalizations, and levels of crisis intervention.

Chair Frazier asked if anyone else had any comments.

Member Phillips asked whether in-person trainings could be recorded, or whether there is a video component to them.

DAG Conway stated that it is unclear whether the in-person trainings will be recorded or have a video component.

SDAG Malouff stated that it would be good to discuss the kind of trainings the Council would like to view in-person versus online, and to determine a rubric for how they want to organize and conceptualize the trainings they want to review. Do they want to for instance examine how many rural versus urban area trainings are provided? Or focus on how many trainings discuss IDD versus mental health? The DOJ can facilitate in terms of determining what that system/rubric is in consultation with the chairs. The DOJ could then present a plan at the next meeting for how the trainings would be reviewed for the Council to consider. If there is anything that the Council knows right now that they want to focus on in terms of how they want to review the trainings, that can be discussed now, or members can email the DOJ with that input.

There was no further discussion and **Chair Frazier** noted that the next Agenda Item was a scheduled break. **Chair Frazier** asked the Council members if they wanted to continue or to take the break. By consensus, the Council members agreed to move forward without taking a break.

10. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Presentation and Discussion Item #10: Presentation on Law Enforcement Academy Training and Crisis Intervention Team (Training)

- **Panelist: Yolanda Cruz, Regional Manager at State Council on Developmental Disabilities**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

Yolanda Cruz presented on law enforcement academy training and crisis intervention training. A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#) and a digital copy of the slides is available under the meeting materials section for this meeting.

Member Petteruto asked whether traumatic brain injury (TBI) is covered when talking about 5th category. Fifth category refers to people who either have not been diagnosed as having IDD or a mental health condition yet have one, or are on the border of qualifying for a diagnosis, yet still need support. **Member Petteruto** also asked whether **Cruz** covers the idea that people can be dually diagnosed with IDD and a mental health diagnosis.

Cruz confirmed that dual diagnosis is covered when she has time during her allotted POST teaching time slot and mentioned that she does not address TBI in her section, but that it is discussed in POST's Learning Domain (LD) 37. **Cruz** also mentioned that she gets variable time (1 – 4 hours with Bakersfield PD) to cover the LD 37 content from CIT during a 40-hour course.

Vice Chair Zuniga thanked **Cruz** and stated that she appreciated that she does site visits.

Cruz clarified that she does not do site visits, but that some programs do have site visits. She has a person with lived experience and talk with the class about their lived experience.

Member Libero referenced Learning Domain 37. She asked whether the speaker's outline covered interviewing people with IDD who have been victims of a crime.

Cruz confirmed that the content covered those individuals with IDD who had been victims of a crime, and that there is roleplaying with scenarios and interviewing.

Chair Frazier asked whether there were ongoing trainings to provide updated information to officers.

Cruz confirmed that they do conduct ongoing trainings, but that this varies by department. She mentioned Salinas as an example, where a probation officer mentioned that she hadn't done the CIT training in 10 years. **Cruz** also mentioned that engagement with the trainings has increased over the years and that LAPD does different types of trainings.

Chair Frazier also mentioned the challenge with doing multiple trainings in rural areas due to lack of capacity.

Cruz responded, mentioning that CIT trainers meet once a month via the CIT collaborative at various departments, and that funding resources and opportunities for smaller departments would be discussed at an upcoming presentation at the Eureka police department. **Cruz** also mentioned that departments can apply for DOJ funding for these programs. She acknowledged this process can be time-consuming for smaller departments that may not have grant writers to submit the applications.

Chair Frazier responded, mentioning that school resource officers (SROs) aren't funded by police departments in smaller districts. They are sometimes funded by city councils, and those councils should be made aware of funding opportunities as well. **Chair Frazier** also mentioned that SROs play an important role because they get to know students with IDD personally, creating awareness of the importance of SRO engagement in schools. **Chair Frazier** mentioned wanting Special Education directors to work with law enforcement to create a curriculum about interacting with law enforcement that is taught in special education classrooms.

Cruz responded that San Bernardino had several SROs, probation officers, and corrections officers attend the 40-hour CIT trainings. She observed that Kern and Bakersfield also make sure that probation officers attend the trainings.

Chair Frazier indicated his concern about counties that don't focus on having SROs in their school district, and wanted them to be proactive about incorporating them into the school environment at an early level and integrating a curriculum with law enforcement.

Following the discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson**, who was unable to hear a portion on the discussion relevant to Agenda Item #7, asked if there had been a motion made by the Council to either have the Council members identify and develop a Process for Evaluating Trainings Pursuant to SB 882, or to authorize the DOJ staff to identify and develop a process for evaluating trainings and bring it back to the Council for consideration.

