

SB 882 Advisory Council Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 17, 2025, 9:00 AM

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

In-Person Location:

Elihu M. Harris State Office

1515 Clay St., 2nd Floor, Room 2

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 Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Clifford Phillips, and Member Emada Tingirides. All Members attended the meeting remotely.

Members Absent: Member Christina Petteruto

1. Call to Order, Welcome Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

Parliamentarian Doreathea Johnson called the second meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council to order at approximately 9:02 am on Friday, January 17, 2025, at the Elihu M. Harris State Office in Oakland, California.

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

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

Members absent: Member Christina Petteruto

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum and there were **8** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was established.

Introductory remarks from the Chair: Thanks to each and every one on the Council for betterment of interactions between LE and MH/IDD community. Thoughts and prayers for the ones in LA who are suffering through the crisis down there. LAPD Chief is going through it, so thank you for your services. Looking forward to this very comprehensive agenda that the DOJ put together and thank you to their hard work. Always spot on for this agenda. With that, move to Item Number 2.

Chair Frazier moved to Action Item: Approval of October 18, 2024, Meeting Minutes.

2. Action Item: Approval of October 17, 2024, Meeting Minutes [9:15]

MOTION:

Member Libero moved to approve the meeting minutes for the October 18, 2024 council meeting, as presented. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

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

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

Nays: None

Abstentions: Member Braziel

Absent: Member Petteruto

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 Advisory Council members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays, and 1 Abstention.**

The Motion Passed and **Parliamentarian Johnson** then moved the meeting to the next agenda item.

3. Presentation and Discussion Item: Presentation on Crisis Intervention Team Model and Methods of Training Evaluation [9:20]

- **Panelist: Dr. Randy Dupont, University of Memphis School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice; Co-Chair CIT International Board of Directors**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#). This presentation discussed the Crisis Intervention Team model and methods of training evaluation.

Summary of presentation: Dr. Dupont talked about his approach to reviewing trainings. He noted that community partnerships are key and should be meaningfully discussed and otherwise reflected in the materials. He emphasized his opinion that good trainings do lead to better outcomes. Then moved on to discuss adult learning strategies and the difference from passive learning strategies that are used with younger people, such as scenario-based learning.

Discussion:

Member Burt: during the discussion on ‘adult education’, **Member Burt** asked Dr. Dupont whether MH and IDD trainings should be combined or remain separate (and clarified whether they should be combined in the same lesson segment). **Member Burt** also asked Dr. Dupont

whether trainings had similar material being instructed on when class length ranged 2, 4 or 6 hours for the same material.

Dupont recommended, in terms of material, to keep the two topics (MH and IDD) separate when laying the foundation of what they entail, but indicated that the two topics could be combined when working on scenarios (keeping in mind that they may need to learn due to unexpected scenario outcomes.). As an example, he suggested a 2-hour course would indicate 2 separate courses of 2 hours focused on MH and IDD respectively. By contrast, scenario training could integrate the two subjects as long as there is a basic foundation to call upon.

Member Phillips (via **Cynthia**, support person) mentioned being excited that the strategies they recommend using are the strategies that are used at the Arc; and are specifically what he uses as a co-instructor in his Black History classes. **Member Phillips** also asked Dr. Dupont about wanting to focus on safety when police officers are interacting with people who have IDD.

Dupont responded that good de-escalation and intervention programs are inherently safety programs at their core, while referencing the fact that he has worked with ARC in other cities and is appreciative of the connection drawn between the two programs.

Following agenda item #3, Chair Frazier raised the question of moving forward with the agenda, since the meeting was ahead of schedule and the next speaker was not available. SDAG Virginia Corrigan suggested that the meeting move to agenda item 13. The Chair agreed, and the meeting proceeded to this agenda item.

Chair Frazier, without objection, changed the order of the agenda, and moved to Agenda Item 13.

4. Agenda Item 13: Presentation and Discussion Item: Report from the Committee on the Law Enforcement Agencies Survey:

Member Libero, a member of the subcommittee on the Law Enforcement Survey, presented the subcommittee report: Since October 18 Council meeting, the survey committee met to review the questions going out, as well as the strategic plan for distributing the survey to maximize responses. Since that time, survey has been revised a bit, and questions have been streamlined to make it more user-friendly for the agency staff. After those changes, the survey was tested in the electronic survey platform. The committee gave more feedback, which was incorporated. The Survey has been finalized and has been placed into the electronic survey platform and tested. The survey is just awaiting final approval from **Members Libero** and **Burt**. Once they approve it, we will be conducting outreach to agency heads. We are on track to send out that communication at the end of this month, January.

