

Meeting Minutes

March 6, 2025, 10:00 AM

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

**In-Person Location for Public Participation: Attorney General Building
1300 I Street, Room 1042
Sacramento, CA 95814**

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

Members Absent: Member Braziel

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

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council to order at approximately 10:06 am on Thursday, March 6, 2025, at the Attorney General Building, 1300 I Street, Room 1042, Sacramento, CA 95814.

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 Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto and Member Emada Tingirides.

Members absent: Member Rick Braziel, Member Clifford Phillips

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

Chair Frazier thanked the council for their work on the council and in the community. He also mentioned that the Sacramento County sheriff's department has changed department policy, and is no longer participating in crisis intervention. **Chair Frazier** requested that this item be agendaized to discuss further, at a future council meeting, the problem, what plan b options there are in light of this policy change.

DAG Conway mentioned how members of the public can access ASL interpretation for the meeting, and noted that **Member Phillips** joined at 10:10 a.m. **Member Phillips** experienced technical difficulties, and was not on camera during the meeting. However, he did cast votes via audio when council votes were called.

2. Chair Frazier then moved to Action Item: Approval of January 17, 2025, Meeting Minutes

MOTION:

Member Burt made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the January 17, 2025 council meeting. This motion was seconded by **Vice Chair Zuniga**.

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

Absent: Member Braziel

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

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** then moved the meeting to the next agenda item.

3. Discussion Item: DOJ Updates on the List of Resources Referenced by Advisory Council Witnesses; and Training Evaluation Timeline and Upcoming Tasks

The list of resources and a training evaluation plan were discussed. Both documents are available for review at <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882>. The current plan is to reach out to trainers, and the council will attend trainings between March – June 2025. The DOJ will also follow up and note data trends if applicable, anticipated but not confirmed for September 2025.

The council initially moved to Agenda Item 4, Public Comment. However, since it was before the posted time for public comment, the Council instead moved to Agenda item 5, then back to Agenda item 4 at 10:36 a.m.

5. Discussion and Potential Approval of Draft Outline for Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council Pursuant to SB 882

The draft report outline is available for review at <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882>. **DAG Burns** discussed the draft report outline and mentioned sections such as legislation background, the council's actions leading up to the report, the problem of interactions between people with IDD and police, systems of care for people with IDD/mental health conditions, and the council training evaluation process and findings, as well as law enforcement survey findings.

Discussion:

Member Burt requested that Section 4, "Systems of Care" indicate that not all systems of care are available in all geographic regions, and that there may be barriers to care. As an example, she mentioned the mental health hotline, that in some areas, deputies, instead of mental health providers, respond to those calls versus having specialized teams respond to those calls. She also mentioned that not all of state has the same resources and wanted to include a section about suicide. Regarding suicide, Member Burt stated that in her experience, many agencies would not respond to crises involving suicide. She requested more information to see whether that is true overall, and if yes, she wanted the Council to inform legislators and the general public about this trend so that they are aware. She requested information about crisis policies and procedures, as well as crisis training. She

also requested research about online versus in-person training and whether one training method is more or less effective.

Member Tingirides provided an alternative perspective to the point mentioned by **Member Burt** that law enforcement are not responding to crisis calls. With respect to Los Angeles law enforcement and clinician responses, **Member Tingirides** stated that whether they respond depends on the type of call, and clinician safety considerations. According to her, in Los Angeles, clinicians typically respond after someone is in custody, and provide treatment once the person is handed over to them. She mentioned that different agencies may have different policies, and encouraged not assuming one way or another regarding agencies' general response.

Chair Frazier echoed **Member Burt's** request to not assume that all agencies have funding and requested focus on not just providing suggestions to improve interactions between law enforcement and people with IDD, but to integrate funding considerations into those suggestions to avoid providing unfunded mandates for agencies to navigate.

Member Petteruto requested that subsections be added to section 4, and that there be more distinction between mental health and IDD, since the community resources that are available are not the same for people who have these conditions. As an example, she mentioned that the regional center is available for people who have IDD but not for people who have mental health conditions.