11. Chair Frazier moved back to Agenda Item #7 and entertained a motion.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga was recognized by **Chair Frazier** and moved to authorize the DOJ to work with the Chair and Vice Chair to formulate a plan to review and observe the trainings, and to develop a rubric for that evaluation process.

The motion was seconded by **Member Phillips**.

Chair Frazier called for a vote. The roll was called by **DAG Ben Conway**, as technical difficulties prevented **Parliamentarian Johnson** from doing so. As discussion was not asked for prior to calling for the vote, **Chair Frazier** redid the motion, called for discussion; and, hearing no discussion, asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

Nays: None

Members Tingirides and **Braziel** were absent during this vote and did not vote on this motion.

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

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** then moved the meeting to Agenda Item #11, Lunch.

12. Lunch (time: 11:26 am – 12:45 pm)

13. Re-Establish Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson reconvened the meeting at 12:45 p.m. and called roll to reestablish the quorum.

Members present during the roll call were: Vice Chair Zuniga, Members: Brown, Burt, Libero, Petteruto and Phillips.

Members absent during the roll call were: Chair Frazier, Members: Braziel and Tingirides.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that **5** members were needed for a quorum, **6** members were present at the time the roll was called, and a quorum was re-established.

14. Vice Chair Zuniga moved to Agenda Discussion and Action item #17: Setting Fourth Meeting Date (Tentatively January 17, 2025) and Agenda, or Alternatively, Delegating Authority to DOJ to Set Fourth Meeting Date and/or Set Agenda Subject to Approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair

Member Burt mentioned that the council needs to think about time needed to write the recommendations, and wondered what the timeline was for that.

SDAG Malouff responded that the council will likely want to start outlining and filling in the report in Spring 2025, drafting 6 months before the April 2026 deadline.

Member Brown requested that the Council invite Michael Bernick to a future meeting. He is an attorney and author in the area of autism (who co-wrote “The Autism Job Club”).

SDAG Malouff mentioned that DOJ staff has reached out to him, and is open to also discussing other ideas for the next council meeting with him.

DAG Goldfaden recommended working backwards from the deadline, April 26, 2026, when thinking about planning the next meetings. Everything needs to be finalized a month before the deadline (not just the content but formatting and graphics, and a draft needs to be sent to the legislature). She recommended that they have an outline ready by Spring 2025. There are sections that the council can address early on, such as describing the trainings, considering initial recommendations, and absorbing the content so far presented. The council will need to consider scope since it is a huge topic—intellectual and developmental disability and mental health both need to be covered—and there are a lot of related areas that could be examined (e.g. juvenile, correctional). Some of the recommendations for the report can come from the presentations as well as reviews of the POST trainings. These comments were summarized by **SDAG Malouff** due to technical difficulties.

MOTION:

Member Burt moved that the Council delegate meeting logistics to the DOJ staff for the next meeting. This motion was seconded by **Members Libero** and **Phillips**.

Vice Chair Zuniga called for discussion on the motion.

Discussion:

SDAG Malouff asked whether people were open to meeting over two days instead of one.

Member Burt asked about the meeting format.

SDAG Malouff responded that the format would be up to the Council, and that the two meetings may not both be two days.

Vice Chair Zuniga mentioned that she is open to meeting over two days for the next meeting, and **Member Brown** mentioned emailing DOJ staff later regarding this.

Hearing no further discussion, **Vice Chair Zuniga** asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll for the vote.

Ayes: Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto, Member Phillips

Nays: None

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 6 Council Members present and voting: **6 Ayes, 0 Nays**.

Vice Chair Zuniga stated that the motion passed.

15. Vice Chair Zuniga moved back to Agenda Presentation and Discussion Item #13: Presentation on Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Mental Evaluation Unit and Crisis Response Support Section

- **Panelists from LAPD**
 - i. **Lieutenant Jon Larsen, Los Angeles Police Department, Officer-in-Charge, Crisis Response Support Section**
 - ii. **Detective Elizabeth Reyes, Los Angeles Police Department, Mental Evaluation Training Unit**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

The Los Angeles Police Department gave a presentation on the Mental Evaluation Unit and Crisis Response Support Section. A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#) and a digital copy of the slides is available under the meeting materials section for this meeting. **Vice Chair Zuniga** appreciated the presentation, and **Member Phillips** thanked the presenters.

The Council members asked the following questions, which were responded to by the panelists, as follows:

Member Burt asked whether urgent care centers are behavioral or medical hospitals, and if people end up in emergency rooms.

Detective Reyes stated that the centers are behavioral health centers. The doctors at those centers determine whether a person needs longer care or is stabilized. The centers are not equipped for emergencies, or for people who need medical care, who cannot walk on their own, or who are combative. The program will also do drop offs to the centers and take people who are on parole or intoxicated. These urgent care centers are calm, with lazy boy chairs, and muted TVs. People can do their laundry there.