There were no questions asked by the Council.

Discussion and Questions:

There were no questions asked by the Council.

Vice Chair Zuniga thanked the subcommittee for their efforts and is looking forward to the results. **Member Libero** thanked the DOJ and the research team for implementing the revisions and working with the subcommittee.

SDAG Corrigan suggested taking an early break, then moving to agenda item 14 since the meeting was still ahead of schedule. The Chair agree, and the meeting adjourned for break at 9:50 am.

5. Break [9:50]

6. Re-Establish Quorum [10:15]

Parliamentarian Johnson reconvened the meeting at 10:15 a.m. and reestablished quorum for the fourth meeting of the Advisory Council, on Friday, January 17, 2024, at 10:15 a.m.

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

Member Petteruto was absent.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the advisory council, **5** members were needed for a quorum, **8** members were present at the time the roll was called, and a quorum was re-established.

7. Agenda Item #14: Discussion and Potential Action Items Regarding Law Enforcement Training Evaluation Tool and Proposed Training Attendance Plan

- **Discussion Item: Presentation on Draft Law Enforcement Training Evaluation Tool and Proposed Training Attendance Plan and Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

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.

Recommendation: that the tool be finalized, either today, or later with edits

Discussion:

Member Braziel asked whether DOJ has been coordinating with POST for the site visits and evaluations, whether POST's evaluation tool to was utilized at all cross-pollinate the evaluation process and inquired about POST's responsiveness to our requests for information so far. He also mentioned that the Council may want to review self-paced trainings offered by POST.

DAG Conway mentioned that, at this time, POST has provided an extensive list of available trainings and logistics data but that their feedback hasn't been needed by DOJ at this point. He also noted that POST has been very responsive, but that they didn't have anything to share that was relevant to the council at this point of their review.

Member Burt asked about whether DOJ had clearly explained to POST that the training evaluating would be collaborative and not designed to judge law enforcement agencies, and whether trainings are just for sworn officers.

DAG Conway confirmed that during outreach, the team will emphasize that the Council is looking for recommendations to make to the legislature (and not to judge). He also mentioned that some materials address 911 operators, and that the DOJ will look for those trainings so that Council will see trainings for both operators and sworn officers.

Following the discussion, Chair Frazier asked the Council members if there was a motion regarding the proposed evaluation tool presented by the DOJ staff in its report.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to approve and adopt the evaluation tool presented by DOJ. This motion was seconded by **Member Phillips**.

Chair Frazier opened the floor to the Council for discussion on the motion to approve and adopt the evaluation tool presented by DOJ. After hearing no discussion, **Chair Frazier asked Parliamentarian Johnson to call for the vote.**

Parliamentarian Johnson restated the motion and called the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Petteruto

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 Advisory Council members present and voting: **There were 8 Ayes and 0 Nays.**

The Motion Passed.

Chair Frazier announced that the motion to approve and adopt the proposed evaluation tool passed and that he was asking for a motion regarding the training attendance plan.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to delegate authority to DOJ to create, finalize and facilitate a training attendance plan for the Council, subject to the final approval by the Chair and Vice Chair.

This motion was seconded by **Member Tingirides**.

Parliamentarian Johnson called for discussion on the motion to approve the delegation of authority to DOJ to create, finalize and facilitate a training attendance plan for the Council, subject to the final approval by the Chair and Vice Chair.

Council Members Libero and Burt asked about whether members could make training recommendations, and the length of trainings that would be sampled.

DAG Conway affirmed that members could make recommendations and requested that they email the DOJ directly to provide the recommendations. He also stated that they wanted the Council to review a variety of trainings but will also work with Council Members' availability. He noted that the desire would be to sample a full bell curve of the ranges of training lengths available, but cited LAPD's MEU training being a 40-hour training as an example of trainings that would need to be feasible for councilmembers to attend.

Chair Frazier also encouraged Council Members to let the DOJ know their expertise and availability.

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Petteruto

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 Advisory Council members present and voting: **8 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier announced the vote** then moved the meeting to the next agenda item, Agenda Item #6

8. Presentation and Discussion Item: Presentation on Joint Project of RAND and Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) on Law Enforcement Response to Persons with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

- **Panelists: Dustin Richardson and Meagan Cahill, PERF**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

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.

