

Meeting Minutes

December 10, 2025, 9:00 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: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Dr. Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto, Member John Robinson, and Member Assistant Chief Emada Tingirides. Chair Frazier and Members Braziel, Brown, Petteruto, Robinson and Assistant Chief Tingirides attended the meeting remotely. Vice Chair Zuniga and Members Dr. Libero and Burt attended in-person at the Attorney General's Building, Room 1042, 1300 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Agenda Item 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 9:00 am on Wednesday, December 10, 2025. The in-person location was at the Attorney General's Building, Room 1042, 1300 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll.

Present: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Members Rick Braziel, Olwyn Brown, Elizabeth Burt, Dr. Lauren Libero, Christina Petteruto and John Robinson.

Absent: Member Assistant Chief Emada Tingirides.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were nine members on the Advisory Council and five members were necessary to establish a quorum. As there were eight members present, a quorum was established. She also noted that the times that subcommittees would present shifted since the agenda posting. Since the time for Public Comment was still pending, the Council moved to Agenda Item 3.

Chair Frazier thanked the Council and DOJ staff for their work.

Agenda Item 3: Action Item: Approval of October 14, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Chair Frazier asked for comments and questions regarding the minutes from the Council's October 14, 2025, meeting. There were no questions or comments from the Council.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to approve the meeting minutes for the October 14, 2025 Council meeting. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

The meeting minutes were provided to the Council members prior to this meeting for the opportunity to review them. Hearing no further discussion, **Parliamentarian Johnson**

asked for discussion of the motion to approve the minutes and, hearing no discussion, called the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

Nays: None.

Absent: Member Assistant Chief Tingirides.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 Advisory Council members present and voting; there were 8 ayes, 0 nays and the motion passed.

Agenda Item 4: Discussion and Potential Action Item: DOJ Staff Update on Council Training Reviews and Updated Report Drafting Schedule

DAG Ben Conway gave an update regarding the training reviews, which covered 24 trainings. **DAG Kelly Burns** provided an overview of the logistics of the report publication over the final few months of the Council's work. She also outlined how we plan to discuss the recommendations and the report during the meeting. The Public Comment period was scheduled for 9:15 a.m. and would end at 9:25 a.m. Noting that they had reached the time for Public Comment, Chair Frazier transitioned to Public Comment.

Agenda Item 2: Public Comment

Chair Frazier introduced public comment. **DAG Ben Conway** provided the public comment guidelines.

Two public commenters, **Catherine Dorn Schreiber** and **Arrissia Owen Turner** provided comments in support of the Manny Alert Act, and the act's feasibility report. **Schreiber** referenced a similar resolution she co-authored in her school district through the parent-teacher association to find and return children with cognitive disabilities, but noted that there wasn't a statewide system that connects law enforcement agencies to aid in these kinds of searches, and that these instances do not qualify for the Amber Alert system if the children leave of their own free will, which is the case when children with cognitive disabilities "wander." **Turner** supported the Manny Alert Act, and noted that the feasibility study was very thorough but seemed to have been "disregarded." She requested reconsideration of the feasibility study and further requested support for implementing the Manny Alert Act.

Chair Frazier transitioned back to Agenda Item #4 while keeping the public comment period open for members of the public to comment if they wished.

Public Comment officially ended at 9:25 A.M. Other members of the public provided public comments in the meeting chat after the public comment period ended. They were directed to submit the comments via email. Staff will include those comments posted in the chat as written public comments for the next Council meeting.

Agenda Item 4 (continued): Discussion and Potential Action Item: DOJ Staff Update on Council Training Reviews and Updated Report Drafting Schedule

DAG Burns continued to discuss the SB 882 Council report draft schedule, and asked the Council for their feedback. In particular, she flagged the following 2026 key dates to the Council:

- January 9: final day for Council members to provide input to staff for the next iteration of the draft report;
- January 30: full Council meeting to discuss and approve recommendations and report content;
- February 4: final day for Council members to provide input to staff for the next iteration of the draft report;
- March 16: full Council meeting to approve final recommendations and report; and
- April 14: final meeting of the Council.

Discussion:

Vice Chair Zuniga noted a potential conflict with March 16. **DAG Burns** noted that there were no dates in which all Council members could attend the proposed meeting and apologized for the inconvenience.

Chair Frazier asked if staff had contacted public safety committees in the legislature about having a joint hearing to hear the Council's report. **DAG Conway** noted that the DOJ staff is researching the restrictions on engaging elected officials to ensure that the Council does not impermissibly lobby; he also noted that an informational campaign should be feasible, and that part of DOJ staff's research was on that issue.

Member Burt asked when the term is past, could former Council members schedule mini hearings regarding the Council's topic. **DAG Conway** said he will look into that.

Chair Frazier, after noting that there were no further questions or comments, moved to Agenda Item 5.

Agenda Item 5: Presentation by Kate Movius, Founder of Autism Interaction Solutions, and Impacted Community Members. She is with Autism Interaction Solutions and provides trainings for first responders. She primarily works with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and is also the mother of a 25-year-old with nonverbal autism.

