



Ad Hoc Committee for Sheriff's Policy and Legislation

SHERIFF COMMUNITY REVIEW COMMISSION

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	2
SUMMARY OF COURT CASES AND REVIEW OF LEGAL OPINIONS	4
Scott v Smith	4
Drummond	5
Barnes v Felix	7
CHANGE OF POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	8
SHERIFF'S OFFICE POLICIES	9
A GAP IN SERVICE	10
RECEPTION OF THE PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL AGENCIES	11
THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIETY AND POLICIES	13
TIMELINE OF EVENTS	15
Committee Events Related to Sheriff's Policies	16
Committee Events Related to SB 43	20
PUBLIC PERCEPTION VS PUBLIC SAFETY BIG PICTURE REALITIES	21
Law Enforcement Training	21
Public Misunderstanding of Law Enforcement Interaction, Mindset, Training and Authority	22
Use of Force and Mental Health Calls for Service	23
Public Duty Doctrine	24
Calls for Service	25
Patrol Services and Staffing	26
Interoperability of 911 and 988	28
CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS	30
Sheriff's Policies	31
SB 43	31
Data	32
RECOMMENDATIONS	33
1. Recommendation 1 – Internal Engagement	33
2. Recommendation 2 – External Engagement	33
3. Recommendation 3 – Modify Policy 408	34
4. Recommendation 4 – BHS, CCIT and CWRT	35
5. Recommendation 5 – Data Reports to Commission	36
6. Recommendation 6 – Working Group, Data Collection and Analysis	36
7. Recommendation 7 – Engagement with Commission	37
THE COMMITTEE	38
APPENDIX AND ATTACHMENTS	39
Media	39
Sheriff's Policies	42
Letter of Sacramento Metro Fire Chief House to Sheriff Cooper	42
Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services Crisis Wellness Response Team Crisis Matrix	42

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the Sacramento County Sheriff Community Review Commission (Commission or SCRC) has expressed concern regarding calls for service, received by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Office (SSO or SO), involving individuals experiencing a mental or behavioral health crisis.

In 2023, the Commission's top priority was to explore SSO patrol operations, policies and procedures occurring in the field surrounding the response to calls for service involving individuals experiencing a mental or behavioral health crisis, including de-escalation and crisis intervention training, collaboration with Wellness Crisis Call Center and response program and family member interactions. The Commission formed an ad hoc committee to further explore this topic; the [report](#) contained six recommendations for the sheriff's office that were approved by the Commission. These recommendations supported the expansion of Co-Response Crisis Intervention Teams (CCIT), formerly known as Mobile Crisis Support Teams (MCST), increased training for deputies and dispatchers, requests for quarterly data and encouragement for the sheriff's office to partner with the county's Community Wellness Response Team (CWRT) to resolve gaps in service.

Since the Committee's report, the County now operates CWRT 24/7, using clinicians and staff with lived experience to respond to locations throughout the county to provide immediate, crisis intervention and de-escalation services, assess needs and risks and create safety plans. Many CWRT calls originate from 988, a suicide and crisis lifeline that has been operated by WellSpace Health since July 2022.

On **January 21, 2025**, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Office publicly announced to the Commission its change of policies and intent to no longer respond to calls for service of mental health crises without a criminal element in response to a [US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruling in Scott v Smith](#)¹.

This prompted a response from affected first responder public agencies, behavioral health agencies and providers, advocacy and community groups and individuals, members of the Board of Supervisors and, in general, the greater communities of Sacramento County. While some advocates and community members supported the change, preferring to limit the interactions between law enforcement and individuals experiencing behavioral health challenges, others strongly disagreed.

The policy change has created an apparent gap to calls for service where there is no apparent crime, but there is a potentially dangerous situation, particularly threatening self-harm involving use of a weapon. Sheriff's office personnel would no longer respond under

¹ United States Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit. "Scott v Smith." United States Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit, July 30, 2024. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2024/07/30/23-15480.pdf>

the new policy and behavioral health staff will not respond due to the risk/safety. This gap in service is complicated as there are statutes, case laws, nuances and opinions on both sides of the issue related to law enforcement's response to non-criminal mental health calls for service.

Due to the shift in the Sheriff's response protocol, the Commission dissolved its existing ad hoc committees and established an ad hoc committee for [Sheriff's Policies](#)² 408, 409 and 327, also referred to as Non-Criminal Mental Health Calls, and Implementation of SB 43, (paraphrased on title documents due to space limitations, hereafter cited as "Committee"). The Committee was [established](#) on **February 18, 2025**.

The Committee's membership was selected by the Commission and consists of

- Committee Chair, Commissioner Ted Wolter, District 3,
- Commissioner and Commission Chair Paul Curtis, District 1,
- Commissioner Sam Somers, District 4,
- Commissioner William Cho, District 3,
- with assistance from Commissioner Eric Jones, Ex Officio Member and Deputy County Executive, Public Safety and Justice Agency,
- and Laura Foster, Office of the County Executive, Public Safety and Justice Agency.

² Sacramento Sheriff's Office. "Sacramento County Sheriff's Office Policy Manual." Sacramento Sheriff's Office, April 7, 2025.
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/q0qinzwfvvvg3dbwgjyra/h?dl=0&e=1&rlkey=zbl5ft2zr99raw6j6bf4ypik>

SUMMARY OF COURT CASES AND REVIEW OF LEGAL OPINIONS

There are various statutes and case laws relevant to this issue. These are briefly summarized and are not intended to be legal opinions. It is provided without preference merely for context and information.

Scott v Smith

On **July 30, 2024**, the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court's denial of qualified immunity for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department only in specific instances of mental health crises, without a suspected crime and no present risk to officers or others.

The facts, claims and issues of the case are summarized by [Police Training Solutions](#) in a **September 24, 2024** "[Prone Handcuffing and the Law](#)" article.

On **February 6, 2024**, the [California Public Safety Labor Blog](#) of [Mastagni Law](#) (a firm who represents public safety professionals) published "[Ninth Circuit Ruling Prompts Refusal to Respond to Mental Health Calls](#)". The opinion appeared to be supportive of the position and policy change of the sheriff's office.

On **February 14, 2025**, [Jones Mayer Law](#) (a firm who represents the [California Peace Officers Association](#), [California Police Chiefs Association](#), [California State Sheriffs' Association](#) and [other public agencies](#)), published "[Vol. 40 No. 2 NO QUALIFIED IMMUNITY ON EXCESSIVE FORCE CLAIM WHERE POLICE USED BODYWEIGHT FORCE ON THE BACK OF A PRONE INDIVIDUAL WHO WAS MENTALLY ILL, NOT SUSPECTED OF A CRIME, AND DID NOT PRESENT A RISK TO OFFICERS OR OTHERS](#)". The opinion appeared to be contrary to the position and policy change of the sheriff's office and stated, "This is a misinterpretation of this ruling."

On **January 5, 2025**, [Petition for Writ of Certiorari](#) was filed with the [United States Supreme Court](#)³. At issue are (1) whether, viewing the facts from the officers' perspective at the time, the officers acted reasonably under the Fourth Amendment by using bodyweight pressure to restrain a potentially armed and actively resisting individual only until handcuffing could be accomplished; and (2) whether the district court panel erred in denying qualified immunity where no case clearly established that pre-handcuffing bodyweight pressure violates the Fourth Amendment.

³ Dispatch Media, Inc. "Smith v. Scott." SCOTUSblog. <https://www.scotusblog.com/cases/case-files/smith-v-scott>

Drummond

In [Drummond ex rel. Drummond v City of Anaheim \(2003\)](#)⁴, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a lower court's decision and held that Anaheim police officers used excessive force when restraining a mentally ill individual, Brian Drummond, leading to severe injuries and a permanent vegetative state. The court found that the officers' actions, which included placing their weight on Drummond's back and neck while he was face down, were clearly excessive and would have been recognized as such by a reasonable officer. The case was remanded for further proceedings, including a trial on the merits.

A Fourth Amendment claim of excessive force is analyzed under the framework set forth by the Supreme Court in [Graham v Connor](#)⁵, [490 US 386, 109 S.Ct. 1865 (1989)]. Graham v Connor is a landmark 1989 Supreme Court case that established the "[objective reasonableness](#)" standard⁶ for evaluating excessive force claims under the Fourth Amendment.

A claim of excessive force by law enforcement during an arrest, stop or other seizure of an individual is subject to the objective reasonableness standard of the Fourth Amendment, rather than a substantive due process standard under the Fourteenth Amendment. In other words, the facts and circumstances related to the use of force should drive the analysis, rather than any improper intent or motivation by the officer who used force. This means that when assessing whether law enforcement officers used excessive force during an arrest, investigatory stop, or other seizure, courts must consider whether a reasonable officer in the same situation would have used the same amount of force. That analysis requires balancing the "nature and quality of the intrusion" on a person's liberty with the "countervailing governmental interests at stake" to determine whether the use of force was objectively reasonable under the circumstances. [Id. at 396, 109 S.Ct. 1865.]

Determining whether a police officer's use of force was reasonable or excessive therefore "requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case" and a "careful balancing" of an individual's liberty with the government's interest in the application of force. Id.; see [Deorle v Rutherford](#), 272 F.3d 1272, 1279-81 (9th Cir.2001). Because such balancing nearly always requires a jury to sift through

⁴ United States Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit. "Drummond v. City of Anaheim." United States Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit, September 10, 2003. <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/us-9th-circuit/1371011.html>

⁵ United States Supreme Court. "Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989)." United States Supreme Court, May 15, 1989. <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/490/386>

⁶ Lexipol. "The Objective Reasonableness Standard: Glancing in the Mirror Before Criticizing Graham v. Connor." Don Weaver, March 31, 2017. <https://www.lexipol.com/resources/blog/objective-reasonableness-standard>

disputed factual contentions, and to draw inferences therefrom, the courts have held on many occasions that summary judgment or judgment as a matter of law in excessive force cases should be granted sparingly. See, e.g., [Liston v County of Riverside](#), 120 F.3d 965, 976 n. 10 [(9th Cir.1997)] (citing several cases). This is because police misconduct cases almost always turn on a jury's credibility determinations. This case is no different.

According to the Ninth Circuit, despite the deadly history of this type of force, it is not clear whether the force allegedly applied in this case constitutes “deadly force” under [Tennessee v Garner](#)⁷, 471 US 1, 105 S.Ct. 1694, 85 L.Ed.2d 1 (1985), to be used only if “it is necessary to prevent the escape [of a suspected felon] and the officer has probable cause to believe that the suspect poses a significant threat of death or serious physical injury to the officer or others.” [Brewer v City of Napa](#), 210 F.3d 1093, 1097-98 (9th Cir.2000) (quoting Garner, 471 US at 3, 105 S.Ct. 1694) (internal quotation marks and emphasis omitted); see also [Monroe v City of Phoenix](#), 248 F.3d 851, 859 (9th Cir.2001) (noting the twin requirements of escape and serious physical harm).

“In this circuit, under Garner, ‘deadly force is that force which is reasonably likely to cause death.’” Monroe, 248 F.3d at 859 (quoting [Vera Cruz v City of Escondido](#), 139 F.3d 659, 663 (9th Cir.1998)). Vera Cruz recognized that not merely the quantum of force, but also how that force is applied, may render it more or less likely to cause death. See Vera Cruz, 139 F.3d at 663 n. 4; cf. [Robinette v Barnes](#), 854 F.2d 909, 913 (6th Cir.1988) (“As we already have stated, the totality of the factors present in a particular case determine whether deadly force was used to apprehend a suspect.”)

Here, although the force employed by the Anaheim police is not extreme in the abstract, it may be reasonably likely to cause death when applied under certain circumstances. Because we find a genuine issue of material fact as to whether the force used was constitutionally excessive under the ordinary Graham balance, we need not decide on this appeal whether it would constitute “deadly force” under Garner.

