

Meeting Minutes

July 15, 9:00 AM

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

In-Person Location for Public Participation:

**Catalina Room
California Endowment**

**1000 N Alameda St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012**

Members Present: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, and Member Christina Petteruto. Members attended the meeting remotely.

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides

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

Parliamentarian Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council to order at approximately 9:03 am on Tuesday, July 15, 2025, at the Catalina Room, California Endowment, 1000 N Alameda St., Los Angeles, CA 90012.

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, and Member Christina Petteruto.

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides

The Council members attended the meeting remotely and members of the Department of Justice (DOJ) staff were present at the **In-Person Location for Public Participation**, California Endowment, Catalina Room, 1000 N Alameda St., Los Angeles, CA 90012. At the time the roll was called, each of the members indicated that there was no one in their presence over the age of 18.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **8** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **7** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was established.

Chair Frazier thanked every individual that was involved in the SB 882 process. He noted the accomplishments within the SB 882 training evaluations and expressed his appreciation for the expertise and experience that everyone will bring to the outcome. With that, he welcomed everybody and moved to Agenda Item #2, Approval of April 1, 2025 Meeting Minutes.

2. Chair Frazier then moved to Action Item #2: Approval of April 1, 2025 Meeting Minutes.

Before asking Parliamentarian Johnson to call the roll for the vote, Chair Frazier asked for comments and questions regarding the minutes. There were no comments from the Council.

Before continuing with the roll, Parliamentarian Johnson asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 1, 2025 meeting.

MOTION:

Member Braziel made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the April 1, 2025 Council meeting. This motion was seconded by **Vice Chair Zuniga**.

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 Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides

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

4. The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** moved to **Agenda Item 4: Discussion Item:**

- **DOJ Updates on:**

(A) Special Acknowledgement – Council Member Phillips, for his Service on the Council;

(B) Pending Legislation; and

(C) Status of Council Members’ Reviews of Law Enforcement Trainings

Chair Frazier noted that he moved to Agenda Item # 4, because Agenda Item #3 Public Comment was scheduled for 9:25 a.m., and stated that he would move to Agenda #3 at 9:25 a.m.

DAG Ben Conway provided a Special Acknowledgement to **Council Member Phillips**, for his service on the Council. Councilmember Phillips had to resign for personal reasons. He shared the following message with the Council: “I am proud of the work we came together to do. I am stepping down to work on other advocacy projects, and I wanted to say thank you for everything.” DAG Conway noted that DOJ staff had contacted the Senate Rules Committee to determine next steps and whether a replacement council member would be appointed. **DAG Ben Conway** called for discussion or questions from the Council regarding this update.

Chair Frazier informed the Council that he, alongside **Vice Chair Zuniga**, recommended that **Council Member Phillips** be acknowledged by certificate of recognition by Senator Scott Wiener.

Hearing no further discussion, **DAG Ben Conway** proceeded to update the Council regarding pending legislation. Three bills of interest were shared with the Council. The first bill was AB 308, from Assemblymember Ramos, regarding developing procedures of mobile crisis teams or units. This bill was modified to remove the provision requiring mobile crisis unit procedures to address certain items including de-escalation techniques, as well as authorization of the director to develop training in conjunction with law enforcement for those procedures. The bill was passed by the Assembly and was referred to the Senate Committee on Human Services as of May 21, 2025. The

second bill was AB 1013 from Assemblymember Garcia, regarding developing peace officer training for behavioral health. This bill was referred to the Assembly Appropriations Committee and has since been held under submission as of May. The last bill shared was SB 664 from Senator Bogh, regarding the development of the Blue Envelope Program by the Department of Motor Vehicles. This bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Transportation and had not been heard. **DAG Ben Conway** called for discussion or questions from the council regarding this update.

Vice Chair Zuniga asked if there was a summary or explanation as to why SB 664 did not proceed.

DAG Conway responded that DOJ staff were unable to identify a reason as to why SB 664 has not proceeded.

Member Burt shared, for transparency, that the Autism Society Inland Empire is one of the co-sponsors for AB 308 and they have actively advocated against SB 664.

Hearing no further discussion, **DAG Ben Conway** proceeded to provide an update on the status of the Council members' reviews of law enforcement trainings. DOJ staff reached out to dozens of trainers across the state to identify training opportunities for council members to attend, who have collectively attended almost 25 training sessions now. Although training reviews were initially planned to be completed by this summer, evaluations will continue into the fall to allow for as many training evaluation opportunities as possible. **DAG Ben Conway** called for discussion or questions from the Council regarding this update.