This group focused on presenting autism interactions. **Kate Movius**, **Neil Katz** and assistant **Zach, Sam Astle (S. Astle)** and mother **Joy Astle (J. Astle)**, and **Justice/Jay Killebrew (J. Killebrew)** and father **Weller B. Killebrew (W.B. Killebrew)** discussed experiences with law enforcement and elopement (wandering). **Movius** mentioned her son's experiences with law enforcement as a child with non-verbal autism, and statistics related to elopement and drowning for individuals who are neurodivergent. **Katz** also discussed his work using a mix of sign language with his adaptive communication device. **S. Astle** discussed his experience with law enforcement. His mother **J. Astle** also provided her perspective and shared another incident that was not as positive (starting to escalate). **J.**

Killebrew and **W.B. Killebrew** also shared **J. Killebrew's** experiences being underestimated, discussed a wandering moment that prompted swimming lessons, and discussed positive interactions with law enforcement.

Discussion:

Movius facilitated a discussion with the other panelists about their experiences with law enforcement and recommendations for these interactions.

J. Killebrew recommended patience and talking to him directly.

J. Killebrew and **S. Astle** also discussed potentially meeting law enforcement today.

J. Astle shared an additional incident her son experienced that was able to be de-escalated, and varying access to swim lessons through regional centers.

W.B. Killebrew shared how he thought his son being Black would also impact a potential police interaction, and expressed worry about potentially worse outcomes for his son due to this.

The Council members also contributed to the discussion.

Member Burt asked about ideal training lengths.

Movius recommended 2-4 hours for this training. She also advocated for a statewide registry for wandering, to lower fatality rates. The goal of this registry would be to find those missing and, if we have to report somebody missing, we need some kind of centralized place where we can check for them, see if they've been hospitalized, etc.

Member Brown asked about whether the Autism Interactions Solutions organization offered swim lessons for these kids that love water.

Movius noted that while Autism Interactions Solutions does not offer swim lessons but also recommended a legislative mandate that regional centers let families know about wandering risks and opportunities for swim lessons for able-bodied clients with autism or developmental disabilities. She noted the need for a legislative mandate so that services related to these items are covered by IPP via regional centers.

Member Brown also mentioned a potential partnership with Parks and Recreation for swim lessons.

J. Astle responded and explained that **S. Astle** received covered swim lessons via their regional center paying for a YMCA membership, who then provided the lessons, and mentioned that there was an opportunity to address this issue with community partnerships.

Member Braziel shared a law enforcement perspective that building bonds between law enforcement and the disability community, and having more information up front, like with a registry, can help those interactions.

Movius also shared how officers in her classes thought about people with disabilities. She noted that before the course, some officers saw certain behaviors by people with disabilities as suspicious or even criminal (and she also talked about how people with disabilities may unintentionally self-incriminate), and that exposure to this community is important for officers because the needs, even among people who have autism, can be vastly different.

Member Braziel also discussed the importance of dispatch personnel in triaging the initial call.

Movius added that the LA Found wristband program has trained dispatchers to ask if someone is a member of that program, and as of the meeting, there has been a 100% successful retrieval rate with the program in LA County.

Chair Frazier mentioned a study he recently did that indicated pools with Parks and Recreation, and other Parks and Recreation areas were generally not accommodating to children and people with disabilities, and emphasized that people with disabilities have a right in public spaces to access those resources as their peers.

Member Robinson shared that he has done CIT training with officers in Santa Clara and interacted with law enforcement to teach them how to interact with people with different disabilities. The training was 2.5 hours.

Member Petteruto shared that she attended an Autism training with the Santa Monica Police Department, and noted continual engagement from attendees during the 2-hour training.

Members of the public also provided public comments in the meeting chat. These comments will be included as public comments for the next Council meeting.

Agenda Item 6: Presentation by 911 Authority on Manny Alert Act Feasibility Report, Joel V. McCamley, ENP, President/COO, 911 Authority, LLC

Vice Chair Zuniga introduced this presentation. **Joel McCamley** presented the findings regarding the feasibility study for AB 911, the Manny Alert Act. He mentioned that the study involved reaching out to California 911 centers to see if the Manny Alert Act Self Registration database (SRDB) could be integrated with their systems, and also examined fiscal feasibility. But there were basically 3 objectives there. There were some technical objectives, there were some practical objectives, and then there were some fiduciary objectives that were being sought by the feasibility study.

The study concluded that the Manny Alert Act SRDB system was technically, practically, and functionally feasible. The feasibility report was submitted back to the legislature in

2021. He was not aware of any further action that was taken by the legislature since then. Potential concerns he noted were that other states' similar systems were not widely used, and when used, an individual's information was not consistently updated, which first responders noted could be a liability if they provided outdated information that was potentially inaccurate. He also noted that a difference between those programs and the Manny Alert Act, is that if implemented, California's SRDB would be connected to the CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch) system, which would enable dispatchers to access that information during a 911 call. In terms of costs, he noted that estimated costs that were noted in the 2020 study would need to be inflated to account for rising costs since the study, and that some of the costs would be included in the statewide effort to implement a universal statewide CAD system.

Discussion:

Member Burt asked about the implementation of similar programs in other states, and how many were implemented.

McCamley confirmed self-registration databases where citizens provide their relevant information were used in Michigan, Arkansas, and Tennessee among others. The report noted the costs and usage rates for those programs. Arkansas allocated \$4 million a year for many years install and upkeep of their database, 3% of the state's population utilized it. At some point the legislature stopped funding it, with regret about implementing it due to low usage. He also noted that less than 10% of the 3% of people who used the program maintained their records after initial input. He didn't know if states other than the ones mentioned did this. He also noted that these programs in other states didn't tie the database to CAD, which the Manny Alert Act would do, and is a difference between California's intended system and other states that had low usage rates.