⁷ United States Supreme Court. “Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985).” United States Supreme Court, March 27, 1985. <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/471/1>

Barnes v Felix

On **May 15, 2025**, in [Barnes v Felix](#), the Supreme Court addressed the standard for evaluating excessive force claims under the Fourth Amendment, specifically regarding the use of deadly force by law enforcement. The Court rejected the as of until now used "[moment-of-threat](#)" rule⁸, which focuses solely on the immediate circumstances leading to the use of force and instead emphasized that courts must consider the "[totality of the circumstances](#)"⁹. This means examining the events leading up to the incident, not just the few seconds before the officer fired their weapon, according to the Supreme Court¹⁰.

⁸ Lexipol. "Examining the "Moment of Threat" Doctrine: A Crucial Case for Law Enforcement." Michael Ranalli, December 16, 2024. <https://www.lexipol.com/resources/blog/examining-the-moment-of-threat-doctrine-a-crucial-case-for-law-enforcement>

⁹ Cornell Law School. "Totality of Circumstances." Legal Information Institute, June 2024. https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/totality_of_circumstances

¹⁰ United States Supreme Court. "23-1239 Barnes v. Felix (05/15/2025)." United States Supreme Court, May 15, 2025. https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/23-1239_onjq.pdf

CHANGE OF POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

On **January 21, 2025**, the sheriff's office announced its change of policy to the Commission.

On **February 4, 2025**, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Office hosted a [press conference](#) to announce their change of policy to no longer respond to mental health calls for service without a criminal element. It was stated that this was in response to a recent US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruling in Scott v Smith.

At the time, it appeared as if the policy change was abrupt. However, it became apparent that this had been discussed for some time and possibly even implemented and tested on a nonpublic and unofficial basis prior to this public announcement. This was based upon discussions with other first responders and their observations of an unstated and subtle change of interagency interaction, practices and field operations.

In addition, it appeared as if the Scott v Smith ruling may have been used as a pretext and catalyst to implement a change that may have been discussed and pursued by public safety agencies for some time based upon public sentiment of recent political and social climates. This is based upon factors and knowledge of similar policy changes in other California jurisdictions.

Aside from one meeting, noted in [TIMELINE OF EVENTS](#), it also appeared as if there had been little meaningful high-level contact, consultation, discussion or notice to and with affected public or private agencies, organizations and groups.

While the sheriff's office's specific process of discussion and implementation of a policy change is not known to this Committee, it can be reasonably presumed it would be similar to other public agencies. A policy change can be precipitated by an event and change of statutes or case law. There may be discussions between management and affected labor groups in a required "meet and confer" process with potential negotiations of language or other issues prior to implementation.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE POLICIES

The sheriff's office general orders or [policy](#) and [procedures](#) manuals are available online at <https://www.sacsheriff.com/pages/transparency.php>. The relevant policies are 327, 408 and 409 which are referenced and linked in the [Appendix](#).

Policy 327 provides guidance to deputies when requesting or responding to a request for mutual aid or when assisting another law enforcement agency.

Policy 408 provides guidelines for interacting with those who may be experiencing a mental health or emotional crisis. Policy § 408.2 now stated, "The Sheriff's Office will not dispatch deputies to requests for service involving individuals experiencing a mental health crisis where there is no criminal element that would typically warrant a physical response or there is no imminent danger to others." Policies §§ 408.5, 408.6 and 408.9 were noted, as well.

Policy 409 provides guidelines for when deputies may take a person into custody for psychiatric evaluation and treatment (5150 commitment) (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150).

A GAP IN SERVICE

Sacramento County is fortunate to have behavioral health assistance, care, programs and treatment for mental health care and crises available and ready to respond. Absent a law enforcement response for mental health calls, these providers and services would ideally respond for assistance. However, Sacramento Metro Fire District, as stated at the February 2025 Commission meeting, and [BHS CWRT Crisis Matrix](#) policies prohibit response in potential or actual dangerous or violent situations that may involve weapons.

The policy change created a gap in service where no public safety or behavioral health agency would respond to potentially dangerous and violent mental health calls for service, raised questions of liability for the County and concern for the welfare of those in behavioral health crisis.

The Commission was informed that on **June 5, 2025**, a suicide had occurred in the county and it was believed to be the first since the sheriff's office policies changed to no longer respond to non-criminal mental health calls for service.

"Learning about any suicide is difficult to understand and reconcile. Hearing of the local resident who took their own life earlier this month was no different except that it has brought rightful attention to the Sacramento County Sheriff's recent policy shift to ignore responding to the very circumstances that led to this regrettable and perhaps avoidable loss of life" said Phil Serna, Chairman of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors. He continued by stating: "I understand the Sheriff remains reluctant to reconsider his policy requiring deputies to ignore mental health crisis dispatch calls for assistance, including those involving suicidal ideation. I strongly disagree with that policy as do others, and I am encouraged to know that Sacramento County's Sheriff Community Review Commission will continue to scrutinize the Sheriff's directive which is now set against the backdrop of a very unfortunate fatality." – Office of Supervisor Phil Serna, District 1

The sheriff's office stated that this incident would not affect or change their policy.

A **July 15, 2025**, a CBS 13 story, "[Sacramento sheriff's office mental health response policy under fire after tragedy – A Sacramento County Sheriff's Office policy not to respond to mental health calls is under fire after a crisis lifeline call ended in tragedy](#)", aired after this event. Commission Chair Paul Curtis was interviewed.

There were many questions posed by the Commission regarding the circumstances, handling and sequence of events of this call for service. For example, the Commission requested clarification of how the call was received and, if, or how it was transferred – to understand the process. As of the writing of this report, the Commission has not yet received answers to its questions.

RECEPTION OF THE PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL AGENCIES

There was significant alarm, confusion and negative response to this announcement from affected first responder public agencies, behavioral health agencies and providers, advocacy and community groups and individuals, the Board of Supervisors and, in general, the greater communities of Sacramento County.

Some members of the Board of Supervisors expressed concern about the policy change due to gaps of service, potential adverse consequences and outcomes, potential liabilities caused by such and harm to the people, staff and first responders of Sacramento County.

Supervisor Phil Serna stated the board could “certainly attempt to influence” the Sheriff’s Office, but the only way the county can “directly influence” the department is through its budget. “At least I can speak for myself that I was extremely concerned when I first heard of the simple statement that the sheriff’s department is no longer responding to these mental health crisis calls involving weapons. That, on its face, would concern anyone,” Serna said on Tuesday morning. “Obviously, there’s more to it than just that. There’s the interpretation of state law. There is the fact that we have other jurisdictions.” – (Hall, E. “Sacramento sheriff no longer responds to some mental health calls. Community members concerned.” The Sacramento Bee, February 5, 2025. <https://www.sacbee.com/news/local/article299717589.html>)

The Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (Fire, Metro, Metro Fire, FD or SMFD) appeared before the Commission and shared concerns of responses to dangerous scenes and violent persons without the protection and support of law enforcement agencies.

As is common practice throughout the nation, law enforcement agencies would typically and initially respond to calls for medical service if there was a potential or actual dangerous situation or violent person(s) to secure the scene and render it safe for firefighters and/or medical personnel.

Metro Fire shared preliminary data and statistics that the sheriff’s office had refused to respond to some calls for assistance. At the time of their presentation and this report, there had not yet been any instances of fire or medical personnel who had been injured or killed as a result of this new dynamic.

Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services, WellSpace Health and other public and private behavioral health providers shared similar concerns for the safety of their staff.

Family Advocates for Individuals with Severe Mental Illness (FAISMI) and those individuals with similar perspectives and experiences oppose this policy change and have shared their concerns with the Commission. FAISMI advocates are family members of individuals with severe mental illness (SMI) who have exhausted all available efforts, methods and systems of care and assistance. They support appropriate law enforcement intervention during mental health crises for those individuals who are unable or unwilling, due to mental illness, to care for or help themselves.

There were advocates, community groups and individuals against any involvement of law enforcement in mental health crises and in support of this policy change who spoke at Commission meetings.

This change in sheriff's policy is supported by the Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff's Association (SCDSA or DSA) and Law Enforcement Managers Association (LEMA). In addition, based upon informal conversations with law enforcement professionals, a well-attended webinar, noted in [TIMELINE OF EVENTS](#), and according to the undersheriff, inquiries received from many other law enforcement agencies, who are exploring a similar change, to request the sheriff's office policy, this is supported by leaders and staff in law enforcement throughout the state.

THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIETY AND POLICIES

Local governments have two basic functions, according to the [Center for the Study of Federalism](#): “To meet needs and solve problems of a local nature and to deliver such basic life amenity services as water, sanitation, streets, fire, police, and citizen protection.”¹¹

One of the fundamental, core functions and roles of local government is to provide, among other essential services, public safety. It is for this reason why the majority of municipal budgets are allocated for public safety. This topic is summarized in [Diligent's](#), “[The primary functions of U.S. local government and why transparency matters](#).”¹²

This was especially true in California since the 1967 enactment of the [Lanterman-Petris-Short Act](#)¹³ (LPS or LPS Act) and revision of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The [LPS Act](#) was intended to reform the state's mental health system. Its primary goal was to end the inappropriate, indefinite and involuntary commitment of individuals with mental health disorders.

An unintended consequence of this was, perhaps, greater law enforcement involvement in mental health issues. If there was not an adequate or no public service for an issue, it, perhaps unfairly, became an unfair burden and responsibility of law enforcement. Unfortunately, public safety has become a “catch all” for most, if not all, problems in society.

While locally and independently elected sheriffs have great power, influence and can make policy, within the law, law enforcement, as an arm of the executive and legislative branches of government, cannot and does not make legislation or general public policy. The appropriate entities and persons those with frustration have should direct it towards policy makers and legislators – not law enforcement who can only act, or not, as directed by statute.

As the opinions of society change, so does the pendulum of government legislation, policies and actions. The social justice advocacy to exclude law enforcement from mental health response is but one example of this. There are a certain portion of the population and advocacy groups with ideologies who support the exclusion of law enforcement from mental health response who may have welcomed and praised this development.

¹¹ Center for the Study of Federalism. “Local Governments.” Robert Agranoff, 2006. <https://federalism.org/encyclopedia/intergovernmental-relations/local-government>

¹² [Diligent](#). “The primary functions of U.S. local government and why transparency matters.” Jeff Schaefer, Senior Director, April 8, 2025. <https://www.diligent.com/resources/blog/what-primary-functions-local-government>

¹³ California State Legislature. “Lanterman-Petris-Short Act.” California State Legislature, 1967. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=WIC&division=5.&title&part=1.&chapter&article

However, this may not be indicative or representative of the sentiments of the larger population who support and advocate for the appropriate inclusion of law enforcement for a balanced system of care.

TIMELINE OF EVENTS

On **January 8, 2025**, the Sacramento Sheriff's Office hosted a multi-agency meeting to include the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District and the County, with representatives from the Office of the County Executive, Department of Health Services and Behavioral Health Services. The supposed purpose of the meeting was to solicit feedback on the policy change. This is the first publicly known meeting of affected agencies.

On **January 17, 2025**, Metro Fire Chief Adam House sent a letter to Sheriff Cooper to describe its effects on Metro Fire and sought clarification of the policy change. Chief House stated concerns later shared with the Commission by Metro Fire staff. It confirmed the reported observations of first responders that the sheriff's policy change had already been implemented prior to **January 8** and prior to its public announcement. Refer to [Attachment](#).

On **January 21, 2025**, the sheriff's office notified the Commission of this change of policy.

On **February 4, 2025**, the Sacramento Sheriff's Office hosted a press conference and announced their change of policy.

On **February 14 – 18, 2025**, the Commission submitted 36 written questions to Undersheriff Mike Ziegler. The questions were designed to reveal the deliberations and process of this policy change and inquiries ranged from its development to implementation. Written responses were received on **February 18** to some but not all questions.

On **February 18, 2025**, prior to the creation of this Committee, the Sacramento Metro Fire District addressed the Commission. Their Deputy Chief Parker Wilborn, Kyle Macdonald, Director of Government Affairs and executives shared their concerns and experiences with the sheriff's policy change. At the time of their presentation and this report, there had not yet been any instances of fire or medical personnel who had been injured or killed as a result of this new dynamic. In addition, fire and EMS personnel are not trained nor certified or qualified for law enforcement actions or investigative procedures such as evidence collection and processing, should they encounter a weapon, for example.