Member Burt asked if the Council would receive any preliminary results or if staff were waiting for all of the trainings to be completed to compile results.

DAG Conway responded that the DOJ staff had planned to present everything in September based on the initial summer timeline, but also presented the option of providing the council preliminary numbers, then a more fulsome update once everything is complete. He offered to provide an update that is more substantive for the September meeting and will provide a more fulsome update once all reviews were complete.

Member Libero asked if the extension meant that DOJ staff will be reaching out with additional trainings to review.

DAG Conway responded affirmatively and stated the DOJ staff will work to consider Council members' geographical limitations and schedules so that every member has an even spread of trainings that they have attended by the end of the extension. As a final note, he requested that Council members reach out if they experience any issues with the review form and to complete the form in a timely manner.

There was no further discussion following these updates.

Chair Frazier noted that Agenda Item #3 was 'Public Comment', which was scheduled for 9:25 a.m., and that time had not arrived. He called for a brief recess and would move to Agenda #3 at the conclusion of the recess, at 9:28 a.m.

5. Recess

6. Action Item: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

DAG Conway called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 9:28 A.M.

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 Christina Petteruto.

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **8** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **7** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

3. Public Comment

Chair Frazier introduced public comment. **Chair Frazier** provided the public comment guidelines. The Public Comment was scheduled for 20 minutes, beginning at 9:25 a.m. to 9:45 a.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. **Chair Frazier** noted that to be informed about future meetings, the public can subscribe to Council updates via: <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882>.

There were three virtual public comments. Two comments were from Yolanda Cruz and one was from Akshita Goswami.

In her comment, Ms. Cruz noted that she had difficulty locating the “raise hand” feature for public comment. She thanked the Council for their work and had an inquiry about the CIT trainings that the Council members have attended so far. She encouraged members to attend the LD 37 Police Academy session that spans over 2 days. She also recommended that the Council invite forensic specialist from the Regional Centers to provide testimony. In addition, she suggested that the Council invite a member from “Sober State,” a drug recovery program that has a focus population of people with IDD. Lastly, Ms. Cruz highlighted her work in California CIT Connects, a quarterly group that provides a space to for CIT programs within California to discuss their efforts, needs, and emerging trends. She once again thanked the Council for their work.

In their comment, Ms. Gaswami thanked the Council for their work, and inquired who the point of contact would be for questions regarding the research survey. They mentioned that they can also email SB882@doj.ca.gov.

In an additional comment, Ms. Cruz stated that there is potentially an issue with the Zoom livestream, as there are other group members from CIT Connects that are having difficulty with participating.

There were no other public commenters.

Chair Frazier transitioned to Agenda Item #12 while keeping the public comment period open for members of the public to comment if they wished. Public Comment officially ended at 10:05 A.M. by **Chair Frazier**.

12. Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff on Preliminary Analysis of the February 2025 Law Enforcement Survey

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Dr. Casey O'Donnell, Research Associate of the California Department of Justice's Research Services branch, previously worked with the SB 882 Advisory Council to administer a survey of law enforcement agency (LEA) heads across the state. Within the month the

survey was open, 156 out of 467 (34.1%) contacted agencies completed the survey. Key takeaways from the data are: (1) LEAs evaluate trainings, but there is not a consensus approach; (2) most LEAs have some special units, but few have one focused on IDD; (3) transferring to 988 was largely not included in trainings; and (4) accessibility to resources is hampered by availability, location, and time.

Discussion:

Member Burt thanked **Dr. O'Donnell** and DOJ Research Services for their work.

Chair Frazier stated that, based on the results of the survey, it looks like the ability and access to funding may be a barrier for agencies that are looking to do more.

Member Braziel asked if there were any trends geographically within the utilization and challenges area, where some agencies in certain parts of the state may have struggled with utilization challenges where others were not.

Dr. O'Donnell responded that it would be his guess that the agencies that were reporting unavailability of resources were most likely those of smaller police departments that were not located next to the city center. He also noted that the purpose of this presentation was to gather additional questions from the Council and noted **Member Braziel's** question for further follow-up.

Member Braziel, in response, noted that this seemed to be the pattern for rural communities due to their lack of practitioners and trainings. He suggested reaching back out to California Chiefs and Sheriffs directly to increase survey participation. He also asked if, based on the data received, there were any stand-out agencies that could be seen as a model.