Member Burt also asked about information security.

McCamley noted that most 911 calls generally don't involve health records or fall under HIPA, though an EMS agency might if an individual is being cared for in the field. He also noted that each caller is giving up some privacy rights so that dispatch and first responders know their location and phone number to find and respond to their location for the emergency. He also noted that CAD has cyber security requirements, but if a 911 center is being cyber attacked, that system is being attacked, and that each 911 center is responsible for their cyber security because there isn't a larger enterprise for it. He also added that 911 systems (and the level of sophistication) are different depending on how many calls come in.

Member Dr. Libero asked since California is transitioning to NextGen 911, would that ease the possibility of a system like this going into place?

McCamley noted the study mentions NextGen 911, which would ease the connectivity and transport of data by shifting from analog to digital data systems. He noted once that system is deployed, there would be more ways to get and move data between 911 centers.

Member Dr. Libero asked whether he had knowledge about 911 dispatch sending out wireless alerts to the public, and about the possibility of a state registry connected to NextGen 911 to enable local agencies to put out alerts in cases of missing persons.

McCamley noted that alerting systems are completely separate from NextGen 911. For alerts, most jurisdictions have ability to alert locally, and there is statewide and national emergency alerting. If a person has wandered a county could issue that alert. As an example, he noted that if someone who has Alzheimer's is missing, silver alerts are sent out in his state. He wasn't sure how those alerts were implemented in California but noted that the technology was there for that.

Chair Frazier mentioned the cost of \$116 million in 2020 for the system, but with 500,000 individuals with developmental disabilities in California, that would only be \$232 per person. He mentioned that he understood **McCamley**, and that in terms of civil rights there's a balance between requiring someone to do something, and making it voluntary, that has to be addressed also. He also appreciated **McCamley** noting that he didn't know where the feasibility study went once submitted, and noted a need for another hearing or acknowledgement that it was received by the legislature.

Vice Chair Zuniga noted that \$116 million was the total amount over 4 years it would cost to sustain everything: upgrading the CAD systems, training, staff wages and benefits. She also noted that they found the funding that wouldn't touch general dollars via previous legislation that allocated money from cellphone bill surcharges. Currently the surcharge is 33 cents, and with the Many Alert Act changes, that could go up to 80 cents, initially, then reduce over time (estimated 12 – 15 cents over the 4 years, may be a bit higher due to inflation). She appreciated **McCamley**'s comment that it was on the back-burner, and that's why they continue to push forward.

McCamley noted the fund **Vice Chair Zuniga** referred to was the SETNA (State Emergency Telephone Number Account) fund.

Agenda Item 7: Break

Agenda Item 8: Reconvene Meeting; Roll Call to Re-establish Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 11:39 A.M. and called the roll to reestablish a quorum.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Robinson.

Members absent, at the time Roll was called: Member Assistant Chief Tingirides.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were nine members on the Advisory Council and five members present were necessary to establish a quorum.

As there were eight members present, a quorum was re-established.

Agenda Item 9: Report and Presentation of Potential Recommendations by Background Subcommittee; Discussion and Potential Action Item

DAG Burns provided a brief introduction regarding the structure of the subcommittee discussions. **DAG Burns** reminded the Council of the new order of presentation of the sub-committee presentations as follows: background subcommittee, then community non-law enforcement subcommittee, the Systems Interventions Subcommittee, the Best and Emerging Practices Subcommittee, the Data Subcommittee, and finally the Law Enforcement Training Subcommittee.

DAG Burns clarified that the order of presentation was subject to additional necessary changes as the meeting proceeded.

DAG Burns further clarified that today's discussions were to provide information to the subcommittees, and that there would be no formal votes on recommendations at this time.

DAG Conway presented on screen a word processing copy of the document First Draft Discussion Points from the Subcommittees for Discussion that had been posted online in advance. He took live notes in that document throughout the subcommittee presentations and the revised copy of this document will be posted in advance of the January 30 meeting.

DAG Angela Sierra introduced the background subcommittee with **Member Petteruto** and **Member Burt**. **Member Petteruto** presented on the background committee's recommendations which involved:

Report Revision Recommendations

- 1) Propose a new term, "SB 882 population" to refer people with intellectual disabilities and mental health conditions as a combined population.
- 2) Add additional information regarding systems of care in California for the SB 882 population, including regional centers and the information below:
 - a. People with autism are the fastest growing population to qualify for regional centers, and are most likely to interact with law enforcement.
 - b. Department of Developmental Services (DDS) community collaborations
- 3) Distinguish the systems of care for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, and mental health conditions respectively.
 - a. Update statistics about the SB 882 population, and specifically about individuals served by regional centers.
- 4) Overview: new terminology, expanding overview of systems of care (and gaps in care), and updating population statistics

Discussion:

Member Brown liked the "SB 882 population" term to refer to both people with intellectual disabilities and mental health conditions.

Chair Frazier asked whether metrics regarding negative outcomes for interactions between people with IDD or mental health conditions and law enforcement were discussed in the background section, as a reason for why the Council is doing their work.

Member Petteruto noted that it was unclear how much data the Council had on negative outcome interactions, and that terms aren't used consistently, which made data collection a challenge (and data subcommittee can discuss this issue).

Member Burt thanked Petteruto for the presentation, and staff for their assistance.