On **February 18, 2025**, the Commission [established](#) this Committee in response to the sheriff's office policy change and concerns from the Board of Supervisors and community.

Committee Events Related to Sheriff's Policies

The Committee subsequently extended invitations to

- Family Advocates for Individuals with Severe Mental Illness (FAISMI),
- [Law Enforcement Managers Association](#) (LEMA),
- [Local 522](#) (firefighters union),
- [Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff's Association](#) (SCDSA),
- [Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services](#) (BHS),
- [Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District](#) (Fire, Metro Fire, FD or SMFD),
- law firms, representing public safety unions, who drafted legal opinions of Scott v Smith and
- other interested individuals and organizations.

The Committee's invitations to meet with SCDSA, LEMA and others were declined or ignored.

In **March 2025**, the Committee reviewed a sheriff's CAD ([computer aided dispatch](#)) event log of an incident referenced by Metro Fire and reported by media. This was to understand the events and dynamics of a mental health call which did not receive a sheriff's response, the context of the totality of the circumstances to include calls for service, staffing, related impacts of time and day and how this related to other similar calls for service. The sheriff's office proactively provided the CAD record for this event but declined to provide an audio recording of the call.

On **March 3, 2025**, Commissioners Wolter and Whiteside met with FAISMI. These advocates are family members of individuals with severe mental illness (SMI). FAISMI opposes this policy change and supports appropriate law enforcement intervention during mental health crises for those individuals who are unable or unwilling, due to mental illness, to help themselves.

On **March 25, 2025**, the [Briefing Room](#) hosted a webinar, "Should Police Stop Responding to Mental Health Calls?", paneled by [Vern Pierson, El Dorado County District Attorney](#), [Scott Savage, Founder at Savage Training Group](#), [Phil Downs, Public Entity Trial Attorney](#) and [Jason Louis, CEO of The Briefing Room](#). Sheriff Cooper and Undersheriff Ziegler were featured guest speakers.

On **April 7, 2025**, the Committee met with Undersheriff Mike Ziegler. Commission Chair Curtis led the conversation with the undersheriff. The undersheriff summarized the basis and evolution of this policy change and reiterated his statement of cooperation and support of the Commission.

The undersheriff stated that the sheriff's office had been inundated with inquiries from dozens, if not hundreds of interested law enforcement agencies, for copies of their changed policy. These agencies had expressed support and wished to make the same changes to their policies. The undersheriff stated the sheriff's office would present at an upcoming law enforcement conference.

The Committee believes it is likely that other California law enforcement agencies will make this policy change and no longer respond to mental health calls without criminal element(s). However, as of the date of this report, only three known counties and three cities, have changed their policies of responding to mental health calls for service.

The undersheriff also stated support for the [Co-Response Crisis Intervention Teams](#) (CCIT). The program pairs a county behavioral health clinician with a specially trained peace officer who responds to mental health calls. This Committee posed questions of whether CCIT still operated and if so, how CCIT would be affected with the policy change. The undersheriff stated that the teams were still in existence and operation.

On **May 13, 2025**, the Committee met with Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services Human Services Division Manager Stephanie Kelly and Health Program Manager Nicole Cable. The Crisis Intervention Teams were discussed. Although BHS presented an MOU (memorandum of understanding) to the sheriff's office for the next fiscal year, the Committee learned that the CCIT partnership with the sheriff's office was, in practice, non-operational and terminated. BHS staff assigned to the CCIT program with the sheriff's office have been reassigned to other agencies or positions.

BHS staff were asked exactly with whom in the sheriff's office, and at what level, they had had discussions of CCIT. Staff stated their discussions had been with field supervisors (sergeants) and/or watch commanders (lieutenants) – but not with the sheriff, undersheriff, captains and executive command staff.

The Committee was previously unaware of the change in resource deployment for BHS clinicians. This was perhaps a symptom of an all too often repeated public misunderstanding of law enforcement hierarchy, command structure and protocol, roles and responsibilities. It has been observed that when county agencies, boards, commissions, departments and staff are queried whether they have consulted with the sheriff's office, or law enforcement and public safety agencies in general, their positive reply to the affirmative may not be accurate under their mistaken assumption that a discussion with line level staff (deputies, officers, supervisors, etc. who do not have authority to make policy or speak for their agency vs agency heads, sheriffs, undersheriffs, chiefs, deputy chiefs, captains, executive command staff, etc. who do have authority to make policy and speak for their agency) constitutes proper engagement. It does not.

This exposed a possible disconnect between sheriff's office executive command staff and field staff about policy and inconsistent messaging. This was also a plausible explanation for the discrepancies of information received from the sheriff's office and BHS about the current status of the CCIT program.

On **May 27, 2025**, Undersheriff Ziegler appeared before the Commission. He briefly described the evolution of the process of the policy change, the Scott v Smith case, verbally presented data (of which the Commission has requested) since the implementation of the policy change and its present conditions.

It was notable, according to the undersheriff, the Sacramento Sheriff's Office is not the only agency that has initiated such a policy change. It was public knowledge that Del Norte County had also made this policy change. However, there have been at least three known California police departments and other sheriff's offices that made this policy change but did not make it publicly known.

The undersheriff was queried about CCIT and its current status. He again stated support for CCIT and its current status as present. Based upon previous discussions with BHS and the sheriff's office, the reply was ambiguous and did not clarify questions and discrepancies of its status as previously stated.

The undersheriff also presented preliminary data and statistics since the public implementation of the policy change.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE CALLS FOR SERVICE FOR MENTAL HEALTH February 2025 through May 27, 2025	
884	Mental Health Calls
410	Mental Health Calls with No Criminal Element
286	Transferred to WellSpace or Fire Department/EMS
188	No Response or Refused Service
0	Known Incidents of Self-Inflicted Serious Injuries or Deaths
0	Known Incidents of Injuries or Deaths to Firefighters or EMS

The Commission inquired about the number of calls handled by or transferred to CCIT and CWRT and other related data. That information was not available because it is not tracked or it is held by other entities.

The undersheriff noted other statutory limitations such as [AB 392](#) and [Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150](#).

AB 392 changed the penal code and standard for when law enforcement officers can use deadly force from "reasonable" to "necessary". It prescribed the circumstances under which a peace officer is authorized to use deadly force to effect an arrest, to prevent escape or to overcome resistance.¹⁴

WI 5150 specifies peace officers as those professional persons with the authority to execute this section. It also states a county may designate other professional persons to do so, as well. The undersheriff suggested the County designate firefighters and EMS, in addition to or in lieu of deputies, to enable them to operate under WI 5150.

In **June 2025**, this Committee requested to meet with a sheriff's office communications center supervisor and a field supervisor (sergeant) and/or watch commander (lieutenant). The Committee requested this to understand the specific process and criteria of how calls are screened, reviewed and determined to receive a response or not. It has also requested, if any such document exists, a list of questions to determine how and if a mental health crisis and/or crime are present. However, as of the writing of this report, the meeting has not yet occurred.

The Commission was informed that on **June 5, 2025**, a suicide had occurred in the county and it was believed to be the first since the sheriff's office policies changed to no longer respond to non-criminal mental health calls for service.

On **July 15, 2025**, Sacramento County resident Ann Donnelly, who lost her son to suicide in June 2025 in similar circumstances to the event noted in [A GAP IN SERVICE](#), addressed the Commission with her story.

¹⁴ California State Assembly. "LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST." California State Legislature, August 19, 2019.

https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB392#:~:text=Existing%20law%20authorizes%20a%20peace%20officer%20to%20make%20an,an%20arrest%2C%20to%20prevent%20escape%2C%20or%20to%20overcome%20resistance.

Committee Events Related to SB 43

Affected individuals, community groups and advocates such as Family Advocates for Individuals with Severe Mental Illness were concerned about the impact of SB 43 on the current systems of care and training of first responders.

The Committee met with Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services, FAISMI and informally with public safety agencies.

Behavioral Health Services Director Dr. Ryan Quist has spoken to the Commission, the [Alcohol and Drug Advisory Board](#), the [Mental Health Board](#) and publicly at length about this issue.

On **November 21, 2024**, the Committee met with David Stammerjohan, Chief of Staff of Senator Susan Eggman. Senator Eggman authored [SB 43](#)¹⁵. It was important to learn the original intent of the bill and its background. Stammerjohan stated that the chaptered SB 43 retained most of its original intent through the amendment process.

Based upon discussions with BHS and public safety agencies, it was generally believed that the SB 43 expansion of the definition of “gravely disabled” to include substance abuse would not dramatically alter or impact current operations or resources. The criteria was expanded to include individuals with a mental health disorder, severe substance use disorder, or co-occurring disorders, who are unable to provide for their basic needs (food, clothing, shelter, safety or medical care). Most incidents of mental health crises include substance abuse as a co-occurring issue with few cases of substance abuse presented alone.

The Board of Supervisors approved implementation of SB 43 in **November 2024**.

[Analysis](#), [amendments](#), [comments](#), [history](#), [versions](#) and [votes](#) of SB 43 can be viewed at the [California Legislative Information website](#).

¹⁵ California State Senate. “SB 43 Behavioral Health.” California State Legislature, October 10, 2023. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240SB43

PUBLIC PERCEPTION VS PUBLIC SAFETY BIG PICTURE REALITIES

It is important to be aware of the basic elements of the law enforcement profession, its culture, training, policy and legislative constraints to understand how mental health calls, and calls for service in general, are managed and how the sheriff's office may or would have come to its decision to change policies and response. An acknowledgement is not agreement or support but a first step towards an objective understanding of the causalities and relationships of this outcome and perhaps, a path towards change.

Law Enforcement Training

The training and professional standards of California peace officers are governed by the [California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training](#) (POST). It was established by the state legislature in 1959 to set minimum selection and training standards for California law enforcement.

The required minimum course of study in police academies spans approximately 1000 hours and requires mastery across over 40 learning domains (LDs) or subjects. These LDs vary from knowledge of and practical application, proficiency and compliance of subjects such local, state and federal statutes, continuously evolving case law and policies, to proficiency of field skills such as arrest control, emergency vehicle driving, firearms and self-defense, at a minimum.

Training is not complete upon graduation from police academies, as commonly and mistakenly believed, as that coursework is only fundamental. The training of new officers is continued through a POST certified field training program of approximately 400 to 600 hours. New officers are required to demonstrate and apply knowledge and skills to a minimum satisfactory level. Additional, remedial training may be required if an officer fails to demonstrate minimum proficiency of knowledge and skills.

In addition, the POST Commission then mandates annual, continued and multiple professional certifications and training. These in-service trainings focus on new and emerging case laws, statutes, policies and perishable skills such as driving, firearms and self-defense proficiency.

There are few, if any, other professions where practitioners are required to master so many different and varied subjects. Officers are expected to not only to actively maintain this ever-evolving knowledge and skills base but to competently and safely execute its application during interactions with the public, all while constantly maintaining a situational awareness and hyper vigilance for their safety and the public.

Agency training managers are tasked with management of rotating all agency staff through state mandated training with the staffing and logistical challenges of budgets, inadequate staffing levels, maintaining adequate staffing levels for services while staff are out of service for training, leaves of absence, sick leaves, vacations and other unforeseen circumstances. Noncompliance of state mandated training may cause adverse actions for an agency.

Calls for additional training are unaware of or ignore this reality.

Public Misunderstanding of Law Enforcement Interaction, Mindset, Training and Authority

There is a stark, dangerous disconnect and fundamental misunderstanding of law enforcement interactions, especially among portions of the population with particular social or political ideologies. This has led to unfortunate outcomes and erroneous assumptions of facts and circumstances, such as claims of excessive force when that is not the case, formed without any professional training or experience, from anti-law enforcement advocates, groups or individuals.

In California, a citizen has a legal duty to comply with the lawful orders, signals and directions of peace officers.