Chair Frazier thanked **Member Petteruto** for the comment and mentioned that people with dual diagnoses could access services for both populations, but for those who do not have dual diagnoses, the distinction is important.

Member Libero requested that education and training programs for people with IDD and mental health conditions for interacting with law enforcement also be included in section 4. She also asked whether the section regarding non-training interventions would also include voluntary registry programs and inquired about including research regarding effectiveness of those programs.

At 10:33, Chairman Frazier suspended discussion with respect to Agenda Item #5 when advised that the time set for the Agenda Item #4, Public Comment, was 10:35. Chair Frazier transitioned to Agenda Item #4 and stated that they would transition back to Agenda Item #5 at the conclusion of Public Comment.

4. Public Comment

Chair Frazier introduced public comment. **DAG Burns** provided the public comment guidelines. The Public Comment was scheduled for 20 minutes, beginning at 10:35 a.m. to 10:55 a.m. Each person was designated three 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 two public comments, one virtual, and one in-person. The comments were from Regina Brink, Director of Governmental Affairs for the California Council of the Blind, and Tania Morawiec (SP), Deputy Director for the State Council on Developmental Disabilities.

Brink's comments raised concern about lack of inclusion of people who have IDD and dual sensory diagnoses of blindness and/or hearing impairment in general discussions about this community's interactions with law enforcement. She requested that the report reference dual sensory diagnoses experienced by people with IDD, and how those sensory diagnoses impact these interactions, since people who have these dual sensory diagnoses may not understand what is happening, and may need ASL interpretation, or other accommodations that address their diagnoses. She also mentioned someone with a hearing impairment in Sacramento who recently passed away during an interaction with law enforcement officers who did not recognize he had a hearing impairment. She also mentioned disappointment with the Sacramento sheriff's department decision to no longer respond to crisis calls, and asked for the reason behind that decision.

DAG Burns publicly inquired about whether a previously scheduled public commenter was available to make a comment. Hearing no response, the Council continued with Tania Morawiec who made an in-person public comment.

Morawiec's comments involved training recommendations including inclusion of the 5th category and sensory implications in law enforcement responses, as well as provision of safety net resources in those interactions. She also recommended securing funding to facilitate co-trainers who have IDD participating in law enforcement trainings since they are noted as important members of the training process, but experience barriers to training attendance and travel. She also mentioned the benefits of peer-to-peer training and requested that Yolanda Cruz, Treasurer of CIT International be added to the SB 882 Council.

Chair Frazier transitioned back to Agenda Item #5 while keeping the public comment period open for members of the public to comment if they wished. Public Comment officially ended at 10:55 am by **DAG Burns**, who confirmed that the pre-scheduled public commenter was not available to provide a comment.

5. Chair **Frazier** moved forward with the discussion of the Draft Outline for Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council Pursuant to SB 882.

DAG Burns recommended that the Council approve the Draft Outline for the Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council pursuant to SB 882.

Chair Frazier requested that the comments from the Council members and those making public comment be added to the report and to the motion.

DAG Burns mentioned that **DAG Conway** could amend the report outline during the meeting, and those changes could be voted on. **DAG Conway** publicly shared his screen while revising the draft outline with the addition of council members' comments. The Council members reviewed the revised draft.

Member Burt requested further amendments to the draft outline. She requested that the outline include defining different crisis situations, whether suicide, mental health or IDD-related. **Chair Frazier** also added a request to discuss level of preparedness and pre-interaction communication by law enforcement. Without objection, those changes were made to the Draft Outline by **DAG Conway**.

1st MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga made a motion to approve the draft report outline with the additional amendments proposed by the council and members of the public. This motion was seconded by **Member Phillips**.

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

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll for the vote:

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Braziel

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

The motion passed. **DAG Burns** recommended that the Council delegate to the DOJ the authority to revise the outline as needed to keep things moving in-between meetings. **Chair Frazier** requested a separate motion for this.

2nd MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga made a motion to delegate authorization to DOJ staff to edit the draft as needed in between meetings in consultation with and with the approval of the Chair and Vice Chair. **Member Brown** seconded this motion.