Legislature Recommendations:

Member Petteruto then presented the subcommittee's recommendation, which was a condensed version of previously noticed recommendations:

That the California legislature continue to build upon the current systems that support the SB 882 population to ensure that individuals, including those in crisis, receive the right services at the right time, and that this should include person-centered planning, access to lifelong services, and strengthening coordination across systems, and looking into how these mechanisms can be incorporated into mental health support systems that are more fragmented.

Discussion:

Vice Chair Zuniga appreciated the recommendation they proposed and noted it as being at the head of the Council's recommendations.

Chair Frazier asked if there were additional questions, heard none and move to Agenda Item 15.

Agenda Item 15: Report and Presentation of Potential Recommendations by the Community/Non-Law Enforcement Subcommittee; Discussion and Potential Action Item

DAG Lucia Choi introduced the subcommittee members, **Chair Frazier** and **Member Robinson**, who each presented on the subcommittee section discussion points, involving interventions besides law enforcement. **Chair Frazier** and **Member Robinson** and shared their proposals for discussion. Deputy Ben Conway screen shared those discussion proposals as they were presented. Their recommendations were:

Recommendations:

- 1) Have School Resource Officers (SROs) in schools, have individuals visit police stations, officers visit day programs, and officers and individuals with IDD and mental health conditions do activities together to build positive rapport between law enforcement and youth who have IDD or mental health conditions
- 2) Implement a course about interacting with law enforcement in the K 12 system, so that people with disabilities can become used to interacting with officers

- 3) Work with speech pathologists to develop a communication signal for people that are nonverbal that can be used to help these individuals communicate with law enforcement
 - a. a bracelet program was noted as an option for the signal
- 4) Slow down the interaction to facilitate better outcomes
- 5) Have law enforcement attend Individualized Education Program team meetings to facilitate understanding and familiarity
- 6) Train and provide resources to non-law enforcement individuals

Discussion:

Member Dr. Libero also recommended safety training for individuals receiving services from regional centers. She noted that some centers are already doing it, but recommended modeling it across the 21 regional centers potentially, and appreciated the recommendation to integrate this training in K-12 schools to capture more individuals that either aren't served by a regional center, or receive services later in life.

Chair Frazier and **Member Robinson** both thanked **Member Dr. Libero** for her feedback and agreed that the only amount of information is not enough.

Additional Topics for Discussion

Chair Frazier mentioned the two additional discussion topics:

- 1) how mobile crisis teams could be utilized and funded
- 2) whether making recommendations for big box stores would be separate from SB 882
 - a. He requested feedback regarding that moving forward from the Council

Discussion

Member Burt noted that **Member Braziel** raised his hand, who noted that his question was already answered by **Member Dr. Libero**.

Member Burt agreed with integrating the safety training in K-12 school, and **Member Dr. Libero**'s comment that not all of the population is at a regional center. She also asked whether the subcommittee was referring to Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) mobile crisis teams, or nonprofits.

Chair Frazier noted that they are open to suggestions and voiced concern about mission creep regarding the SB 882 Council's goals.

Member Burt noted that the Autism Inland Society cosponsored AB 308 and voiced an issue with non-law enforcement mobile crisis entities. She shared that families called a non-law enforcement mobile crisis team, but law enforcement still had to clear the scene, and that non-law enforcement teams hadn't show up to calls, or called back the next day. Given these issues with non-law enforcement mobile crisis teams, she requested clarity regarding the subcommittee's recommendation.

Chair Frazier asked **Member Braziel** to respond and noted that in Sacramento law enforcement will not respond to these calls, so another entity will need to do so, and address those gaps. He asked **Member Braziel** if he had additional thoughts.

Member Braziel confirmed this. He also noted that it may come up during the data sub-committee presentation to potentially examine how effective the new process was in Sacramento and how that could impact the other service providers that previously were not involved in this process. He also noted that improving these interactions is about having the appropriate entities respond instead of law enforcement.

Vice Chair Zuniga noted that in Modesto the mental health response “CHAT” team uses a chat to address mental health crises, and homelessness in the community. She noted that it seemed to work well, but that would depend on the area.

Member Burt noted that in terms of report background, the terminology is the same for a mental health crisis and autism meltdown but that can be misleading because the causation and treatment are different for these interactions. She agreed that the Modesto CHAT team might work for people in mental health crisis, but wondered whether it would work for autism and IDD.

Vice Chair Zuniga agreed and noted that the issue goes back to the data. **Member Burt** agreed. **Chair Frazier** appreciated the input.

With **Member Robinson**’s prompting, **Member Braziel** noted questions in the chat. **Chair Frazier** replied that they directed chat commenters to the website, confirmed that the comments would be made available in the next meeting minutes, and moved the Council meeting to a lunch break.

Agenda Item 11: Lunch Break

Agenda Item 12: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Parliamentarian Johnson noted the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council reconvened at 1:40 P.M. and called the roll to re-establish a quorum.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, and Petteruto. Council Member Braziel initially asked not to be counted as present in case he had to step away for personal reasons, but as he was able to participate in the full afternoon session, **Parliamentarian Johnson** noted at the end of the meeting that he should be considered present.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were nine members on the Advisory Council and five members present were necessary to establish a quorum.

As there were six members present (not at that time counting Member Braziel), a quorum was re-established. Vice Chair Zuniga and Members Burt, and Dr. Libero were in attendance in-person at the Sacramento location; other members participated remotely.