This is not subject to debate, argument, justification, negotiation, objection, pleading, protestation, reasoning or resistance. The only acceptable and safe response is compliance.

[California Penal Code § 148](#)¹⁶ states it is a crime to willfully resist, delay or obstruct peace officers.

[California Penal Code § 843a](#)¹⁷ states if a person has knowledge, or by the exercise of reasonable care, should have knowledge, that they are being arrested by a peace officer, it is the duty of such person to refrain from using force or any weapon to resist such arrest. This defines the boundaries of a citizen's duty when under arrest.

¹⁶ California Penal Code. "PART 1. OF CRIMES AND PUNISHMENTS [25 - 680.4] (Part 1 enacted 1872.) TITLE 7. OF CRIMES AGAINST PUBLIC JUSTICE [92 - 186.36] (Title 7 enacted 1872.) CHAPTER 7. Other Offenses Against Public Justice [142 - 181] (Chapter 7 enacted 1872.)." California State Legislature.

https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=148.

¹⁷ California Penal Code. "PART 2. OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE [681 - 1620] (Part 2 enacted 1872.) TITLE 3. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS REGARDING CRIMINAL PROCEDURE [777 - 883] (Heading of Title 3 amended by Stats. 1951, Ch. 1674.) CHAPTER 5. Arrest, by Whom and How Made [833 - 851.93] (Chapter 5 enacted 1872.)." California State Legislature.

https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=834a.

[California Vehicle Code § 2800](#)¹⁸ states it is a crime to fail or refuse to comply with a peace officer's orders or directions given. This, for example, may include things like pulling over when signaled or complying with instructions to leave a vehicle.

This is not the appropriate time to object, make a case or even resist and not comply with commands from peace officers. The appropriate time to do so is (1) after an officer has secured the scene to render it safe and/or (2) in a court of law in front of a judge or jury. To do so at a scene jeopardizes the safety of the officer(s), the citizen and community.

From an officer's perspective, peace officers are trained that officer safety is a paramount and overriding concern above all else and that it is essential to secure and control scenes to minimize risk and ensure safety of all involved. Only after a scene is secured, not during, can the "business" of the contact be conducted. It is expected most people encountered would obey and comply. However, while peace officers are trained to constantly evaluate and adapt to developing situations, when a person (who lacks knowledge of and misunderstands law enforcement practices and mistakenly believes resistance is justified) is uncooperative, obstructive, combative, violent or resistive, the noncompliant person, not the officer, escalates the situation and endangers the safety of themselves, bystanders or the community and officers.

[California Penal Code § 835a](#)¹⁹ and [POST Use of Force Guidelines](#)²⁰ defines the authority to use force and states that a peace officer shall not be considered the aggressor or lose their right to self-defense when using objectively reasonable force to make an arrest, prevent escape or overcome resistance. This means that if a peace officer is actively engaged in making an arrest and the subject resists, the officer is not required to retreat and can use necessary, not equal, force to complete the arrest.

Use of Force and Mental Health Calls for Service

The mainstream entrance and acceptance of mental health conversations in society prompted law enforcement to evaluate incidents and related policies of mental health

¹⁸ California Vehicle Code. "DIVISION 2. ADMINISTRATION [1500 - 3093] (Division 2 enacted by Stats. 1959, Ch. 3.) CHAPTER 4. Administration and Enforcement [2800 - 2818] (Chapter 4 enacted by Stats. 1959, Ch. 3.) ARTICLE 1. Lawful Orders and Inspections." California State Legislature, 1959.

https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=VEH§ionNum=2800

¹⁹ California Penal Code. "PART 2. OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE [681 - 1620] (Part 2 enacted 1872.) TITLE 3. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS REGARDING CRIMINAL PROCEDURE [777 - 883] (Heading of Title 3 amended by Stats. 1951, Ch. 1674.) CHAPTER 5. Arrest, by Whom and How Made [833 - 851.93] (Chapter 5 enacted 1872.)" California State Legislature.

https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=835a.&lawCode=PEN

²⁰ California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). "POST Use of Force Standards and Guidelines." POST, November 22, 2021.

https://post.ca.gov/Portals/0/post_docs/publications/Use_Of_Force_Standards_Guidelines.pdf

encounters with unfortunate, deadly, tragic outcomes. Policies were revised and additional, specialized mental health training of officers was implemented, however, within the challenges and realities described in [Law Enforcement Training](#).

Prior to mental health awareness in the mainstream consciousness, when officers encountered a person in mental health crisis who behaved erratically, was irrational, uncooperative, non-compliant or refused to obey commands, regardless of the person's mental state, from the officers' perspective, experience and training, that person was viewed as a threat and a danger to officers and others. A situation was drastically exacerbated if a mentally ill person had a weapon and the likelihood of a tragic outcome was exponentially increased.

In the fractions of seconds officers have to evaluate a situation and threat, and in the fractions of seconds officers have to make a decision and react, and based upon training, it was not practical, realistic nor safe to pause and examine the cause of a person's behavior until an imminent or immediate threat was eliminated. There may have been some officers with the wherewithal to realize a person or situation was atypical or abnormal beyond a typically uncooperative or resistive person without mental illness. However, this was the exception until mainstream acceptance and conversations of mental illness prompted awareness and additional training of officers.

Any tragic outcomes are never desired. Although training increased officer awareness of mental health issues and may have decreased instances of unfortunate outcomes, regardless of a person's state, safety is paramount and threats must be eliminated to keep officers and the community safe.

In addition, the mental health of officers must be acknowledged and addressed. An officer who encounters a dangerous, violent criminal and is forced to justifiably eliminate the threat, although the loss of any life is tragic, reacts differently and fares better than an officer who is forced to eliminate a threat from a mentally ill person. The officer may suffer from depression, grief, PTSD, trauma and other debilitating issues.

Public Duty Doctrine

The Public Duty Doctrine is a legal principle that generally states the responsibility of government is to the public as a whole and not individuals.

This is a complicated and nuanced issue that will not be extensively analyzed but is noted for its relevance to this issue.

The public duty doctrine distinguishes between a general duty owed to the public and a specific duty owed to an individual. Government officials, like police officers, have a

general duty to enforce the law and protect the public but this doesn't automatically translate to a duty to protect each individual from harm.

One common exception is the "special relationship" exception, which applies when a specific relationship exists between a government official and an injured person, giving rise to a duty of care. For example, if a police officer makes an arrest, a special relationship is created, and the officer has a duty to ensure the arrestee's safety. Once this special relationship is formed, the official and the government may owe a specific duty of care to that individual, and a breach of this duty resulting in harm could lead to liability.

The public incorrectly believes law enforcement has a duty to act when it has no such obligation. The central tenet of the public duty doctrine is that government agencies, like police departments or municipalities responsible for sidewalk maintenance, primarily serve and owe a duty to the general public. For instance, a police officer's duty to enforce laws and protect citizens is considered a duty to the community at large, not to any particular person.

An example may be a failure to respond to a 911 call. If police fail to respond to a 911 call and someone is subsequently harmed, the public duty doctrine might shield the police from liability if no special relationship existed.

The public duty doctrine is a legal tool that balances the need to protect public resources and prevent excessive liability for government entities with the need to provide some recourse for individuals harmed by government action or inaction.

Calls for Service

The constitutional duties of a sheriff's office, in precedence, are (1) correctional or custodial services, (2) court security, (3) coroner duties, in some instances, and then (4) patrol services and only if appropriate. Patrol services are not required.

911 calls are routed to city, county or regional [Public Safety Answering Points](#) (PSAPs) which are federally and state designated and governed telecommunications centers. This was established by the [Warren-911-Emergency Assistance Act](#) in [Government Codes §§ 53100 – 53121](#).

Calls for service in the County of Sacramento are prioritized on a descending order from 1 (highest priority of in progress, urgent, life-threatening emergencies) to 4 (routine, non-urgent, non-emergencies).

911 call takers and dispatchers are certified and highly trained by [POST standards](#)²¹ to triage, evaluate and manage calls with specific questions to rapidly obtain relevant and necessary information to ensure the safety of responding officers, the community and everyone involved.

There are typically more calls for service in Sacramento County than there are available officers. This has contributed to longer response times, responses only to high priority calls as lower priority, and perhaps more important, quality of life calls are not addressed, decreased satisfaction and a decreased quality of service for the public; and for officers, decreased productivity, decreased safety and increased illness, burnout, leaves, stress, trauma, turnover, workload and even suicides. This is a perpetual, dangerous and unsustainable cycle.

Patrol Services and Staffing

Adequate staffing has been a constant challenge for public safety agencies. According to a [US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics "Local Police Departments Personnel, 2020" bulletin](#)²², law enforcement agencies serving 1 million or more residents had 3 officers per 1,000 residents on average.

According to the [FBI](#),²³ for comparison, and this is not "apples to apples", in 2016, the Sacramento Police Department had a ratio of 1.32 officers per 1,000 residents. The police department has had the lowest number of sworn officers per capita among police departments protecting cities with similar populations.

In 2022, municipalities nationwide reported 1.09 officers per 1,000 residents. The nationwide average is approximately 2.4 officers per 1,000 residents.

The [Rule of 60](#) is a workload based staffing model and expands the typical population based staffing model for law enforcement. The activity and performance guided Rule of 60 suggests a fully staffed police department should have at least 60 officers per 100,000 residents. However, law enforcement agencies nationwide are alarmingly and drastically understaffed well below any comfortable metric or ratio.

²¹ California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). "Public Safety Dispatchers' Basic Course." POST. <https://post.ca.gov/public-safety-dispatchers-basic-course>

²² US Department of Justice. "Local Police Departments Personnel, 2020." Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, November 2022. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/lpdp20.pdf>

²³ Federal Bureau of Investigation. "Ratio of Law Enforcement Employees to Population and Police Employee Data." Criminal Justice Information Services Division. <https://cde.ucr.cjis.gov/LATEST/webapp/#/pages/le/pe> and <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2019/crime-in-the-u.s.-2019/topic-pages/police-employee-data>

The Rule of 60 is a guideline developed by the [International City/County Management Association \(ICMA\) Center for Public Safety Management \(CPSM\)](#) to help determine appropriate police staffing levels. [It's based on research that analyzed call data from 62 police departments.](#)²⁴ The study found that relying solely on traditional methods like crime rates or population size for staffing decisions was often inaccurate.

The Rule of 60 in police staffing suggests that no more than 60% of a patrol officer's time should be dedicated to responding to calls for service. This allows for time spent on proactive policing, community engagement and being available for emergencies. It also implies that calls for service, excluding priority one emergencies, should be handled within 60 minutes on average.

The Rule of 60 is the subject of a white paper by the US Department of Justice, [Office of Community Oriented Policing Services \(COPS Office\)](#), "[A Performance-Based Approach to Police Staffing and Allocation](#)", published in 2012, revised 2014.²⁵

Locally and recently, it was cited by the Manteca Ripon Bulletin, "[THE RULE OF 60 VS. ONE OFFICER PER 1,000 PEOPLE - Community being asked to weigh in on Manteca Police Department staffing during July 23 forum](#)", as the City of Manteca examines police staffing.

According to this referenced Sacramento Bee article, the staffing of sheriff's office patrol services has been extremely inadequate due to budget constraints (and other issues). [Sacramento County has 194 fewer deputies than 20 years ago.](#)²⁶ Sacramento County's minimum standard is approximately 1.93 to 2.09 officers per 1,000 residents. However, the current ratio is approximately 1.66 officers per 1,000 residents. According to some analysis, an ideal staffing ratio would be approximately 4.66 officers per 1,000 residents for Sacramento County.