Member Burt also asked when the emergency calls come in, if there is a question to determine whether this is a person with autism who is having behavioral dysregulation, versus someone who is not on their medications.

Detective Reyes stated that the dispatcher would ask questions and can tell if there is someone with autism or will ask if there has been a mental health diagnosis. Those questions give more insight. Our officers are being trained to ask more than the basic questions about harm or self-harm to others, to ask about mental health or intellectual and developmental disability to help a dispatcher better communicate with that individual.

Member Burt mentioned appreciating the 5 pillars: training, triage, crisis-response, follow-up, and community engagement. She asked for a smaller department, where the pillars would be prioritized.

Detective Reyes recommended that agencies that are just starting to focus on capturing the data. She mentioned an example from LAPD. Many calls were between 10 p.m. and 12 p.m., but if

they didn't have that data, they wouldn't have shifted resources to that time frame. Also, LAPD gives resources to those communities that they can scale to their needs.

Lieutenant Larson also stated that there is a working group for best practices for smaller agencies. A scalable template for how to develop programs like this was just published in September and discusses how officers respond to these scenarios. We worked with Bell Gardens to create it.

Parliamentarian Johnson noted for the record that **Member Tingirides** joined the meeting at 2:15 pm.

Vice Chair Zuniga asked about how to improve, whether to focus on MEU program, trainings, more technology, more access.

Lieutenant Larson mentioned that they lack capacity to respond to calls. They only respond to 25% of them, are still building facilities, urgent care centers, and program coordination so that they know someone has made two contacts. He also mentioned, in terms of trainings, they do not target officers who are just patrolling or supervisors who are not currently required to do the trainings. They could also provide more trainings to individuals and our partners.

Member Tingirides thanked the presenters. She also mentioned that training outward on what law enforcement does is something to improve on, in teaching the policies, roles and responsibilities on how we respond to these populations.

Vice Chair Zuniga again thanked the presenters for their time and presentation and moved to Agenda Item # 14.

16. Break (time: 2:25 pm – 2:40 pm)

Vice Chair Zuniga called the meeting back to order following the break and asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll to call the roll to re-establish quorum.

17. Re-Establish Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson reconvened the meeting at 2:40 p.m. and called the roll to reestablish the quorum.

Members present during the roll call were: Vice Chair Zuniga, Members: Brown, Burt, Libero, Petteruto, Phillips and Tingirides.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that 5 members were needed for a quorum, 7 members were present at the time the roll was called, and a quorum was re-established.

18. Vice Chair Zuniga moved to Agenda Presentation and Discussion item #16: Presentation on Ventura County Sheriff's Department Crisis Intervention Team

- **Other panelist, Mark Stadler**
- **Ventura County Sheriff's Office Crisis Intervention Team**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

The Ventura County Sheriff's Office gave a presentation on the Crisis Intervention Team. Pictures on the training slideshow indicate that people have taken the course as well as community partners, NAMI, CIT, etc. A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#) and a digital copy of the slides is available under the meeting materials section for this meeting.

The Council members asked the following questions, which were responded to by the panelists, as follows:

Member Burt asked about CIT classes, whether they all require a component on autism and IDD, or if that is up to the instructor.

Stadler stated that the best practice is yes. After graduation, on Monday new recruits come to the CIT training and get another 40 hours of training, and 8-hour update classes every 2 – 3 years, and additional information on a quarterly basis.

Vice Chair Zuniga stated that she discusses the four Fs, “fight, flight, freeze and fawn” frequently. Then she asked about what Ventura County needs, and if more places to take folks was a potential need.

Stadler agreed about needing more spaces for people to be placed. He mentioned that people wait 72 hours in the emergency department, and don't get mental health treatment.

The presentation was concluded, and **SDAG Malouff** noted that there was a member of the public with their hand up. **SDAG Malouff** encouraged that person to reach out via email to sb882@doj.ca.gov since the public comment time period was over.

19. Vice Chair Zuniga moved to Agenda Discussion item #18: Closing Remarks by Chair

Vice Chair Zuniga provided closing remarks. She encouraged people to do their own research, reach out to staff and presenters with questions because we still have work to do. She also discussed the process for divvying up reviewing the trainings, and the component of hearing from law enforcement.

20. Vice Chair Zuniga moved to Agenda Action item #19: Meeting Adjourns

MOTION:

Member Libero moved to adjourn the meeting. **Member Burt** seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Zuniga asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll for a vote on the motion.

Ayes: Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto, Member Phillips, and Member Tingirides

Nays: None

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **7** members present and voting. There were **7** Ayes and **0** Nays.

Vice Chair Zuniga stated that the motion passed, and the third meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council was adjourned at 3:32 pm.