Agenda Item 13: Report and Presentation of Potential Recommendations by the Systems Intervention Subcommittee; Discussion and Potential Action Item

DAG Conway introduced this subcommittee, whose members were **Member Dr. Libero** and **Member Braziel**. **Member Dr. Libero** provided the subcommittee's recommendations:

Recommendations:

- 1) Foster awareness of regional centers, and connections with county health departments
- 2) Develop safety training for (1) youths and adults with IDD, and (2) training for direct support staff
- 3) Develop law enforcement trainings to increase awareness of multiple or co-occurring conditions
 - a. **Member Braziel** added to note to review the already available training to see if they meet the Council's expectations, and proceed accordingly. He noted that some trainings are available but that the Council would need to determine whether they were adequate.
- 4) Develop training for dispatch on how to handle calls that come from a third party, that may not be aware that an individual has a disability, and enabling coding for that call
- 5) Address workforce shortages in California law enforcement and regional centers
- 6) Follow up on the Manny Alert Act recommendations regarding a voluntary registry
- 7) Develop best practices and language for memoranda between law enforcement agencies, regional centers, and county behavioral health
- 8) Build more services for people with multiple conditions
- 9) Address the statewide bed shortage for people in crisis
- 10) Consider funding streams to support these recommendations, especially for smaller agencies in rural areas
 - a. 911 surcharge fund for Manny Alert Act recommendations
 - b. The Mental Health Services Act (HSA)/Prop 63 funds

Discussion:

Member Burt asked about the regional center recommendations. She noted that in her area, sometimes law enforcement has called regional centers and they haven't responded. She voiced providing best practice recommendations to establish protocols for having regional centers respond to an incident, even if it occurs outside of business hours, so that a person in crisis can get the right resources at the right time.

Member Dr. Libero asked the Council how specific the recommendations should be.

Chair Frazier noted that if the recommendations are left up to interpretation, everybody will have a different interpretation, and recommended precision to receive what the subcommittee requested.

Member Burt agreed that being more specific in terms of the kinds of training being recommended, and other terminology used (elopement versus wandering as an example) was necessary.

Member Petteruto agreed that additional detail could be helpful. She noted that for regional centers it could be challenging to foster connections with law enforcement agencies when there are multiple agencies to connect with and added that some but not all connections were fostered. She noted if the Council or law enforcement agencies had thoughts about how to establish connections, whether through the training academy, or potentially specific departments, that would be helpful.

Chair Frazier noted that protocols need to be in place because staff at agency have been continually transitioning, so if a person left without protocols in place, the connection was dropped.

Member Braziel asked **Member Petteruto** if she was looking for specific examples for fostering those connections in the report.

Member Petteruto agreed with **Member Braziel** and also appreciated the idea of a memoranda of understanding (MOU). She noted MOUs take time but there's a benefit of requiring agencies to come together, and having something in writing. She noted that there is a lot of different expertise on the Council, and any input was appreciated.

Member Dr. Libero talked about the MOU recommendation, whether the Council should require or provide language. She also noted that some regional centers cover multiple counties, with potentially 100 agency MOUs. She wasn't sure how practical MOUs would be for those regional centers and agreed with **Member Petteruto** that for both regional centers and law enforcement agencies, there can be outreach but no call back, and hence no relationship between them.

Member Braziel proposed initial outreach by attending each county's sheriff's association monthly/quarterly meeting to identify the best model for their region to work with regional centers. He also suggested that the Council recommend requiring that the county meet with regional center staff at minimum once a year

Member Burt requested to have someone in the sheriff's office as a liaison for people to reach out to in times of crisis and asked for **Member Braziel's** input.

Member Braziel noted that if regional directors meet with the Sheriff directly sometimes that will work. Other times they may appoint someone like a liaison to handle it, which would depend on the command structure. He also noted that it seemed to him the issue was largely about education, whether the Sheriff's know about the regional center resources are available to them.

Chair Frazier asked whether California Highway Patrol (CHP) attends those meetings.

Member Braziel confirmed that CHP has attended those meetings along with other agencies. He also noted that a benefit of attending those meetings was interfacing directly with the law enforcement Chiefs versus a liaison that potentially had 15 other duties.

Member Burt asked whether there is a list of what regional centers do during a crisis, some have a 24-hour crisis call. She noted this list would help the Council realize regional center crisis best practices, and other regional centers can find, and try out something that works in their area. She mentioned hating the possibility of a regional center meeting with somebody and the regional center telling the individual they don't know how to help them.

Member Dr. Libero noted some of the police areas Council members talked to did not have any communication with their regional centers, so that was part of the subcommittee's recommendation wish list. **Member Burt** agreed. After hearing no further discussion, **Chair Frazier** moved to the next agenda item.

Agenda Item 14: Report and Presentation of Potential Recommendations by Best and Emerging Practices Subcommittee; Discussion and Potential Action Item

DAG Catherine Ysrael introduced this subcommittee, with **Member Burt** and **Member Braziel**, who co-presented the subcommittees discussion points.