There are typically more calls for service in Sacramento County than there are available officers. This has contributed to longer response times, responses only to high priority calls as lower priority, and perhaps more important, quality of life calls are not addressed, decreased satisfaction and a decreased quality of service for the public; and for officers, decreased productivity, decreased safety and increased

²⁴ ICMA Center for Public Safety Management. "An analysis of police department staffing: How many officers do you really need?" Professor James McCabe, Ph.D., Senior Associate, ICMA CPSM. https://icma.org/sites/default/files/305747_Analysis%20of%20Police%20Department%20Staffing%20-%20McCabe.pdf

²⁵ US Department of Justice. "A Performance-Based Approach to Police Staffing and Allocation." Jeremy M. Wilson, Ph.D., Alexander Weiss, Ph.D., Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2012, r. 2014. <https://portal.cops.usdoj.gov/resourcecenter/content.ashx/cops-p247-pub.pdf>

²⁶ Police 1. "With 194 fewer deputies than 20 years ago, Calif. sheriff prioritizes 911 response in new budget." Police 1, June 9, 2025. <https://www.police1.com/chiefs-sheriffs/with-194-fewer-deputies-than-20-years-ago-calif-sheriff-prioritizes-911-response-in-new-budget>

illness, burnout, leaves, stress, trauma, turnover, workload and even suicides. This is a perpetual, dangerous and unsustainable cycle.

Interoperability of 911 and 988

Interoperability refers to the standards, protocols, technologies and mechanisms that allow data to flow between diverse systems with minimal human intervention. It allows diverse systems to talk to each other and share information in real time.

Time is critical in a mental health crisis and the ability of two independent systems and processes to communicate is essential. The fastest routing of a call from 911 to 988 and to other services or providers such as CWRT is vital for the well-being of those who need help.

[AB 988 – The Miles Hall Lifeline Act](#)²⁷ mandated interoperability of 911 and 988 no later than **July 1, 2024**.

AB 988 and [Government Code § 53123.1](#) et al. established benchmarks for technical requirements and deadlines for 911 and 988 interoperability.

In **April 2023**, the [Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration](#) (SAMHSA) and OES presented “[Cal OES and 988 Overview](#)” to the [Forensic Mental Health Association of California](#).

On **March 19, 2024**, the [911 / 988 Interface Working Group for the 988 Technical Advisory Board](#) created policy and procedures for [911 / 988 Transfer and Handling Criteria](#).

By **June 30, 2024**, the CA Health and Human Services Agency and the CA Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES or OES) were required to develop a plan for the statewide coordination of 911, 988 and behavioral health crisis services. The plan will be based on a five-year implementation plan that includes a landscape analysis of existing services and describes how to expand, improve and link services with the goal of fully implementing the 988 system by **January 1, 2030**.

It is commendable and fortunate that Sacramento County has already accomplished this ahead of schedule. 911 and 988 interoperability was implemented and operational in **2025**. This allows direct transfer of calls from 911 to 988. Prior to this, callers were referred to 988 and the call disconnected. This was obviously problematic as there

²⁷ California State Assembly. “Mental health: 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline.” California State Legislature, September 29, 2022. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB988

was no ability to know if the caller connected with 988 and received the required assistance and mental health resources.

CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS

These conclusions are based upon available documents and information, cited sources, discussions with noted agencies, organizations and individuals, media and other communication. Analysis and reference of applicable issues and topics is not intended to be comprehensive. Information is objectively presented for its relevance.

The National Library of Medicine published "[Consensus Statement of the National Association of EMS Physicians International Association of Fire Chiefs and the International Association of Chiefs of Police: Best Practices for Collaboration Between Law Enforcement and Emergency Medical Services During Acute Behavioral Emergencies](#)".²⁸

Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and law enforcement (LE) frequently work as a team in encounters with individuals experiencing acute behavioral emergencies manifesting with severe agitation and aggression. Optimal management is a rehearsed, coordinated effort by LE and EMS providing the necessary interventions to address behaviors that endanger the patient, the responders and the public.

The [National Association of EMS Physicians](#) (NAEMSP®), the [International Association of Fire Chiefs](#) (IAFC) and the [International Association of Chiefs of Police](#) (IACP) brought together a group of representatives in early 2023 to discuss this issue and to draft consensus statements on best practices for the collaboration of LE, EMS and Fire to preserve the safety of all people.

It is the observation and opinion of this Committee, the Commission and other public officials, based upon available information, that

- (1) the public announcement of the sheriff's policy change to cease responding to non-criminal mental health calls for service and its implementation was poorly executed from a public relations perspective or any other reasonable standard of a professional organization,
- (2) it did not foster any trust or goodwill and only increased public dissatisfaction, frustration and mistrust of the sheriff's office,
- (3) internal and external outreach and engagement, if any at all, was minimal or nonexistent,
- (4) there was significant negative response from many affected agencies, communities, officials, stakeholders, etc.,

²⁸ Levy, M. K., Tan, D. K., McArdle, D. Q., McEvoy, M., Kupas, D. F., Beltran, G., & Miller, D. L. (2024). "Consensus Statement of the National Association of EMS Physicians International Association of Fire Chiefs and the International Association of Chiefs of Police: Best Practices for Collaboration Between Law Enforcement and Emergency Medical Services During Acute Behavioral Emergencies." *Prehospital Emergency Care*, 28(8), 1058–1062.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10903127.2024.2402530#abstract>

- (5) there was sufficient cause for concern to examine this issue and establish this Committee and
- (6) although the Sheriff's constitutional authority is recognized that
- (7) any future policy changes with such far and wide-reaching implications for the County should be subject to and developed within an open outreach and engagement process to foster trust and goodwill.

Sheriff's Policies

Scott v Smith and [AB 392](#)²⁹ were cited as a mitigating factors by the sheriff's office. AB 392 changed the standard for when law enforcement officers can use deadly force from "reasonable" to "necessary". In consideration of the Scott v Smith ruling, other relevant case law and the current political and social climate, it is unlikely the sheriff's office will change their policy. However, the sheriff's office has stated an openness to discuss specific and limited modifications to their policy as it relates to support of other first responders.

It has become apparent that an increasing number of law enforcement agencies are trending towards this direction not only in California but nationwide. Other public and private agencies, providers and services will be required to expand and increase and their resources and staffing to fill the void.

SB 43

The anticipation among local law enforcement agencies was that SB 43 would not significantly change or increase WI 5150 holds. Preliminary data from Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services has supported this.

Based upon discussions with BHS and public safety agencies, it was generally believed that the SB 43 expansion of the definition of "gravely disabled" to include substance abuse would not dramatically alter or impact current operations or resources. The criteria was expanded to include individuals with a mental health disorder, severe substance use disorders (SUD), or co-occurring disorders, who are unable to provide for their basic needs (food, clothing, shelter, safety or medical care). Most incidents of mental health crises include substance abuse as a co-occurring issue with few cases of substance abuse presented alone.

In addition, concerns about additional training of law enforcement officers regarding SB 43 were not supported.

²⁹ California State Assembly. "AB 392 California Act to Save Lives." California State Legislature, August 19, 2019. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB392

Data

The data and statistics presented to the Commission, while valuable, have been incomplete. It has demonstrated and validated a related and glaring, problematic issue about data collection, monitoring, sharing and evaluation.

Inquiries about data are often answered with statements that it is unknown or the information is held by other agencies, organizations or entities.

Data on mental health calls for service, and their subsequent resolution, appears to be compartmentalized in silos and scattered across numerous agencies, departments, offices and (contracted private) organizations that are difficult or nearly impossible to access. If, by chance, all data is available and collected, it is fragmented and without a clear and unifying scope, metrics or goal, it is difficult to obtain comprehensive “big picture” views.

There is not a central place where comprehensive data about this topic from point A to point Z is accessible and retained. There is no accountability or efficiency. This is not acceptable. As policy makers with fiduciary responsibilities, without comprehensive data, it is difficult to make informed policy decisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations have been developed after analysis of all available information, applicable statutes and case law, relevant factors and consideration of the totality of the circumstances.

1. Recommendation 1 – Internal Engagement

A best practices collaborative approach and partnerships are ideal and supported by the Committee (and Commission).

The public announcement of the sheriff's policy change and its implementation was poorly executed from a public relations perspective or any other reasonable standard of a professional organization. It did not foster any trust or goodwill and only increased public dissatisfaction, frustration and mistrust of the sheriff's office.

- A. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office commit to a genuine and meaningful outreach and engagement process prior to any future policy changes with such potential wide-reaching impacts or implications for Sacramento County.
 - a. This process should be initiated immediately, or as soon as practical thereafter, of any internal discussion of such a potential policy change.
 - b. Outreach should include the Board of Supervisors, county executive leadership, the district attorney, public defender, chief probation officer, appropriate county departments and other public agencies, as appropriate, potentially affected by such proposed policy changes.

2. Recommendation 2 – External Engagement

The public trust is essential to maintain communication, foster goodwill and develop solutions with community involvement that are supported and ideal for our county.

The public announcement of the sheriff's policy change and its implementation was poorly executed from a public relations perspective or any other reasonable standard of a professional organization. It did not foster any trust or goodwill and only increased public dissatisfaction, frustration and mistrust of the sheriff's office.

- A. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office commit to a genuine and meaningful community outreach and public engagement process prior to any implemented future policy changes with such potential wide-reaching impacts or implications for Sacramento County.

- a. A community outreach and engagement process should be genuine and in good faith without reservations or a pre-determined intent or course of action.
- b. A community outreach and engagement process should include all potentially affected agencies, entities, known advocacy groups, subject matter experts, individuals or organizations, including but not limited to the SCRC, other first responders or public safety agencies, behavioral health agencies or providers and any other appropriate agencies, individuals or organizations.
- c. A community outreach and engagement process could include, as appropriate, community town halls, focus groups, polling, presentations to those affected, social media engagement, surveys, traditional broadcast media and any other form of appropriate communication.

3. Recommendation 3 – Modify Policy 408

The Committee (or Commission), after analysis of all available information, applicable statutes, case law, relevant factors and consideration of the totality of the circumstances, believe a balanced response is ideal. This would simultaneously alleviate the sheriff's office concerns that caused this policy change and address the created gap of service. This would permit non-law enforcement response that would otherwise be unsafe or impossible and allow those who critically need assistance to receive the help of which they may otherwise be deprived.

- A. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office modify their policy to close the current gap in service (threatened self-harm with a weapon), which inhibits other non-law enforcement response from FD/EMS/CWRT, and respond to non-criminal mental health calls that involve a weapon. Ideally, this modification would entail a co-response with behavioral health personnel, as officers observe in a protective/safety role, with behavioral health staff taking a lead position in interacting with the individual in a mental health crisis.
- B. The Committee (or Commission) recommends modification of the policy, and any others related to mental health response, to address the safety and concerns of other first responders (fire and EMS), county behavioral health staff, CWRT and the community to permit response in instances of dangerous or violent persons, weapons or any other circumstance or event, even without an associated criminal element, that may endanger the safety of fire, EMS or CWRT personnel.

4. Recommendation 4 – BHS, CCIT and CWRT

A proactive approach may actually and likely reduce mental health calls for service and mitigate concerns of the sheriff's office by finding permanent, sustainable and thoughtful solutions for individuals, by addressing causes and not just symptoms of their underlying issues, in crisis. While a mental health crisis may not necessarily be criminal in nature, its related issues are linked to public safety. An investment here may resolve interconnected issues such as homelessness and associated crime to release limited sheriff's resources for priorities.

- A. The Committee (or Commission) recommends increased resources for the CCIT program. It has proven to be a valuable asset and effective at proactively and successfully mitigating and decreasing mental health calls for service, as noted in the prior ad hoc committee's [report](#).
- B. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office reinstate and increase the CCIT program so that it may (1) operate 24/7 and effectively during hours when it would be most needed, not just typical business hours, to (2) proactively address the needs of "frequent flyers" with low-level criminal offenses and (3) be used in scenarios where a criminal act has occurred or is likely to occur where an individual involved is experiencing a mental health crisis.
- C. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office, perhaps in partnership with BHS, promote public awareness of the CWRT program for those in a behavioral health crisis to call 988 instead of 911, when appropriate, to reduce the possibility of a law enforcement response and release sheriff's office resources.