Dr. O'Donnell noted that a 34% survey participation rate is high, as the usual expectation is around 10% or less. In addressing **Member Braziel's** question, he stated that although the survey doesn't have the level of detail to identify exemplars, it could possibly identify agencies that have both in-house policies and related trainings, which will most likely be larger agencies such as LASD.

Member Braziel, in response, stated that from experience and observation, some of these exemplar agencies may not necessarily be some of the larger agencies, but those that are mid-size with in-region resources, such as an agency that is not within the larger metropolitan area but on the outskirts of it.

Dr. O'Donnell responded that they hope to include more individual responses in the final report that will address these questions.

Member Libero inquired about which specific agencies endorsed having a disability response team, as they represented 3% of the total responses.

Dr. O'Donnell confirmed that he can follow up on that.

Chair Frazier thanked the agencies for their responses and highlighted the importance of funding in implementation.

5. Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by Michele Saunders, LCSW, CIT & David Randall, MA, MBA, ACA

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: **Ms. Saunders** and **Mr. Randall** discussed how behavioral health and IDD training for law enforcement can be effective. **Ms. Saunders** highlighted the importance of ongoing training for officers and the risk of perishable skills. She summarized the CIT Training Model and its building blocks. She mentioned a few elements to consider when buying into a CIT Model, especially pertaining to more rural communities or agencies that do not have the resources, time, or infrastructure. She applied the CIT Model to intervention training within corrections. **Mr. Randall** highlighted the importance of establishing a buy-in and informing corrections officers and leadership that intervention training is meaningful and helpful. As a part of grant conditions, **Mr. Randall** and **Ms. Saunders** provided technical training to grant recipients, and the American Correctional Association is required to demonstrate sustainability and effectivity via measurable data points and deliverables. He identified understaffing as a major barrier and offered a few suggestions to incorporate effective training, such as partnering with larger organizations like IACP and Arc, utilizing agency peer to peer support.

Discussion:

Member Burt called attention to the discrepancy in the amount of time being given to the subject matter of intellectual and developmental disabilities versus other subject matters in the CIT Model. She inquired whether there were any best practices that would suggest how long that training is. She also asked if there were any current best practices that would involve the “lived experience” aspect of the training.

Ms. Saunders, in response, stated that the current crisis response and intervention training curriculum is based on the Memphis model, which has specific time allotments for various topics. However, she acknowledged that some communities may have their own needs and so it is up to the community group to make those adjustments. She stated that it is important to have two things: a steering committee that oversees the community’s CIT program and connects with other community groups, and consistent in-service or refresher trainings after the initial 40-hour program. As for the “lived experience” aspect of the training, she asserted that there should be more than just an individual and a family member present, and it is the responsibility of the steering group to make that more robust. Although there hasn’t been set rules for the number of hours that should be dedicated to each topic, the national curriculum has laid out suggested best practices. She also recommended, when getting more people with lived experience involved, to connect them with The Arc and the Autism Society for support services, because the experience of contributing to these trainings can be stressful.

Randall added that some of the sites have connected with community partners, including IDD-focused trainers, to provide that kind of training on-site, especially in jail facilities.

Chair Frazier thanked the panelists and the inclusion of corrections within their presentation. He highlighted how affected individuals are often funneled to the jail system after an interaction due to the lack of crisis beds and resources, and so appreciated the panelists’ efforts in bridging that gap.

There were no further questions from the Council. **Chair Frazier** moved to Agenda Item 6, Break.

6. Break

7. Action Item: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 11:06 A.M.

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 Christina Petteruto

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 members on the Council and 5 members were needed for a quorum. There were 7 members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

8. Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by Undersheriff Mike Ziegler, Sacramento County Sheriff's Office

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Undersheriff Mike Ziegler spoke on the Sacramento County Sheriff's Office's new policy of no longer responding to mental health calls for service unless there has been incident of a crime or someone else other than the person experiencing a mental health crisis is in danger. He cited two separate incidents in which the Sheriff's Department responded to a mental health call, both resulting in the death of the individual that was experiencing the mental health crisis. In the adoption of this policy, he stated that there were several components that were considered, including the legal responsibility to respond to mental health calls. **Undersheriff Ziegler** identified several resources that are available to the community, including the county's CIT team that is paired with an officer response as well as a Community Wellness Response Team (CWRT) that responds to nonviolent calls. Most recently, they have integrated 988 interoperability with their own dispatch centers, in one month they transferred 1200 calls to 988, only 4 were transferred back to them. They are also considering having fire departments respond to these calls since they can respond to medical emergencies.