Recommendations:

- 1) Best practices have to be evidence based. **Member Braziel** mentioned an example that POST followed research and moved from 8-hour trainings and to more 2-hour and self-paced training. In addition to increasing learning, this format also has helped rural agencies that couldn't afford sending people to a 40-hour training.
- 2) Virtual reality training is an opportunity (for law enforcement, medical professionals, and people with IDD and mental health conditions) because AI responds to the person taking the training. **Member Braziel** noted that as mentioned earlier, relationships and exposure have a big influence on the IDD and mental health condition population, noting more comfortability with and appreciation of law enforcement response, and less escalation. He also noted that most officers going through training now and in the field are younger, used to virtual reality and should have the chance to provide their input to make training more efficient. He also referenced Sacramento county's blue envelope program, and San Francisco. He noted these programs, but also that the Council needs to focus on the results and how those programs improve interactions. He also noted that measuring positive outcomes and related questions would be discussed in-depth in the data subcommittee presentation.
- 3) **Member Burt** also added that the online trainings would not be like ones she experienced in the past with videos and quizzes. The trainings this subcommittee is recommending would include meaningful content and decision trees to motivate deeper thought. **Member Braziel** added that POST has been going in the direction of interactive online training, and that this subcommittee's recommendation would be to motivate and assist POST with doing that more. He gave the example of the "Shoot, Don't Shoot" videos of the past, that had set decision paths. He explained that new online self-paced training videos would expand on that (dispatchers already are training with them), and the AI software would generate a reaction to the dispatcher's choice instead of funneling the video down a decision pathway. If the dispatcher

made a mistake, they could go back at any time, and change their choices along the way. He noted that this interactive approach has seen some success in dispatcher training, and that these trainings aren't about setting the video at 1.5 speed and walking away, that there's truly interactive decision making.

DAG Conway asked a clarifying question for the notes. **Member Braziel** clarified, and shared an example of a dispatcher who received a suicidal caller. The dispatcher noted she was able to de-escalate that situation due to an interactive training she recently completed. **Member Braziel** noted that law enforcement training is not about checking a box, it's not about output, it's about outcomes, outcomes that are having an influence.

Discussion:

Member Dr. Libero appreciated the microlearning recommendation. She noted that officers she spoke to when attending trainings liked the shorter training clips (easier engagement) done during roll call with the chief. **Member Dr. Libero** also noted this connected well to previous discussion about exposing officers more to this population since officers go on so many calls that don't interact with these people. She added their lens for interactions may not include them. The more exposure officers get, like the microlearning piece, motivate them to think through those interactions. She noted these trainings also could integrate different perspectives on disability and mental health, and will help officers over time pick up on patterns during those interactions. Following Council Member Burt's comments, Chair Frazier asked if there were any more thoughts or comments for the subcommittee.

After hearing no additional comments or questions, **Chair Frazier** moved to the next subcommittee presentation on Data.

Agenda Item 15: Report and Presentation of Potential Recommendations by the Data Subcommittee; Discussion and Potential Action Item

DAG Burns introduced this subcommittee that had **Member Braziel** and **Member Dr. Libero**, who co-presented on the data subcommittee recommendations.

Recommendations:

- 1) Determine whether the data has efficacy
 - a. **Member Dr. Libero** noted concerns about data quality and accuracy, since some of the data was based on an officer's perception of disability, which could be inaccurate. She added a recommendation to potentially engage with researchers to assess the accuracy of this data, with a pilot or on the ground red teaming program to identify gaps and failures in this data collection.
- 2) For law enforcement trainings, whether there is ongoing assessment of success
 - a. **Member Braziel** noted that the legislature can request something, but they don't always build in an evaluation model. He proposed that the Council look into how to create one, and recommended running pilots to continue this work after the Council's term ends.

- 3) Define what success means to the Council. Potential measures of success mentioned were:
 - a. reductions in deaths
 - b. reduced use of force
 - c. reductions those interactions in general
 - d. reduction in calls to law enforcement
 - e. whether people are being connected to resources
 - f. reductions in the number of internal affairs complaints about behavior
- 4) A data repository for these interactions since many local law enforcement agencies, Department of Developmental Services (DDS) and Department of Public Health (DPH) collect data but there's nothing centralized. The Data Subcommittee has been working with the Department of Justice (DOJ) research team to compile a list of agencies that are already collecting data to identify data gaps.

Questions for the Council to Consider

- 1) What is the scope of the problem regarding law enforcement interactions with the SB 882 population?
- 2) What are the Council's priorities regarding data collection for these interactions?

Discussion:

Chair Frazier asked **Member Braziel** whether there's a monitoring system required by the legislature now about hate crimes. He wondered if law enforcement documentation of these interactions could fall under that system of reporting.

Member Braziel noted if a crime is committed, or if there is liability to the jurisdiction, a report is written. He noted that sometimes informational reports are done, but that a majority of call information is noted in the CAD system, so while there aren't reports for every interaction, the CAD system is still a searchable database. He noted that the data subcommittee question was to clarify what they would be asking agencies to start tracking, and how to track it in the CAD system, since agencies might use different codes, which went back to the problem of lack of centralization of data coding/tracking.

Chair Frazier followed up with a clarifying question about hate crime tracking and **Member Braziel** confirmed that the RIPA tracking system could be used as a model, and that there are other tracking systems out there related to the Council's work.

Member Burt asked whether, in a previously discussed interaction between someone with autism and law enforcement, whether it would get flagged that the individual had autism.

Member Braziel noted that currently that couldn't be flagged (as a code) and that it would only be noted in the notes if the officer thought to include it, since agencies currently are not asking to track that information. He noted that CAD could track that, the Council (or agencies) would need to say they want that data captured, and note the data field(s). He also noted the subjectivity issue that it like with RIPA, it would be up to the

officer's interpretation to determine whether a stop fell under the SB 882 definition of those interactions (unless a disability is self-disclosed).