5. Recommendation 5 – Data Reports to Commission

The Committee (or Commission) requests this data to evaluate the concerns by the Board of Supervisors, other first responder agencies, behavioral health agencies and providers and the community, to review, analyze and monitor the implementation of the policy change, to indicate if the Commission's recommendations have been implemented, to identify any potentially unknown gaps, inherent and emerging issues to resolve them before it becomes a problem or crisis and areas for improvement.

A. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office provide the Commission with data related to this policy change on a quarterly basis for 2 years from the date of this policy change. The data should include, but not be limited to,

- how many mental health calls received,
- how many calls received of a mental health element only,
- how many calls received of a mental health element with a criminal element,
- how many calls received a response,
- how many calls received no response,
- dispositions of calls,
- how many calls transferred to 988 or other similar entity,
- instances of self-inflicted injuries or death due to no response to a call,
- instances of injuries or death of first responders or behavioral health clinicians, peer support staff and others,
- and any other data or information that emerges as appropriate or relevant.

6. Recommendation 6 – Working Group, Data Collection and Analysis

Cooperative partnerships and “big picture” data is essential to make informed policy decisions to address issues, efficiently allocate budgets and resources and identify areas for improvement. Its purpose, as is best practice, is to ensure continued communication and coordination, for the aforementioned and subsequently stated reasons, and to assure a consistent awareness and application of policy and service and resolution of issues.

A. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office, establish, or repurpose an existing, working group to include fire and EMS agencies, public and private behavioral health agencies and providers and other affected entities, to analyze and address the effects of this policy change to establish consistency and improve overall response.

- B. The group should identify and analyze established or existing structures or systems in other jurisdictions to adopt, emulate and implement practices, policies and systems from successful models.³⁰
- C. The group should be comprised of representatives from every affected agency, department, entity, office or organization including the county executive's office, sheriff's office, Behavioral Health Services, the new Behavioral Health Commission and/or their appropriate subcommittees (e.g., ADAB Criminal Justice Committee, CWRT, etc.), CWRT, 988, WellSpace and any others as appropriate.
- D. The group membership should consist of those with the authority to make decisions, policy and publicly speak for their organization.
- E. The group should meet regularly to maintain dialogue and cooperation for inherent and emerging issues to resolve them before it becomes a problem or crisis.
- F. The group should prioritize, as one of its primary objectives, a central database for system wide data collection and analysis across all agencies, public or private, entities, providers and systems. Information and data that is compartmentalized in silos is difficult to access and impossible to construct a complete picture. This masks indicators of issues for organizational direction and prevents improvement. An accurate, comprehensive database is crucial for success. As public officials with fiduciary duty of public funds and public trust, it is incumbent, regardless of (reasonable) cost or technical challenges to ensure accountability and efficiency across systems.

7. Recommendation 7 – Engagement with Commission

The sheriff's office is encouraged to use the Commission as a resource, as it is intended and established by statute and the Board of Supervisors – a public forum to build trust, connect and engage with the community.

- A. The Committee (or Commission) recommends the sheriff's office engage with the Commission prior to any future changes of policy and procedures with such potential wide-reaching impacts or implications for Sacramento County.

³⁰ Police 1. "8 things to know before establishing a mobile crisis intervention co-responder program." Chief of Police Joel F. Shults, Ed.D., September 22, 2020. <https://www.police1.com/crisis-intervention-training/articles/8-things-to-know-before-establishing-a-mobile-crisis-intervention-co-responder-program-XfhVK3liwUCUac6D/>

THE COMMITTEE

Respectfully Recommended by,

Committee Chair, Commissioner Ted Wolter, District 3,
Commissioner and Commission Chair Paul Curtis, District 1,
Commissioner Sam Somers, District 4,
Commissioner William Cho, District 3,
Ad Hoc Committee for Sheriff's Policy and Legislation

APPENDIX AND ATTACHMENTS

Media

There has been extensive media coverage of this issue. As mental health awareness has become mainstream this topic has been in the national and international consciousness and discussion for some time. A Google search of this topic produces a myriad of articles and information about (non) law enforcement response to mental health crises. In addition to traditional broadcast and print media, social media conversations have been prevalent, as well. The media referenced here is directly related or relevant to Sacramento County.

1. On **September 22, 2020**, **Police 1** published "[8 things to know before establishing a mobile crisis intervention co-responder program](#)".
2. On **May 31, 2023**, **Police 1** published "[U.K. police department to stop responding to emergency mental health calls soon](#)". The metropolitan police chief stated the change is necessary because it is taking officers away from their core responsibilities of fighting crimes.
3. On **May 31, 2023**, **Police 1** published "[Should U.S. police follow the example of London's Metropolitan Police and stop responding to mental health crisis calls?](#)". London's police commissioner announced plans to stop police response to mental health emergencies unless there's a direct life threat. There is reference to this issue in the United States and law enforcement response to mental health calls in the State of Oregon³¹ and cities nationwide.
4. On **August 27, 2023**, the **Associated Press (AP)** published "[Many big US cities now answer mental health crisis calls with civilian teams – not police](#)". Mental health crisis response is explored and data is analyzed in many cities across the nation. As of 2023, 14 of the 20 most populous US cities are hosting or starting such programs, sometimes called civilian, alternative or non-police response teams.
5. On **January, 29, 2025**, **CBS 13** published "[Sacramento Metro Fire district says sheriff's office's new policy change creates danger for crews](#)".
6. On **February 4, 2025**, the **Sacramento Sheriff's Office** conducted a [press conference](#) to announce their change of policy to no longer respond to mental health calls without a criminal element.

³¹ Vera. "We Need to Think Beyond Police in Mental Health Crises." Nicholas Turner, April 6, 2022. <https://www.vera.org/news/we-need-to-think-beyond-police-in-mental-health-crises>

7. On **February 4, 2025**, the **CBS 13** published "[Sacramento sheriff addresses new response policy](#)".
8. On **February 4, 2025**, **CBS 13** published "[Sacramento sheriff explains new policy to turn away certain calls for help](#)".
9. On **February 4, 2025**, **FOX 40** published "[Sacramento County Sheriff's Office to no longer respond to non-criminal mental health calls](#)".
10. On **February 5, 2025**, **CBS 13** published "[Families fear new Sacramento sheriff's office policy on non-criminal mental health calls](#)".
11. On **February 5, 2025**, the **Sacramento Bee** published "[Sacramento sheriff no longer responds to some mental health calls. Community members concerned](#)".
12. On **February 5, 2025**, the **Sacramento County Sheriff's Office** published their first podcast [The Sacramento County Sheriff's Podcast](#), Episode 1, "[The Hard Truth on Mental Health with Sheriff Jim Cooper](#)". Sheriff Cooper discussed the latest policy changes and what they mean for the agency and the community.
13. On **February 6, 2025**, **Police 1** published "[Calif. sheriff's office ends response to non-criminal mental health calls after qualified immunity ruling](#)".
14. On **February 10, 2025**, the **Sacramento Bee** published "[New Sacramento Sheriff policy will change how others respond to emergency mental health calls](#)".
15. On **February 20, 2025**, **CBS 13** published "[Crisis response questions remain after Sacramento sheriff's new policy on mental health calls](#)". Dr. Jonathan Porteus, CEO of [WellSpace Health](#), presented issues with the sheriff's policy change and highlighted 988 and the county's [Community Wellness Response Team](#) (CWRT).
16. On **February 20, 2025**, the **Del Norte Triplicate** published "[Del Norte Sheriff responds to Appeals Court Decision on Non-Criminal Mental Health Calls](#)".
17. On **March 6, 2025**, **Jefferson Public Radio** published "[Ninth Circuit ruling is reshaping police responses to mental health crises](#)".
18. On **March 7, 2025**, the **Del Norte Triplicate** published "['The Courts Have Handcuffed Us' Del Norte Sheriff Claims](#)". Crescent City Police Chief Richard Griffin mirrored the Sheriff's position and added, "The Crescent City Police

Department (in Del Norte County) has implemented a policy of non-response for non-criminal issues with no threat to public safety.”

19. On **March 25, 2025**, **Capitol Public Radio's Insight** program published [“Homelessness, mental health, politics: Sacramento County Sheriff weighs in on priority issues”](#) and interviewed Sheriff Cooper who spoke about this policy change, among other issues.

20. On **March 26, 2025**, **Police 1** published [“Analysis: Sheriff shifts approach to mental health calls after federal court ruling”](#).

21. On **April 15, 2025**, **CBS 13** published [“Civilian advisory committee gives update on Sacramento sheriff's new policy on certain 911 calls”](#). Commission Chair Curtis was interviewed.

22. On **April 28, 2025**, **CalMatters** published, [“They called for urgent help with a mentally ill loved one. Why California police refused”](#).

23. On **May 16, 2025**, **CalMatters** published [“Listen: What happens when California cops refuse to respond to mental health calls?”](#).

24. On **May 16, 2025**, the **Sacramento Bee** published [“Sacramento Mental Health Board urges county to improve handling of crisis calls”](#).

25. On **March 26, 2025**, **Telehealth and Telecare Aware** published [“Perspectives: As police step back from mental health calls, telepsychiatry steps forward”](#). The article noted that the Austin (Texas) Police Department has also enacted a similar change of policy³².

26. On **May 27, 2025**, **CBS 13** published [“Sacramento County Sheriff's Office faces more questions on mental health policy”](#). Commission Chair Curtis was interviewed.

27. On **July 15, 2025**, **CBS 13** published, [“Sacramento sheriff's office mental health response policy under fire after tragedy – A Sacramento County Sheriff's Office policy not to respond to mental health calls is under fire after a crisis lifeline call ended in tragedy”](#). Commission Chair Curtis was interviewed.

³² Fox 7 Austin. “Should Austin police officers respond to mental health crisis calls?” Meredith Aldis, January 20, 2025. <https://www.fox7austin.com/news/should-austin-police-officers-respond-mental-health-crisis-calls>

Sheriff's Policies

1. [Sacramento Sheriff's Office Policy Manual, Policy 327 – Outside Agency Assistance, page 229](#)

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/q0qinzwfvvxg3dbwgjyra/h?dl=0&e=2&preview=Sacramento+County+Sheriff%27s+Office+Policy+Manual+as+of+062525.pdf&rlkey=zbl15ft2zr99raw6j6bf4ypik#:~:text=228-,Policy,229,-Sacramento%20Sheriff%27s%20Office>

2. [Sacramento Sheriff's Office Policy Manual, Policy 408 – Crisis Intervention Incidents, pages 330 - 333](#)

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/q0qinzwfvvxg3dbwgjyra/h?dl=0&e=2&preview=Sacramento+County+Sheriff%27s+Office+Policy+Manual+as+of+062525.pdf&rlkey=zbl15ft2zr99raw6j6bf4ypik#:~:text=328-,Policy,333,-Policy>

3. [Sacramento Sheriff's Office Policy Manual, Policy 409 – Mental Illness Commitments, pages 334 - 338](#)

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/q0qinzwfvvxg3dbwgjyra/h?dl=0&e=2&preview=Sacramento+County+Sheriff%27s+Office+Policy+Manual+as+of+062525.pdf&rlkey=zbl15ft2zr99raw6j6bf4ypik#:~:text=409,338>

Letter of Sacramento Metro Fire Chief House to Sheriff Cooper

Attached

Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services Crisis Wellness Response Team Crisis Matrix

<https://dhs.saccounty.gov/BHS/SiteAssets/Pages/CWRT/Community-Wellness-Response-Team/BHS%20Resources%20for%20LEA%20-%20Mobile%20PDF%20rev.%202-26-25.pdf>

Outside Agency Assistance

327.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance to members when requesting or responding to a request for mutual aid or when assisting another law enforcement agency.

327.2 POLICY

It is the policy of the Sacramento Sheriff's Office to promptly respond to requests for assistance by other law enforcement agencies, subject to available resources and consistent with the applicable laws and policies of this Sheriff's Office.

327.3 ASSISTING OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Generally, requests for any type of assistance from another agency should be routed to the Watch Commander or designee for approval. In some instances, a memorandum of understanding or other established protocol may exist that eliminates the need for approval of individual requests.