Discussion:

Member Burt asked how the Sheriff's Department went about developing those relationships with other agencies in bridging the gap.

Undersheriff Ziegler responded that face-to-face meetings allowed them to discover those gaps that the Sheriff's Department could not fill. He recalled one incident in particular where a community member expressed disappointment in how LE officers were responding to his 911 MH calls for his daughter, because they weren't helping, then stopping responding to the calls. The implementation of 988 and the CWRT have become alternatives to law enforcement response. **Undersheriff Ziegler** expressed hopefulness that other jurisdictions and agencies will follow by their example.

Member Brown thanked **Undersheriff Ziegler** for his presentation.

Vice Chair Zuniga echoed **Member Brown's** gratitude and shared her experience in advocating for Smart 911 in Elk Grove and other parts of Sacramento County.

Member Braziel asked if **Undersheriff Ziegler** would be able to share a copy of the Sheriff Department's new policy, particularly regarding the triage questions that 911 dispatchers have been trained to ask before the caller is connected to 988.

Undersheriff Ziegler responded affirmatively to sharing the new policy regarding triage questions. He also offered his contact information and email to the Council, which can be distributed by DOJ staff upon request.

Chair Frazier revealed that upon first learning about the change in policy, he was taken aback, so he appreciated **Undersheriff Ziegler** for taking the time to share the Sheriff Department's new approach. He shared that there was another fatal officer-involved shooting in Antioch with a mental health patient. He emphasized his advocacy during his time in office and the importance of funding for necessary programs and resources.

Undersheriff Ziegler, in response, shared that there are current, ongoing efforts to adopt certain language and identify individuals experiencing a mental health crisis as clients to remove the barriers that come with servicing these community members. He also shared that there is discussion surrounding whether CIT should be incorporated within the Fire Department or should partner exclusively with the Fire Department. He also stated that the County is looking at the possibility of the Fire Department authorizing 5150 holds.

Chair Frazier, in response, inquired whether Sacramento County has the capacity for crisis beds. He asked if there was any additional follow-up after an individual has been placed on a hold.

Undersheriff Ziegler responded that this question may be better suited for the Behavioral Health Department but confirmed that there is follow-up care. However, he stated that the recent trends of crisis care often look like individuals constantly being funneled in and out, just medicated with no real follow-up. He stated that there are currently not enough resources for the level of mental health crises happening. He asserted that funding in isolation was not enough and emphasized the importance of making sure it is going to the right places. He concluded that although there is follow-up care, there are currently not enough resources to do it for everybody the right way.

There were no further questions from the Council. **Chair Frazier** moved to Agenda Item 9, Lunch.

9. Lunch Break was called and Chair stated that the meeting would reconvene at 1:00 p.m.

10. Action Item: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 1:00 P.M.

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, and Member Christina Petteruto

Members absent: Member Emada Tingirides

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 members on the Council and 5 members were needed for a quorum. There were 7 members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

Chair Frazier stated that as a quorum had been reestablished, he moved to Agenda Item #11.

11. Discussion Item and Potential Action Item: Presentation by Dr. Jack Glaser, Richard & Rhoda Goldman School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Dr. Glaser is a social psychologist by training and an expert in implicit racial and ethnic bias in policing. He emphasized the existence of implicit bias and how it affects human behavior, including the difficulty of changing implicit biases. He stated that the trainings that have been developed to reduce implicit bias have a very limited effect on the performance of police officers. He provided different examples in which implicit biases clearly predicted behavior, including in medical decisions. Studies found this pattern consistent in respect to race-crime stereotypes among police officers. Psychological scientists had previously attempted to test various methods to reduce implicit racial bias, and found that although bias could be reduced, it could never be fully eliminated. They also found that in the absence of sustained training, people often reverted to their baseline. He discussed the inherently vague legal construct of “reasonable suspicion” and its variation across police departments. **Dr. Glaser** concluded that (1) implicit biases are pervasive; (2) policing decisions are often made under considerably ambiguous circumstances; (3) the combination of ambiguity, discretion, and bias will lead to disparate treatment; and (4) anti-bias training has been shown to be ineffective. He stated that what is effective, however, is repeatedly constraining discretion and slowing processes down to allow for higher order cognitive processing and decreasing the reliance on implicit automatic processes, as well as the expectation of supervision and evaluation.