DAG Burns jumped in to check in with the **ASL interpreter**, who requested to be assigned as an interpreter again in the meeting due to a technology issue. **AGPA Trinidad Hurtado** confirmed this would be done, and later this issue was verified as resolved.

Member Braziel continued the discussion and asked what success means for the Council.

Chair Frazier added that he saw it as imperative that the Council have a descriptive goal to accomplish the intention of the SB 882 Advisory Council.

Member Burt proposed goals of finding lost people promptly, that during these interactions people with disabilities be treated with respect, dignity and understanding, and receive the resources they need. She also suggested that not all calls need to be handled by law enforcement. She also noted that positive engagements like what she recommended could be happening in the community and she didn't know because she hadn't heard about them, and wondered how those positive interactions could be measured.

Chair Frazier agreed with the recommendation for a pilot study to help the legislature re-evaluate improvements, responses and recommend potential next steps to address these issues after the Council sunsets. He noted that moving forward all recommendations would likely be phased in, and emphasized having a pilot to measure success to move forward with those findings.

DAG Burns noted that **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** joined the Council meeting at about 2:35 pm.

Member Braziel suggested reduced use of force during interactions, less interactions with law enforcement, and increased referrals by law enforcement to service providers, educating family about services available to them to reduce calls to law enforcement for the SB 882 population as metrics to measure success for these interactions.

Member Petteruto liked the reduction in internal affairs (IA) complaints as a success metric because it would reflect the experience of the individual or family member regardless of the type of call involved.

Member Braziel shared about an agency that treated internal affairs reports, and their work, like customer service. They started treating everyone with common courtesy and their IA complaints went down by 40%. He agreed that it was a really good measure of success.

Member Brown asked to change Member Braziel's status to present due to his participation. **Member Braziel** declined and noted that he was waiting for the 10-week-old to come out of her nap. **Member Brown** thanked him for his support.

Member Braziel noted that it is a heavy topic, recommended that the Council send staff their ideas about measuring success, and proposed considering what that could look like a year or two.

Chair Frazier noted that he also wanted to hear from **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** about the handbook pursuant to that.

Member Assistant Chief Tingirides noted in terms of success measurements, for training they recommended stopping use of force and officer involved shootings and building trust and relations with SB 882 population. She asked how trust is measured. She proposed that how law enforcement interacts, listens, de-escalates, and slows down, will reduce use of force. She also noted that the handbook **Chair Frazier** requested more information about is currently being reviewed and will hopefully be ready to disseminate soon.

Member Burt asked if there was data that could be used for the background section to leverage the good work this subcommittee has already done.

DAG Burns answered that in the next version of the report, data will be integrated where it makes sense to be. She also clarified that the Council could share ideas about what they want to have happen even if they don't know how that idea will be measured. She noted that DOJ Research could be consulted to see whether and potentially how something could be measured.

Agenda items 16, Break and 17, Reconvening from Break, were skipped by the Council, and the Council instead moved to **Agenda item 18**, the Training Subcommittee's presentation.

Agenda Item 18: Report and Presentation of Potential Recommendations by Law Enforcement Training Subcommittee; Discussion and Potential Action Item

DAG Lisa Ehrlich introduced Training Subcommittee **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides**, and **Member Brown**, who co-presented the Subcommittee's problems to address and recommendations:

Problems to Address

- 1) lack of centralization of guidance
- 2) lack of realistic scenario-based training for officers that reflects the community's needs
- 3) a need for officers to understand the culture and the history of the communities that they're working with

Recommendations

- 1) Reduce use of force and officer involved shootings
- 2) Integrate the SB 882 population in de-escalation training
 - a. having more scenario-based training that focuses on the SB 882 community in the POST learning domains

- 3) Develop a field ready digital resource for officers to reference, via QR code/mobile app
- 4) Have trainings cover the history and culture of interactions so that officers learn the nuance of the culture, how their actions can escalate things, and about
- 5) Utilize simulation technology and embedding scenario-based trainings in those trainings, and developing statewide mobile training units that smaller agencies who can't afford the technology on their own can still access to enhance their trainings
 - a. Explore funding opportunities for virtual reality
- 6) Consult with experts that work with the SB 882 population to co-develop training modules, organizations can be overwhelmed and don't always know what to do in crisis situations
- 7) Create a standardized training hub and library for SB 882 related trainings that law enforcement, medical professionals, nonprofits, and other organizations can access
- 8) Provide training recommendations and sample policy language
- 9) Create/Model training units that can be checked out by smaller agencies
- 10) Build and utilize training evaluation metrics, encourage to track interaction outcomes pre- and post-training
 - a. This is to receive feedback in real time so they can update the trainings as they go
- 11) Partner with academic institutions to analyze body cam footage experience, and access early indicators of escalation
- 12) Include people with lived experiences, both the SB 882 population, and officers who have family members/are otherwise connected to the SB 882 population
- 13) Have civilian oversight boards regarding use of force
- 14) Policy and curriculum reform by recommending that POST formally integrate SB 882 population considerations into de-escalation standards and include subject matter experts and curriculum review processes.
 - a. Also, have discussions with POST academic partners to update related POST curriculum

Member Assistant Chief Tingirides noted that it was challenging to package these in a way that's universal to law enforcement agencies and other agencies, but they wanted to provide basic non-negotiable guidelines for every party, rural agencies, medical facilities that could speak to everyone, provide de-escalation training and techniques to all involved parties to keep everybody safe.