Summary: In collaboration with RAND, PERF brought together a panel of about two thousand experts, law enforcement, advocacy orgs, and research to identify what are the key problems in the area and what needs to be done to correct these problems. Police officers are the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system, and those experiencing IDD/MH will be encountering police officers first. The workshop's purpose is to determine how we can develop more guidance for police officers and improve police officers' responses. The lack of data is a problem, so the first source was identifying existing data. In the day and a half workshop, asked participants to identify current issues related to the topic area, as well as issues they would see arising within the next 5 years. At the end of the workshop, the results are shared with NIJ to inform them of

funding decisions, as well as shared with the public. Other than improved responses, the panel wanted to see an improvement in resources and awareness.

Discussion:

Discussion Topics included the following:

Improving Training

- Identify key training topics
- Establish training standards and curricula
- Develop and improve Resources

Establishing Partnerships

- Involving Interdisciplinary teams
- Establish Relationships with Local IDD Community
- Dissemble Knowledge

Moving Forward

Chair Frazier asked and commented:

- 1) Whether anyone with IDD was included in the workshop process
 - a. *Richardson* responded that there were not people with IDD in the workshop, but others with lived experience, a child or loved one with IDD were included in it.
- 2) Whether using technology for someone who is hearing impaired to get an ASL interpreter was discussed
 - a. *Richardson*: that wasn't discussed because their main concern was that main questions about training officers couldn't be answered, so they focused on those
- 3) Whether navigating trauma in the police response was discussed in the workshop.
 - a. *Richardson*: this was discussed, it was most important for officers to identify and communicate with these people. An example that was discussed was that they found a woman who was at a facility and had wandered. She had a history of sexual assault and challenged officers. We challenged officers to be mindful of that and ask an individual if they had been assaulted while out wandering. Are they mindful of that trauma?
- 4) School Resource Officers when interacting with students, are helpful in terms of getting those relationships in the community. I think is beneficial as they grow up in the program, something I have seen that has been helpful.
 - a. *Richardson*: yes, this can humanize the issue and allow officers to empathize and understand the experiences of these individuals. These community outreach efforts are helpful for that.
- 5) Whether there was any discussion into the need to involve 911 dispatchers in this process and integrate their involvement at all?
 - a. *Richardson*: wasn't able to include in PowerPoint, but it was discussed. Dispatchers talked about these trainings and resources are also included in their

trainings, and that these resources are received by them. Further discussed how often dispatchers reported receiving no specific training or resources aren't developed for them. Because many encounters start with dispatch, we talked about importance of resources for them, maybe not separate, but that they still receive something key to them

Member Burt asked:

- 1) Whether the data examined was self-reported. As an example, if there is a call from loved one who is saying they have a loved one at a facility who needs help.
 - a. *Richardson*: they didn't look at self-reported data, and it's hard to collect good data. One of the things they talked about is. how do we get data about prevalence of IDD contacts? There was no agreement. But ultimately, there was some consensus to ask officers to collect, a minimum burden of data (check box in a report about suspected IDD). If asking for textbox, officers can find ways around it, and if you ask for too much, resulting data is not going to be great. Also, the data mainly will come from medical or public health officials, officers can only give so much data.
- 2) Was there a conversation around co-occurring conditions?
 - a. *Richardson*: There was discussion on the need for data on cooccurring conditions. They didn't specify how exactly law enforcement will go about collecting this data, but the report does touch on the importance of at least knowing the prevalence of these cooccurring disorders. Goes back to the importance of teaching officers to identify. Panel doesn't believe that officers should diagnose, but believes that there should be consideration of these factors in play
 - b. *Meagan Hill*: This was interesting part of the workshop, as it informs how we want the training to look. Part of the argument is that we can't expect officers to arrive and identify it immediately, but more training the officers on these behaviors and the responses. Don't need the diagnosis but need to be able to respond to the circumstances well. Giving them enough tools to address the largest range of situations in the best way.
- 3) **Member Burt** generally noted that we have a responsibility to help families know what data they need to give to first responders quickly. When they do have a long list of conditions, it's figuring out how to convey this information to first responders quickly and succinctly so that they can make the best decisions

Member Phillips emphasized a need to come together as a group without bringing guns into situations where they would be harmful

- a. *Richardson*: At PERF, you get to work with some of the best, most compassionate officers. All those involved need to come together and have mutual understanding.

There were no further questions from the Council Members during or following this presentation. Chair Frazier asked for additional thoughts and turned to Richardson to close. Richardson stated how much they appreciated participating and sharing their work

Chair Frazier then recessed for lunch at 11:44 a.m. to return at 1:00 p.m. the meeting to the next agenda item.

9. Lunch [11:44 a.m.]

10. Re-establish Quorum [1:00]

Parliamentarian Johnson reconvened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. and reestablished quorum for the first meeting of the Advisory Council, on Friday, January 17, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.