Discussion:

Member Burt asked, whether, if some of the ambiguity is reduced, such as when an individual exhibiting strange behavior is disclosed to have autism, the likelihood of implicit bias and discrimination be decreased?

Dr. Glaser replied affirmatively, provided that the officers on scene have a reasonable understanding of autism. Although he wasn’t aware if there was any direct research on this, to the extent that any ambiguity can be removed from the situation, you are going to see a less-disparate outcome according to psychological theory.

Member Burt, in response, inquired whether training would be able to help in this case.

Dr. Glaser responded that although foundational knowledge is important, the most significant factor in reducing mistakes is not only focusing on education, but practicing and developing muscle memory in effectively carrying out a tactic they wish to retain.

Dr. Libero, in reference to the last slide of **Dr. Glaser’s** presentation, asked if the expectation for supervision and evaluation included evaluation of reports or incidents or body camera review footage. What would supervision and evaluation look like?

Dr. Glaser responded that body camera utilization could be more effective if there is a general expectation of review, since there is a general belief amongst officers that body cam footage is very rarely reviewed unless it is specifically flagged. However, literature stated that for the expectation of supervision and evaluation to work as a function for reducing bias, there also has to be an expectation that whoever the evaluator is also wants you to do the right thing. This changes the motivation of the individual and causes them to internalize a third person perspective.

Member Burt asked **Dr. Glaser** if he could elaborate on the expectations aspect and how biases can change when someone is in a supervisory position.

Dr. Glaser acknowledged the hierarchal nature of policing and the importance of supervisors conveying to their supervisees that they have expectations of certain kinds of behavior. However, in respect to race and policing, what tends to happen is that supervisors encourage officers to show results at the end of their shift, which leads to increased stops at lower thresholds of suspicion. However, if supervisors were to convey an expectation of constitutional policing and avoidance of unnecessary use of force, then that would promote the opposite effect.

Dr. Libero shared that Elk Grove Police Department is engaged in fitness directly with individuals with developmental disabilities, and officers have shared that it has been effective for improving identification of developmental disorders and increasing empathy. She asked if **Dr. Glaser** was aware of any research that analyzed how direct exposure and interaction with diverse communities may influence or reduce bias or if that was possibly an area of study that needs further exploration.

Dr. Glaser stated that there is an extensive body of work within social psychology on the concept of intergroup contact. These studies show that when you place people into real life contact and personal interactions with members of other groups, biases towards those other groups become meaningfully and lastingly reduced. In terms of information processing, it is more salient when you learn it by interacting with actual people and also results in a positive emotional effect.

Chair Frazier added that in respect to school resource officers (SROs) who interact with the students in special education classes, it makes a difference to build that connection. He acknowledged that not every city authorizes the presence of SROs within schools, but did want to highlight the productive aspect of it.

Dr. Glaser replied affirmatively to **Chair Frazier**, stating that the manner in which these engagements happen are significant. Although agencies may dictate their own method of community-oriented policing, relationship building is most integral when it is distributed across the force, including SROs.

There were no further questions from the Council.

Chair Frazier, without objection from the Council members, moved to agenda Item 15, and would consider the break, after Item #15 concluded

15. Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by Dr. Lee Lipsker, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)

Summary of presentation: **Dr. Lipsker** is the Chief Psychologist for CDCR's statewide mental health program training unit. He provided definitions for the Clark Remedial Plan, a set of policies and procedures aimed at protecting California prisoners with developmental disabilities from serious injury and discrimination, and the Developmental Disabilities Program (DDP). Each incarcerated person is screened to determine placement in the DDP, depending on their results. Each new correctional officer recruit receives weeks of training regarding the DDP population, which is continued on an annual basis. At the BCOA (basic correctional officer academy) they receive six instructor-led modules; annually, once they have graduated the academy, they receive one hour of an instructional-led module and four hours each year of self-directed training and optional training. He highlighted several core training curricula, including but not limited to training on the DDP program, de-escalation, victimization, mental health, and suicide prevention.

Discussion:

Member Petteruto asked how individuals are initially identified for participation in the DDP program, especially for individuals that have previously not been identified as having a developmental disability.