Chair Frazier agreed that an officer's safety and well-being is also important.

Member Assistant Chief Tingirides also shared an incident that happened two days before the meeting, in which officers responded to home call with an individual who had schizophrenia. The call was dispatched, officers were calm. The brother arrived. Officers asked about medications, waited for de-escalation tools. The son with schizophrenia stabbed father, then there was an officer involved-shooting. The officers are unsure what they could have done differently.

Member Burt noted that the presentation was great, and bad things happen. She appreciated that **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** and the officers asked those questions afterwards, and that meant a lot as bridges are being built. She asked related to the incident, about potentially comparing people with IDD versus mental health conditions, or someone on drugs, and assessing whether those different populations would have different law enforcement responses. She didn't know where that would fit in the training, but was curious if **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** had any suggestions.

Member Assistant Chief Tingirides noted that she also considered the difference between having schizophrenic versus a disability, versus a binge, and noted that officers need to assess within seconds to identify all those things. She noted that this could be in the training under different subsections: someone under the influence, versus someone with a disability, or someone with a mental health condition and isn't taking their medication. This reminded her of another officer involved shooting with someone who was deaf who was shooting a gun at her daughter. There was an officer involved-shooting, but after learning that the woman was deaf, the agency wondered what else could have been done. **Member Assistant Chief Tingirides** noted it (being deaf/hard of hearing) as another potential subsection.

Member Dr. Libero asked about the kind of field-ready resources the subcommittee were proposing.

Member Assistant Chief Tingirides replied that they focused on what an officer needs in the field. They suggested a QR code with a link to resources for the SB 882 population nearby, information about the address such as whether someone at that address has a disability, and training bulletins regarding responding to a call (i.e., getting a language interpreter).

Member Brown also noted that they discussed making safe spaces for law enforcement personnel to share experiences of having a child or relative with a disability so that others see it as real. They recommended adding that voluntary option to trainings as well.

Member Assistant Chief Tingirides added that this was intended to build trust and relationships between officers and the SB 882 population.

Hearing no additional comments or questions, **Chair Frazier** moved to Agenda Item 19.

Agenda Item 19: Discussion and Potential Action Item: DOJ Presentation on Draft Report, Discussion of Draft Report, and Continued Discussion of Subcommittee Recommendations

DAG Burns provided an additional opportunity for Council members to share any additional thoughts they had regarding the subcommittees' presentations.

Member Dr. Libero asked whether ideas/comments for specific subcommittees are supposed to be sent to a specific staffer.

DAG Burns noted that questions can be shared during this Council meeting or sent to the DOJ staff regarding subcommittees or the draft report, then asked the Council how they wanted to discuss the draft report.

Vice Chair Zuniga noted that the subcommittee presentations reviewed most of the report chapters so leaving the floor open for general comments would work.

DAG Burns noted this feedback and left the time open for those comments or questions.

Member Assistant Chief Tingirides asked whether the report would be broken down into sections that align with a subcommittee, or if the topic would be content spread throughout the report.

DAG Burns noted that it depended. Some topics like training have distinct sections, but data is all over the place. She noted that discussions that happen in the full Council will be worked into the report in a way that makes the most sense, but that if the Council has feedback regarding putting information in a different location, DOJ staff are open to that feedback, which could be provided in the meetings, or outside of them.

Chair Frazier asked whether there was anything else to cover for this agenda item, and when **DAG Burns** confirmed everything was covered, he thanked the subcommittees for their work and noted that the subcommittees would be meeting at least one more time before the next meeting to finalize the recommendations.

DAG Burns also noted that recommendation language from each subcommittee would be due on January 9, 2026, and that their DOJ liaison would be reaching out to each subcommittee to schedule their subcommittee meeting. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item 20.

Agenda Item 20: 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

Chair Frazier called for a motion for this agenda item. **DAG Burns** noted the previously mentioned future meeting dates of January 30, March 16, and April 14, 2026. She requested that the Council note these proposed dates, but also to keep their dates open in case something needs to be adjusted.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved to delegate authority to the DOJ to set the next meeting dates subject to approval of Chair and Vice Chair. This motion was seconded by **Member, Assistant Chief Tingirides**.

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

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Tingirides.

Nays: None.

Absent: Member Robinson.

Parliamentarian Johnson reported that there were **8** Council members present and voting; there were 8 ayes and 0 nays and the motion passed. She also noted that **Member Braziel** was present and participated in the vote despite previously wanting to be noted as absent.

Agenda Item 21: Closing Remarks by Chair

Chair Frazier thanked the Council for their hard work. He also noted that he is looking forward to the Council being impactful and helpful to the people they care about; and is hoping for successful outcomes. He wished Council a Merry Christmas and noted that he is looking forward to the report.

Agenda Item 22: Meeting Adjourned

Chair Frazier called for a motion to adjourn the December 10 meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga moved adjourn the SB 882 Council meeting. This motion was seconded by **Member Braziel**.

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

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, and Members Braziel, Brown, Burt, Dr. Libero, Petteruto, and Tingirides.

Nays: None.

Absent: Member Robinson.

Parliamentarian Johnson reported that there were **8** Council members present and voting; there were 8 ayes and 0 nays and the motion passed.

The December 10, 2025 meeting for the SB 882 Advisory Council was adjourned at 3:27 pm.