When another law enforcement agency requests assistance from this Sheriff's Office, the Watch Commander or designee may authorize, if available, an appropriate number of deputies to assist. Deputies are reminded that their actions when rendering assistance must conform with applicable laws and be consistent with the policies of this Sheriff's Office.

Deputies may respond to a request for emergency assistance, however, they shall notify a supervisor of their activity as soon as practicable.

Arrestees may be temporarily detained by this Sheriff's Office until arrangements for transportation are made by the outside agency. Only in exceptional circumstances, and subject to supervisor approval, will this Sheriff's Office provide transportation of arrestees to other facilities on behalf of another agency.

In the event of a request for assistance from another agency involving a mental health crisis, refer to the Crisis Intervention Incidents policy for guidance.

327.3.1 INITIATED ACTIVITY

Any on-duty deputy who engages in law enforcement activities of any type that are not part of a mutual aid request and take place outside the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Sheriff's Office, to include an arrest made after a hot or fresh pursuit initiated inside the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Sheriff's Office, shall notify their supervisor or the Watch Commander and the Communications Center as soon as practicable. This requirement does not apply to specialized or multi-agency units that regularly work in multiple jurisdictions.

327.4 REQUESTING OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE

If assistance is needed from another agency, the deputy requesting assistance should, if practicable, first notify a supervisor. The handling deputy or supervisor should direct assisting personnel to where they are needed and to whom they should report when they arrive.

Sacramento Sheriff's Office

Policy Manual

Outside Agency Assistance

The requesting deputy should arrange for appropriate radio communication capabilities, if necessary and available, so that communication can be coordinated between assisting personnel.

327.5 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Incidents of outside assistance or law enforcement activities that are not documented in a crime report may be documented in an informational report or as directed by a supervisor.

327.6 MILITARY FACILITIES

Jurisdiction for offenses occurring on military facilities is affected by the location of the offense and by the status of the violator.

- (a) Military facilities can be comprised of three distinct jurisdictional properties: exclusive, partial, and proprietarily.
 - 1. If the offense occurs on federal land that is either exclusive or partial, the federal government (military police, military investigation agency, or Federal Bureau of Investigation) has sole authority to investigate the crime.
 - 2. If an offense occurs within proprietorial jurisdiction, local civilian law enforcement agencies or the federal government may investigate or both.
- (b) Federal police agencies have the authority to investigate and arrest violators who are military members regardless of the location of the incident. The Sheriff's Office will cooperate with federal authorities on a case-by-case basis to determine which party has the greater interest in the investigation.

Crisis Intervention Incidents

408.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This policy provides guidelines for interacting with those who may be experiencing a mental health or emotional crisis. Interaction with such individuals has the potential for miscommunication and violence. It often requires a deputy to make difficult judgments about a person's mental state and intent in order to effectively and legally interact with the individual.

The Sheriff's Office recognizes not all scenarios and variables can be articulated in policy. Nothing in this policy shall be construed to prevent the Sheriff's Office from responding to an incident where unique circumstances are identified.

408.1.1 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy include:

Person in crisis - A person whose level of distress or mental health symptoms have exceeded the person's internal ability to manage their behavior or emotions. A crisis can be precipitated by any number of things, including an increase in the symptoms of mental illness despite treatment compliance; non-compliance with treatment, including a failure to take prescribed medications appropriately; or any other circumstance or event that causes the person to engage in erratic, disruptive or dangerous behavior that may be accompanied by impaired judgment.

408.2 POLICY

The Sacramento Sheriff's Office is committed to providing a consistently high level of service to all members of the community and recognizes that persons in crisis may benefit from intervention. The Sheriff's Office will not dispatch deputies to requests for service involving individuals experiencing a mental health crisis where there is no criminal element that would typically warrant a physical response or there is no imminent danger to others.

The Sheriff's Office will collaborate, where feasible, with mental health professionals to develop an overall intervention strategy to guide its members' interactions with those experiencing a mental health crisis. This is to ensure equitable and safe treatment of all involved.

408.3 SIGNS

Members should be alert to any of the following possible signs of mental health issues or crises:

- (a) A known history of mental illness
- (b) Threats of or attempted suicide
- (c) Loss of memory
- (d) Incoherence, disorientation or slow response
- (e) Delusions, hallucinations, perceptions unrelated to reality or grandiose ideas
- (f) Depression, pronounced feelings of hopelessness or uselessness, extreme sadness or guilt

Crisis Intervention Incidents

- (g) Social withdrawal
- (h) Manic or impulsive behavior, extreme agitation, lack of control
- (i) Lack of fear
- (j) Anxiety, aggression, rigidity, inflexibility or paranoia

Members should be aware that this list is not exhaustive. The presence or absence of any of these should not be treated as proof of the presence or absence of a mental health issue or crisis.

408.4 COORDINATION WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS

The Sheriff should designate the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) coordinator to collaborate with mental health professionals to develop an education and response protocol. It should include a list of community resources, to guide Sheriff's Office interaction with those who may be suffering from mental illness or who appear to be in a mental health crisis.

408.5 DISPATCHING DEPUTIES

The Communication Center is responsible for reviewing each call received to determine if it meets the criteria for dispatching deputies. Communication Center staff shall direct questions on whether a crime is being committed, has been committed, and if the subject of the call is an imminent danger to others. If it is determined that the above criteria are not met, deputies will not be dispatched, and the call will be referred to the appropriate outside resource (i.e., Suicide & Crisis Lifeline 9-8-8).

1. The on-duty Communication Center Sergeant will resolve any questions about the appropriateness of dispatching deputies.
2. If the Communication Center Sergeant cannot make a determination, the call shall be forwarded to a field Watch Commander.

The field Watch Commander and/or field Sergeant shall review, as soon as practical, calls for service that warrant a physical response.

408.6 FIRST RESPONDERS

When it is determined that a physical response is needed, the safety of all individuals is a priority for first responders. It is important to recognize that individuals under the influence of alcohol, drugs or both may exhibit symptoms that are similar to those of a person in a mental health crisis. These individuals may still present a serious threat to deputies; such a threat should be addressed with reasonable tactics. Nothing in this policy shall be construed to limit a deputy's authority to use reasonable force when interacting with a person in crisis.

Deputies are reminded that mental health issues, mental health crises and unusual behavior alone are not criminal offenses. Individuals may benefit from treatment as opposed to incarceration.

If the criteria for a physical response are met, a deputy responding to a call involving a person in crisis should:

Sacramento Sheriff's Office

Policy Manual

Crisis Intervention Incidents

- (a) Promptly assess the situation independent of reported information and make a preliminary determination regarding whether a mental health crisis may be a factor. If the deputy's assessment differs from the information provided in the call, the deputy shall notify the supervisor.
- (b) When feasible, responding deputies and a field supervisor should communicate and develop a plan of action prior to a physical response.
- (c) Request available backup deputies and specialized resources as deemed necessary and, if it is reasonably believed that the person is in a crisis situation, use conflict resolution and de-escalation techniques to stabilize the incident as appropriate.
- (d) If feasible, and without compromising safety, turn off flashing lights, bright lights or sirens.
- (e) Attempt to determine if weapons are present or available.
 - 1. Prior to making contact, and whenever possible and reasonable, conduct a search of the Department of Justice Automated Firearms System via the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) to determine whether the person is the registered owner of a firearm (Penal Code § 11106.4).
- (f) Take into account the person's mental and emotional state and potential inability to understand commands or to appreciate the consequences of their actions or inactions, as perceived by the deputy.
- (g) Secure the scene and clear the immediate area as necessary.
- (h) Employ tactics to preserve the safety of all participants.
- (i) Determine the nature of any crime.
- (j) Request a supervisor, as warranted.
- (k) Evaluate any available information that might assist in determining cause or motivation for the person's actions or stated intentions.
- (l) If circumstances reasonably permit, consider and employ alternatives to force.

408.7 DE-ESCALATION

Deputies should consider that taking no action or passively monitoring the situation may be the most reasonable response to a mental health crisis.

Once it is determined that a situation is a mental health crisis and immediate safety concerns have been addressed, responding deputies should be aware of the following considerations and should generally:

- Evaluate safety conditions.
- Introduce themselves and attempt to obtain the person's name.
- Be patient, polite, calm, courteous and avoid overreacting.
- Speak and move slowly and in a non-threatening manner.
- Moderate the level of direct eye contact.

Crisis Intervention Incidents

- Remove distractions or disruptive people from the area.
- Demonstrate active listening skills (e.g., summarize the person's verbal communication).
- Provide for sufficient avenues of retreat or escape should the situation become volatile.

Responding deputies generally should not:

- Use stances or tactics that can be interpreted as aggressive.
- Allow others to interrupt or engage the person.
- Corner a person who is not believed to be armed, violent or suicidal.
- Argue, speak with a raised voice or use threats to obtain compliance.

408.8 INCIDENT ORIENTATION

When responding to an incident that may involve mental illness or a mental health crisis, the deputy should request that the dispatcher provide critical information as it becomes available. This includes:

- (a) Whether the person relies on drugs or medication, or may have failed to take their medication.
- (b) Whether there have been prior incidents, suicide threats/attempts, and whether there has been previous sheriff's response.
- (c) Contact information for a treating physician or mental health professional.

Additional resources and a supervisor should be requested as warranted.

408.9 SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITIES

When responding to an interaction with a person in a crisis, a supervisor should:

- (a) Confirm that a deputy response is appropriate, communicate with the responding deputies, and develop a plan of action for a physical response.
- (b) Be present during the physical response.
- (c) Attempt to secure appropriate and sufficient resources.
- (d) Closely monitor any use of force, including the use of restraints, and ensure that those subjected to the use of force are provided with timely access to medical care (see the Handcuffing and Restraints Policy).
- (e) Consider strategic disengagement. Absent an imminent threat to the public and, as circumstances dictate, this may include removing or reducing law enforcement resources or engaging in passive monitoring.
- (f) Ensure that all reports are completed and that incident documentation uses appropriate terminology and language.

Crisis Intervention Incidents

- (g) Conduct an after-action tactical and operational debriefing, and prepare an after-action evaluation of the incident to be forwarded to the Commander.

Evaluate whether a critical incident stress management debriefing for involved members is warranted.

408.10 INCIDENT REPORTING

Members engaging in any oral or written communication associated with a mental health crisis should be mindful of the sensitive nature of such communications and should exercise appropriate discretion when referring to or describing persons and circumstances.

Members having contact with a person in crisis should keep related information confidential, except to the extent that revealing information is necessary to conform to Sheriff's Office reporting procedures or other official mental health or medical proceedings.

408.10.1 DIVERSION

Individuals who are not being arrested should be processed in accordance with the Mental Illness Commitments Policy.

408.11 PROFESSIONAL STAFF INTERACTION WITH PEOPLE IN CRISIS

Professional staff members may be required to interact with persons in crisis in an administrative capacity, such as dispatching, records request, and report taking.

- (a) Members should treat all individuals equally and with dignity and respect.
- (b) If a member believes that they are interacting with a person in crisis, they should proceed patiently and in a calm manner.
- (c) Members should be aware and understand that the person may make unusual claims or requests.

If a person's behavior makes the member feel unsafe, if the person is or becomes disruptive or violent, or if the person acts in such a manner as to cause the member to believe that the person may be harmful to themselves or others, a deputy should be promptly summoned to provide assistance.

408.12 TRAINING

In coordination with the mental health community and appropriate stakeholders, the Sheriff's Office will develop and provide comprehensive education and training to all members to enable them to effectively interact with persons in crisis.

This Sheriff's Office will endeavor to provide Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)-approved advanced officer training on interaction with persons with mental disabilities, welfare checks and crisis intervention (Penal Code § 11106.4; Penal Code § 13515.25; Penal Code § 13515.27; Penal Code § 13515.30).

Mental Illness Commitments

409.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This policy provides guidelines for when deputies may take a person into custody for psychiatric evaluation and treatment (5150 commitment) (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150).

409.2 POLICY

It is the policy of the Sacramento Sheriff's Office to protect the public and individuals through legal and appropriate use of the 72-hour treatment and evaluation commitment (5150 commitment) process.