Dr. Lipsker responded that individuals do not usually have a pre-diagnosed disability when they enter the system. Within seven days of incarceration, the individual is assessed by mental health staff for initial evaluation. This is a three-step process that escalates if an individual indicates in the initial screening they might qualify for DPP. The three steps/levels of evaluation are: (1) simple screening using nonverbal cues, (2) more involved non-verbal evaluation of intellectual capabilities, and (3) a more elaborate evaluation that includes interviews and with the individual themselves and people who know the individual. This helps to identify what type of adaptive supports they may need. Based on the totality of this process, the individual is designated as levels of DD 1, DD 2, or DD 3, which can change over time. This process is also applied to individuals who are already within the prison system but may develop neurocognitive disorders later in life, such as dementia. With a prison population that is aging, they are re-evaluating more individuals to see if they newly qualify for DPP.

Chair Frazier asked if there was any policy or procedure that addressed the topic of dual diagnoses.

Dr. Lipsker replied that similar to the screening for cognitive and intellectual disability, individuals also receive a screening for mental health. More than one third of the prison population has a diagnosed mental disorder, and about 80% individuals within the DPP are also in the mental health program, or have a dual diagnosis. This means they receive both mental health treatment and adaptive supports for their IDD.

Chair Frazier offered an example of an individual who served their term of incarceration in DPP and is then released on probation. He inquired whether there was a continuum of service that moves forward within the probation period.

Dr. Lipsker responded that they are currently hoping to receive additional resources that will allow them to refer individuals out to other related programs that will prepare individuals for discharge into the community as well as linking them community resources. They provide a continuum of services for individuals that are within CDCR's community release program where they communicate with participating institutions about the individual's records and adaptive supports. However, the staff at many of these community resource programs may be limited in their access to professionals to help them. **Dr. Lipsker** also confirmed that CDCR is working to establish a closer linkage with regional centers. Particularly, at intake, if individuals have a history of being a part of the regional center system, then CDCR will reach out to retrieve records of this individual. He acknowledged that the current system is not as well established as it needs to be.

Member Brazier mentioned that there has been leadership development within CDCR for about the last 7 years. He emphasized that one third of the population has IDD issues. He encouraged the Council to look at some of the partnerships between institutions and determine what is working and what is not. He agreed with Chair Frazier's sentiment that the currently system for hand-off is ineffective. Based on what he's seen within his training classes and cohorts, there is a pattern of a shortage of psychologists and psychiatrists that are available for hire. These issues are further amplified within the private sector and the rural areas. He suggested that within the Council's report to legislature, that they include a potential research opportunity into how law enforcement custody staff interact with mental health staff and resources within the institution. He highlighted the potential partnership that could link CDCR, this Council, and the legislature that could consequently impact the jail system and the community outside as a whole.

Dr. Lipsker appreciated Member Braziel's comment. He clarified that the book of CDCR's court-mandated responsibilities fall under the Coleman case as opposed to the Clark case. Despite staff shortages, there has been great progress.

Chair Frazier added that there is a lack of institutions that service individuals affected by mental health or IDD and they are largely funneled through the correctional system. He emphasized the role of correctional facilities in housing these individuals who should be deferred to other, more appropriate kinds of facilities.

There were no further questions from the Council.

Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item 16: Presentation by DOJ Staff on the SB 882 Final Report.

16. Discussion and Potential Action Item: Presentation by DOJ Staff on Preliminary Draft Sections of Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council, Pursuant to SB 882

DAG Burns provided an update on the preliminary draft sections of the final report, pursuant to SB 882. There is currently a working draft of the introduction, background sections, and literature review portions of the report. DOJ staff are currently working to update and revise the existing draft to highlight information that is most actionable for the Council and integrate the survey information that was presented to the Council today. Because of the ongoing work, DOJ staff plan to present a draft to the Council for review at the September meeting so that members can review the most up to date version. **DAG Burns** opened the discussion to Council, inquiring if members had any suggestions on what should be included in the next draft that would help them make recommendations to the legislature.

Discussion:

Member Burt suggested including more information on the deaf plus community.

Chair Frazier requested to include the sight-impaired community as well.

Member Braziel recounted that, from the past meetings, they have heard that trainings don't work, and immersive experiences are most effective, but we cannot do those at the level that is needed. He also recounted that there are existing models that seek to improve interactions by reducing interactions altogether. Although the SB 882 Council's mandate operated off the assumption that interactions can be improved by training, several meetings have shown otherwise. He suggested that the Council may have to take a step back and reassess the way we respond, rather than push a system that is not working.