Members present during the roll call were: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Phillips.

Members Absent were: Member Petteruto and Member 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.

Chair Frazier stated that as a quorum has been reestablished, we will move to Agenda Item #9:

11. Presentation and Discussion Item: Presentation on Improving Interactions Between Law Enforcement and Individuals with Autism [1:05]

- **Panelists: Michael Bernick (Counsel, Duane Morris LLP, and former Director, California Employment Development Department (EDD)) and Camilla Bixler (Co-Chair of Board of Directors, AASCEND)**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

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.

Summary: Want to focus on the issue of public safety for adults on the spectrum, and how to build structures, housing, etc. to better integrate IDD community members to the larger community. AASCEND is volunteer-run. In terms of activities, employment is the aspect they emphasize. Camila is a parent of an autistic child and was fearful for her son's safety in law enforcement interactions. Members of AASCEND have been victims of crime, victims of police. There are anecdotal experiences. Discussed the possibility of carrying identification cards but reaching for that could be dangerous. Invited the SFPD to be a part of this meeting, who pointed out that the biggest issue is compliance. AASCEND emphasizes command, comply, wait. A video, in collaboration with SFPD, was created to educate officers re: autism and include lived experiences.

Discussion:

Member Burt asked:

- 1) How long was that video?
 - a. *Bixler*: Training video was 20 minutes, and the SFPD retained control of the video, and hired their own videographer.

Member Phillips commented:

- 1) safety is so important when interacting with police
 - a. *Bixler*: yes, when we first talked to them, we emphasized that we want you to keep us safe, and that's how we started the conversation

Member Libero asked:

- 1) How staff went about recruiting the advocates in the video, whether they were volunteers or were any of the panelists paid?
 - a. *Bixler*: All were volunteers. For the trainers, our organization might've said that we will pay them \$50-\$100 for their time. Usually is what happens when we ask panelists to spend a large part of their day. Usually, it is volunteers. For the video, we had lots of people who wanted to participate, so we let everyone to participate.
- 2) For the ARC dance, was that required or was there an incentive?
 - a. *Bixler*: I can't recall if they were forced. We had a good turn out, and when I watched I didn't see poor body language. People seemed happy to be there.

Chair Frazier again, thanked the presenter and: changed the order of the agenda, moving to Agenda Item #15:

12. Discussion and Action Item: Setting the next Council Meeting Date(s) (Tentatively April 1 and 2, 2025) and Agenda; or, Alternatively, Delegating Authority to DOJ to Set Meeting Date and Agenda Subject to Approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair

Chair Frazier asked the DOJ staff for their recommendation as to month, dates, etc. DOJ presented that it would depend on logistics of setting the meeting, the witnesses' availability, and the subject and presentations. DOJ indicated that that they would like flexibility in scheduling the meeting, subject to the approval of the Chair and V. Chair.

Chair Frazier entertained a motion regarding the next meeting.

MOTION:

V. Chair Zuniga moved to authorize DOJ to schedule the next meeting, subject to the approval of the Chair and Vice Chair.

Member Burt seconded the motion.

Chair Frazier asked the Parliamentarian to call for the vote.

Parliamentarian Johnson, asked if there was further discussion.

Discussion:

1. **Brown:** For the past practice of DOJ sending out surveys to set the date, do we continue that way?
 - a. **Frazier:** This was the practice before, and the idea was for councilmembers to look at the calendar and confirm those dates?
 - b. **DAG Burns:** This was the practice before, and the best availability was April 1st and 2nd. What we've done in the past was have you give delegation to the DOJ to make a draft agenda, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair. We just need a motion to do exactly that.
2. **Frazier:** This just came out, April 1st and 2nd is my organization's advocacy days and he will have to be there, and therefore won't be able to attend those council meetings.

Member Braziel made a motion to move forward from the discussion. **Parliamentarian Johnson** asked if there were any objections and hearing none stated the Council could move on to the next agenda item by consensus.

Parliamentarian Johnson, after hearing no discussion, called the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Petteruto

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 Council Members present and voting: **8 Ayes, 0 Nays**

The Motion Passed and **Parliamentarian Johnson** then moved the meeting to **Break**.

13. Break [1:40]

14. Re-establish Quorum [2:10]

Parliamentarian Johnson reconvened the meeting at 2:10 p.m. and reestablished quorum for the first meeting of the Advisory Council, on Friday, January 17, 2025, at 2:10 p.m.

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

Member Petteruto was absent.

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.

Chair Frazier changed the order of the agenda moving forward as follows - Agenda Item 10: Public Comment.