Chair Frazier called for discussion on the motion. **Chair Frazier** confirmed after hearing no discussion that **Parliamentarian Johnson** could call the roll for the vote on the motion.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Braziel

Following the roll call vote, Parliamentarian Johnson reported that 8 members were present and voting. There were 8 Ayes and 0 Nays.

The motion passed, and **Chair Frazier** moved to the next item on the agenda.

6. Presentation, Discussion, and Potential Action Items: Identifying a Process for Drafting, Reviewing, and Approving Final Report

DAG Burns reported on the report drafting process and timeline and stated that they were available for review on <https://oag.ca.go/sb882>. **DAG Burns** mentioned that the Council will start reviewing report narrative in July, and the survey analysis results in the summer. The goal is to discuss those results in September, review a report draft in December, propose final edits in January, and approve

the final draft in February. DOJ would finalize the layout and formatting between February and April for the Council's final meeting in April.

Discussion for Agenda Item 6a:

Member Burt asked about whether this means the Council will not have other presentations, and will only focus on the report and reviewing trainings

DAG Burns mentioned that the timelines for the things described what, at a minimum, needed to happen at those meetings, but the Council could spend the rest of the time however it desired, and hear from witnesses. **DAG Burns** stated that comments made by witnesses could be incorporated until such time that the Draft was finalized and approved by the Council.

1st MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga made a motion to approve the current report drafting schedule. This motion was seconded by **Member Tingirides**. **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Doreathea Johnson** called the roll for this motion.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Braziel

Following the roll call vote, Parliamentarian Johnson reported that 8 members were present and voting. There were 8 Ayes and 0 Nays.

The motion passed.

2nd MOTION:

Member Zuniga made a motion to delegate authority to the DOJ to adjust the report drafting schedule as needed subject to approval of the Chair and Vice Chair. **Member Libero** seconded this motion.

After **Chair Frazier** confirmed there was no discussion regarding this matter, **Parliamentarian Doreathea Johnson** called the roll for this motion.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Braziel

Parliamentarian Johnson reported that there were 8 Council members present and voting. There were 8 Ayes and 0 Nays.

The motion passed.

Discussion for Agenda Item 6b:

DAG Burns mentioned that this was an opportunity for the Council to discuss their level of involvement, and potentially create a subcommittee to allow Council members to participate in a way that they previously have for the law enforcement survey. She mentioned options for the council to consider, including one subcommittee for report drafting; multiple subcommittees for pertinent topics; the DOJ providing drafts for the Council to review without subcommittees before upcoming meetings; or a DOJ staff person collaborating with a council member to draft various report sections.

Member Tingirides mentioned liking subcommittees and wanting to review the report draft. She asked whether it would be possible to have Council members review draft outside of the subcommittee process.

DAG Burns clarified that the subcommittee would enable committee members to create a report draft instead of the DOJ. However, individual Council members could instead review, revise and approve a report draft that the DOJ has created without a subcommittee.

Chair Frazier mentioned that each subcommittee would only have two members and suggested potentially having one subcommittee per topic. He also liked the idea of everything being compiled by DOJ staff then the Council could provide feedback as needed. He also mentioned bandwidth constraints, and the benefits of having members on the survey subcommittee, so wanted to leave the option open for Council members to engage via a subcommittee if they wanted to.

DAG Burns mentioned that a subcommittee would need to be made today if Council members wanted to engage with creating the detailed outline for the next meeting. Otherwise, the DOJ could present a detailed outline for review at the next meeting and a subcommittee could be created at a later date. She also suggested potential subcommittees for sections about systems of care, interactions with police, and/or training versus non-training interventions, having topic-based subcommittees (that potentially focus specifically on issues for youth with IDD, or in corrections settings), or having a generic report subcommittee for the council's consideration.

Chair Frazier mentioned the recent wildfires in Los Angeles, considering whether the Council could review those emergency interactions between people with IDD and first responders. He asked Member Tingirides for her insight.

After clarification, **Member Tingirides** mentioned the report could potentially have a section about co-response to community critical incidents, law enforcement working with grief counseling and other resources, and post-critical response options. She mentioned uncertainty about whether improving law enforcement's role in disaster moments was within SB 882's scope but offered that idea for the report if the council was able to address that issue.