Chair Frazier, adding to **Member Braziel's** comment, suggested that improving relationships between individuals with mental health disorders and IDD through education and exposure to police and public safety officers may be more effective.

Member Burt recounted in a training that she had attended that the instructors were utilizing the federal definition of developmental disability which included ADHD and anxiety amongst other disorders. It seems that the Council has been utilizing the regional center's definition of developmental disability, and so she requested that we clarify these definitions within the report.

DAG Burns replied to **Member Burt**, stating that the report includes some definitions as defined by the law, which is also ambiguous. She asked for clarification as to whether **Member Burt** simply wanted to focus down or be explicit in these definitions.

Member Burt responded that we should both focus down and be explicit in these definitions. She also asked, in terms of the report, how the Council would be able to provide their input in the process of making recommendations to the legislature.

DAG Burns, in response, clarified that the current draft only includes background information such as the survey data and literature review. The plan is to have the Council review the report that includes all of the witnesses' testimonies alongside all other relevant background information, which can be used as a resource for when the Council is generating their recommendations. In a past meeting, a schedule was presented and approved by Council. This schedule outlined later meetings that would give members the opportunity to discuss their recommendations. **DAG Burns** offered to recirculate this schedule to the Council again, but feedback is welcome at anytime.

Chair Frazier reiterated the importance of funding avenues for their recommendations.

DAG Burns replied to **Chair Frazier**, confirming that there is a section within the draft that incorporates that concern. DOJ staff are open to hearing further feedback or ideas for this topic.

Chair Frazier added that this funding needs to be a constitutionally protected resource, similar to education funding through Proposition 98 which sets a baseline that they have to attain funding for.

DAG Burns asked the Council whether they would be interested in setting a meeting sooner to begin that discussion for setting recommendations.

Vice Chair Zuniga heavily considered the lack of resources and funding, especially as she has been attending these trainings. She stated she was not sure if it was best to rush into it or if it was better to take some time to reflect on what she's been seeing in her trainings and these meetings.

Chair Frazier agreed with **Vice Chair Zuniga**. He stated he is a visual learner, and would prefer to see a draft, and in light of the conversations today, would defer to the rest of the Council for next steps.

Member Braziel suggested that we have a meeting not to discuss the recommendations themselves, but persistent themes they have seen such as different resources and alternative response models. He stated that organizing these themes into different buckets could be a first step.

DAG Burns clarified that **Member Braziel** is suggesting that the Council take some time to take stock of some of the themes they've been seeing without the pressure of making them actionable.

Member Braziel replied affirmatively. He also made note of the witness testimonies that can also be categorized within different themes.

Member Petteruto agreed with the approach, mentioning that it will allow the Council to identify gaps in information and where we might want to bring in additional speakers and identify additional research.

There was no further discussion from the Council. **Chair Frazier** moved to Agenda Item 17, Presenting the Next Meeting Dates, and Setting the Next Meeting Agenda.

17. 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 Ben Conway reported that the DOJ staff has not yet received everyone's response for the availability survey and encouraged the Council to provide their availability in order to set the date for

the remaining meetings for the 2025 year. Based on the prior survey, the next proposed meeting date is Thursday, September 18, 2025. **DAG Conway** also requested that the Council delegate authority to the DOJ to set the agenda for the September meeting.

MOTION:

Member Braziel made a motion to delegate authority to the DOJ to set the next meeting date and agenda, subject to the approval by the Chair and Vice Chair. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt** and **Vice Chair Zuniga**.

After hearing no further discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides

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 18: Discussion Item - Closing Remarks by Chair.

18. Discussion Item: Closing Remarks by Chair

Chair Frazier thanked everyone for participation. He noted that there was a lot of information that was covered today and there were some great suggestions by the Council on how to move forward. He appreciates the interactions and expertise of this Council. He thanked DOJ staff for organizing and allowing the Council to be a part of the solution. He commented by the time of the next meeting, he will be married. He expressed deep appreciation for all attendees and looks forward to working with everyone for the remainder of their time on the Council.

Chair Frazier then moved the meeting to Agenda Item 20: Action Item - Meeting Adjournment.

19. Action Item: Meeting Adjournment

MOTION:

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

After hearing no further discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Tingirides

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

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** adjourned the meeting at 2:55 P.M.