15. Public Comment [2:13-2:33 p.m.]

- Available through the Livestream at <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882/meetings>
- In-Person Public Comment is Available at Elihu M. Harris State Office, 1515 Clay St., Room 2, Oakland, CA 94612

DOJ introduced public comment. The public comment period was for 20 minutes beginning at 2:13 p.m. to 2:33 p.m. Each person was designated two minutes to speak, and instead of or in addition to making public comments, members of the public were able to send written comments to sb882@doj.ca.gov. DAG Burns noted that to be informed about future meetings, the public can subscribe to council updates via: <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882>.

There were 2 comments: 0 in-person comment and 2 comments provided via Zoom.

Teresa Anderson: Thank you to the council. Appreciate their time and dedication to the issue. This was a great meeting – all the presentations were informative and helpful. Want to call out one of the comments made by Member Burt, and how this is a collaborative effort. Was a part of the team that worked so hard to pass SB 882 and bring together everyone with collaborative intent. The intention was to stop the finger-pointing and bring people together to make actual improvements. The data issue is huge – data is a big part of the recommendations. Really love the idea that was put forth about the training for the councilmembers, as they are all in a position of leadership. Also appreciate the discussion about how to include technology, and training officers on how to use this technology. How do we work forth facilitating meaningful communication between these two parties? Also, the point to individuals that are deaf and hard of hearing is critical, and considering what they need to participate. Strongly encourage DPSS’s deaf specialist, Lisa Gonzalez, to invite her to speak on some things she has worked on over the years. She had some great ideas of working on a project together, and how you can facetime with certain service providers to provide immediate, instant real-time interpreting, and considering how to incorporate technology into some of the recommendations. Thank you for the opportunity. I’m Teresa Anderson, executive director with California Policy Center for Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

Dr. Christina Aguirre-Kolb: From Santa Barbara Regional Center. Want to reiterate what Ms. Anderson was talking about. Presentation was very timely and well presented. As clinical director, I have been going to our CIT teams, and what the presenters have said ring true. We need the police officers to resonate with the trainings and their work. In Santa Barbara, just met with the SBPD regarding the blue envelope program. This is very timely, and glad that there is state-wide work to make this work. Would like the council to take in everything that was said today, because it is so true. It is a good representation of the work that is trying to be accomplished for individuals with developmental disabilities.

In concurrence with the public comment period, the Chair moved to the next agenda item:
Chair’s Closing Remarks:

16. Chair’s Closing Remarks

Chair Frazier provided closing remarks as follows: I think that the premise of our stepping up and being in this position is important. We are in the presence of two law enforcement experts, and that is something that I am looking to input from their expertise. Like our public commenter, Anderson, said, there is no finger-pointing. It is imperative to collaborate to accomplish this goal. Opinions are everything, but good data in provides good data out, and better outcomes. I think that the training tools we are looking at will be very helpful for decision making. Want to remind that we are reaching out to other agencies, like CHP, and all of our Sherriff's departments. The implementation will be much harder in rural areas b/c of lack of funding and resources, so want to consider that. Want to have an open forum of any thoughts on how to go moving forward.

Member Tingirides followed with: Would like to echo Frazier. This has been extremely beneficial today and coming from my perspective as a law enforcement officer, the key takeaway is the training and the tools are fresh, consistent, and ongoing. When we look at training, we have to do it at 2 different levels – on-ground officers, and the leadership perspective. What is my understanding of this training so I can better support it and uplift it and set expectations? Getting training in a classroom is one thing, but also having understanding that command staff officer is another. So having two tracks is extremely important.

Member Burt followed with: Did want to echo what Teresa said about having a deaf specialist. Also is curious about the data dashboard – what exactly is out there in California? The VR simulators and scenarios – are they effective? Starting to see that as well and would love to hear some experts talk about that. Appreciative of everyone on the council and the expertise they bring, and is encouraged about the future

Member Zuniga followed with: Many of the presenters today triggered more questions today about how to best approach the topic. Loves the last presenter, Camille, and her hint to the SMART 911 technology out there, as a proponent of the Manny Alert Act. It is another tool for law enforcement. It isn't a fix-all, but if you know you're making a 911 call in advance, and you have that tool prior to going into it, it's very useful. There was a fiscal report in implementing that, and training for dispatchers was included in that. Could be part of the recommendations and is excited that others are aware of it.

Member Phillips closed with: thanking fellow council members and expressing his loves to help everyone out and come together to make a change.

17. Meeting Adjournment

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by **Member Libero**.

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Petteruto

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 Council Members present and voting: **8 Ayes, 0 Nays**

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.