Chair Frazier mentioned he was focused on that initial interaction between people with IDD and law enforcement as they evacuate a fire or other emergency scenario, and the potential need to know how to de-escalate someone in those scenarios.

Member Tingirides agreed and mentioned that this scenario could go under a report heading for de-escalation. **Member Burt** added that this scenario could be added to the report under the section for different types of crisis scenarios.

Chair Frazier said that in light of the fires, he wanted to ensure people are prepared. He also circled back and asked what the council's thoughts were regarding creating a subcommittee for the report.

Member Burt asked about the amount of work left on the survey subcommittee, and the feasibility of joining a report subcommittee.

DAG Burns mentioned the survey subcommittee can be hands off while Research Services works on the response data, and that those results will be integrated into the report so the work for the two subcommittees would overlap. The remaining task is to bring the analysis into the report. **Member Burt** nodded.

Chair Frazier asked about subcommittee participation, and hearing no response, offered the option of the DOJ providing a draft for review, and the council assesses at that time whether to create a subcommittee. **Members Tingirides** and **Petteruto** agreed with this idea.

3rd MOTION:

Member Petteruto made a motion to have DOJ staff create a draft report for the council to consider at the next meeting, and that the council can entertain subcommittees at that time. **Member Tingirides** seconded this motion.

Chair Frazier called for discussion. The council agreed that it would be more efficient to wait to review the draft report before entertaining a motion as to forming subcommittees. Following the initial discussion, there was no further discussion.

Chair Frazier requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** call the roll for the vote on the motion.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll for the vote.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Member Braziel

Following the roll call vote, Parliamentarian Johnson reported that 8 members were present and voting. There were 8 Ayes and 0 Nays.

Chair Frazier noted that the motion passed to have the DOJ create a draft of the council report to present at the next meeting for council review, and determination at that time, as to whether subcommittees were necessary or needed. Agenda Item 6c regarding creating subcommittees was no longer applicable, at this time. **Chair Frazier** moved on to Action Item 7.

7. Action Item: Setting Next Meeting Date (April 1 and 2, 2025) and Agenda or, Alternatively, Delegating Authority to DOJ to Set Future Meeting Dates and/or Set Next Meeting Agenda Subject to Approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair

DAG Burns noted that, April 2nd is no longer an available meeting date and that hence the next potential meeting date would just be April 1st. She also noted that DOJ staff is requesting authority to set multiple meeting dates to plan for the report schedule.

1st MOTION:

Member Libero moved to set the next meeting date for April 1st. **Member Brown** seconded this motion.

Chair Frazier called for Discussion:

Member Burt asked whether the meetings would be in-person or virtual. **DAG Burns** mentioned that there will always be an in-person location for public comment, and the Council could decide to have an in-person meeting at any time. **Chair Frazier** agreed with **Member Burt** that it might be good to meet in person to finalize things for the last few meetings.

After the discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** 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, Member Tingirides

Nays: None

Absent: Member Braziel

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

Chair Frazier then stated that **the motion passed.**

2nd MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to delegate authority to the DOJ to schedule future meetings as needed in consultation with the Vice Chair and Chair. This motion was seconded by **Member Brown.**

Chair Frazier called for discussion on the motion. After hearing no discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** 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, Member Tingirides

Nays: None

Absent: Member Braziel

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

The motion passed and Chair Frazier moved to Agenda item 8, Closing Remarks.

8. Chair Closing Remarks

Chair Frazier thanked the Council and DOJ staff for their professionalism and work. He also thanked public commenters for their engagement, and Yolanda Cruz for informing him about the Sacramento Sherriff's Office crisis intervention policy changes. He also noted that being sight and hearing impaired was mentioned early on in council discussions of police interactions with people with IDD and will be a part of council discussions in the future. Finally, **Chair Frazier** requested

that the DOJ include providers who work with people who have behavioral health needs/IDD to receive their input regarding interactions with law enforcement.

9. Chair Frazier adjourned the SB 882 Council Meeting at approximately 11:41 am on March 6th, 2025.