409.3 AUTHORITY

A deputy having probable cause may take a person into custody and place the person in an approved mental health facility for 72-hour treatment and evaluation when the deputy believes that, as a result of a mental disorder, the person is a danger to themselves or others or the person is gravely disabled (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150; Welfare and Institutions Code § 5585.50).

When determining whether to take a person into custody, deputies are not limited to determining the person is an imminent danger and shall consider reasonably available information about the historical course of the person's mental disorder, which may include evidence presented from any of the following (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150; Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150.05):

- (a) An individual who is providing or has provided mental health treatment or related support services to the person
- (b) A family member
- (c) The person subject to the determination or anyone designated by the person

409.3.1 VOLUNTARY EVALUATION

If a deputy encounters an individual who may qualify for a 5150 commitment, the deputy may inquire as to whether the person desires to voluntarily be evaluated at an appropriate facility. If the person so desires, the deputies should:

- (a) Transport the person to an appropriate facility that is able to conduct the evaluation and admit the person pursuant to a 5150 commitment.
- (b) Document the circumstances surrounding the individual's desire to pursue voluntary evaluation and/or admission.

If a person withdraws their consent for a voluntary evaluation at any time, either through words or actions, officers are discouraged from using force to enforce the hold. Instead, they should consider a plan to safely disengage and leave the situation when appropriate unless they are a danger to others. Whenever practical, deputies should notify their supervisor before disengaging and provide the individual with appropriate resources.

Sacramento Sheriff's Office

Policy Manual

Mental Illness Commitments

409.4 CONSIDERATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Any deputy handling a call involving an individual who may qualify for a 5150 commitment should consider, as time and circumstances reasonably permit:

- (a) Available information that might assist in determining the cause and nature of the person's action or stated intentions.
- (b) Community or neighborhood mediation services.
- (c) Conflict resolution and de-escalation techniques.
- (d) Community or other resources available to assist in dealing with mental health issues.

While these steps are encouraged, nothing in this section is intended to dissuade deputies from taking reasonable action to ensure the safety of the deputies and others.

Deputies should consider a 5150 commitment over arrest when mental health issues appear to be a mitigating factor for people who are suspected of committing minor crimes or creating other public safety issues. In an incident involving a subject who is a danger to self, with no criminal element, deputies should only proceed if a 5150 commitment can be accomplished without the use of force. In the event that deputies determine a use of force may be necessary to effect a 5150 hold, deputies should consider tactfully disengaging and instead offer resources to assist the person in crisis whenever feasible.

Nothing in this policy shall be construed to limit a deputy's authority to use reasonable force where unique circumstances are identified. Refer to the Use of Force Policy for guidance.

409.4.1 SECURING OF PROPERTY

When a person is taken into custody for evaluation, or within a reasonable time thereafter, and unless a responsible relative, guardian or conservator is in possession of the person's personal property, the deputy shall take reasonable precautions to safeguard the individual's personal property in their possession or on the premises occupied by the person (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150).

The deputy taking the person into custody shall provide a report to the court that describes the person's property and its disposition in the format provided in Welfare and Institutions Code § 5211, unless a responsible person took possession of the property, in which case the deputy shall only include the name of the responsible person and the location of the property (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150).

409.5 TRANSPORTATION

When transporting any individual for a 5150 commitment, the transporting deputy should have the Communications Center notify the receiving facility of the estimated time of arrival, the level of cooperation of the individual and whether any special medical care is needed.

Deputies may transport individuals in a patrol unit and shall secure them in accordance with the Handcuffing and Restraints Policy. The presence of a deputy during transport may be required

Sacramento Sheriff's Office

Policy Manual

Mental Illness Commitments

should the detainee require transport in a medical transport vehicle and there is a concern for the safety of any person, including the detainee.

409.6 TRANSFER TO APPROPRIATE FACILITY

Upon arrival at the facility, the deputy will escort the individual into a treatment area designated by a facility staff member. If the individual is not seeking treatment voluntarily, the deputy should provide the staff member with the written application for a 5150 commitment and remain present to provide clarification of the grounds for detention, upon request.

Absent exigent circumstances, the transporting deputy should not assist facility staff with the admission process, including restraint of the individual. However, if the individual is transported and delivered while restrained, the deputy may assist with transferring the individual to facility restraints and will be available to assist during the admission process, if requested. Under normal circumstances, deputies will not apply facility-ordered restraints.

409.7 DOCUMENTATION

The deputy shall complete an application for a 72-Hour detention for evaluation and treatment, provide it to the facility staff member assigned to that patient and retain a copy of the application for inclusion in the case report.

The application shall include the circumstances for deputy involvement; the probable cause to believe the person is, as a result of a mental health disorder, a danger to others or themselves or gravely disabled; and all information used for the determination of probable cause (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150; Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150.05).

The deputy should also provide a verbal summary to any evaluating staff member regarding the circumstances leading to the involuntary detention.

409.7.1 ADVISEMENT

The deputy taking a person into custody for evaluation shall advise the person of:

- (a) The deputy's name and agency.
- (b) The fact that the person is not under criminal arrest but is being taken for examination by mental health professionals and the mental health staff will advise them of their rights.
- (c) The name of the facility to which the person is being taken.
- (d) If the person is being taken into custody at their residence, they should also be advised that they may take a few personal items, which the deputy must approve, and may make a telephone call or leave a note indicating where they are being taken. The deputy should also ask if the person needs assistance turning off any appliance or water.

The advisement shall be given in a language the person understands. If the person cannot understand an oral advisement, the information shall be provided in writing (Welfare and Institutions Code § 5150).

Sacramento Sheriff's Office

Policy Manual

Mental Illness Commitments

409.8 CRIMINAL OFFENSES

Deputies investigating an individual who is suspected of committing a minor criminal offense and who is being taken on a 5150 commitment should resolve the criminal matter by issuing a warning or a Notice to Appear as appropriate.

When an individual who may qualify for a 5150 commitment has committed a serious criminal offense that would normally result in an arrest and transfer to a jail facility, the deputy should:

- (a) Arrest the individual when there is probable cause to do so.
- (b) Facilitate the individual's transfer to jail.
 - 1. Advise Main Jail Medical Intake personnel of the circumstances involved with the arrest of a mentally disturbed individual so that Mental Health Services can be advised and preparations made to hold the person.
- (c) Thoroughly document in the related reports the circumstances that indicate the individual may qualify for a 5150 commitment.

In the deputy's judgment, the individual may instead be arrested or booked and transported to the appropriate mental health facility. The deputy should consider the seriousness of the offense, the treatment options available, the ability of this Sheriff's Office to regain custody of the individual, Sheriff's Office resources (e.g., posting a guard) and other relevant factors in making this decision.

409.9 FIREARMS AND OTHER WEAPONS

Whenever a person is taken into custody for a 5150 commitment, the handling deputies should seek to determine if the person owns or has access to any firearm or other deadly weapon defined in Welfare and Institutions Code § 8100. Deputies should consider whether it is appropriate and consistent with current search and seizure law under the circumstances to seize any such firearms or other dangerous weapons (e.g., safekeeping, evidence, consent).

Deputies are cautioned that a search warrant may be needed before entering a residence or other place to search, unless lawful, warrantless entry has already been made (e.g., exigent circumstances, consent). A search warrant may also be needed before searching for or seizing weapons. Any warrant obtained should be done in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Warrants Policy.

The handling deputies shall issue a receipt describing the deadly weapon or any firearm seized, and list any serial number or other identification that is on the firearm. Deputies shall advise the person of the procedure for the return of any firearm or other weapon that has been taken into custody (Welfare and Institutions Code § 8102 (b)) (see the Property and Evidence Policy and the Gun Violence Restraining Orders Policy).

409.9.1 PETITION FOR RETURN OF FIREARMS AND OTHER WEAPONS

Whenever the handling deputy has cause to believe that the future return of any confiscated weapon might endanger the person or others, the deputy shall detail those facts and circumstances in a report. The report shall be forwarded to the Security Services Division, which

Sacramento Sheriff's Office

Policy Manual

Mental Illness Commitments

shall be responsible for initiating a petition to the Superior Court for a hearing in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code § 8102(c), to determine whether the weapon will be returned.

The petition to the Superior Court shall be initiated within 30 days of the release of the individual from whom such weapon has been confiscated, unless the Sheriff's Office makes an ex parte application to the court to extend the time to file such a petition, up to a maximum of 60 days. At the time any such petition is initiated, the Sheriff's Office shall send written notice to the individual informing them of the right to a hearing on the issue, that they have 30 days to confirm with the court clerk any desire for a hearing and that the failure to do so will result in the forfeiture of any confiscated weapon.

Deputies may not confiscate weapons from an individual pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code § 8102(a) if they do not meet the criteria for a 5150 commitment.

409.10 TRAINING

This Sheriff's Office will provide Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)-approved advanced officer training on interaction with persons with mental disabilities, 5150 commitments and crisis intervention.



Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District

10545 Armstrong Ave., Suite 200 • Mather, CA 95655 • Phone (916) 859-4300 • Fax (916) 859-3702

January 17, 2025

SENT VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY

Sheriff Jim Cooper
Sacramento County Sheriff's Office
4500 Orange Grove Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95841

Sheriff Cooper:

I write today on behalf of the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District, regarding the Sacramento County Sheriff's Office changes in policy surrounding response to certain mental health related calls for service.

Metro Fire was grateful to have been invited to participate in a multi-agency meeting on January 8, 2025 including representatives from our two agencies, as well as the City of Sacramento Police Department, and County of Sacramento to discuss these recent revisions. At that meeting, Undersheriff Mike Ziegler directed meeting participants to provide feedback on these changes by the end of the following week. While this is a dynamic and ever-changing issue, please see below for Metro Fire's initial feedback, provided in the hopes that continued collaboration will take place on the issue:

- 1) Increased Clarity:** In the immediate, it is critical that the operational understanding of what these changes mean is clarified. Our crews have had several instances in recent weeks where both our firefighters and your deputies have expressed confusion with the lack of clarity on which calls will and will not receive the support of law enforcement. Despite your policy purportedly only applying to mental health calls where a crime is not being committed, we have experienced this confusion with both non-mental health calls, as well as calls where a crime is occurring.
- 2) Need for Training / Thoughtful Implementation:** Along the lines of point 1, Metro Fire is concerned with the policy rollout occurring without an opportunity to discuss how calls for service will now be addressed in these instances. We welcomed the chance on January 8th to hear of your office's intentions; however, some of the most significant portions of your

policy had already been implemented prior to that meeting. This left us scrambling to provide our line personnel direction on how to proceed, adding confusion to an oftentimes already convoluted crisis. Metro Fire would ask that training and coordination between deputies in the field and firefighters on the line takes place.

- 3) **Ensuring Proper Referral:** As the Sheriff's Communications Center determines whether law enforcement may be dispatched, Metro Fire asks that in instances that the Sheriff's Office decides not to respond that the calls be routed to the appropriate resources. Every second counts during a mental health crisis, and timely transfer to 9-8-8 or similar mental health resources will ensure that the individual requiring care receives what they need without additional delay. As these policies continue to evolve, we ask that they take into account balancing the right care, at the right time, with the right resources.

In closing, I understand your desire to protect your deputies from both physical harm and legal liability. As agency-heads, we are tasked with balancing the safety of our community and first responders alike, with the very real reality we find ourselves with legal, legislative, and other limitations. While I respect your authority to implement policy directives for your agency, I ask that when such changes drastically impact both first responders and public safety, that they are done in a collaborative method with all external stakeholders, including fire, law enforcement, city, and county at the table. Metro Fire believes in a partnership environment for the best results.

We look forward to additional conversations with you and your office going forward. If you have any questions in the meantime, please do not hesitate to reach out directly.

Sincerely,



Adam A. House
Fire Chief

CC: Undersheriff Mike Ziegler, Sacramento County Sheriff's Office
Assistant Sheriff Matthew Petersen, Sacramento County Sheriff's Office
Deputy Chief Adam Mitchell, Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District
Assistant Chief / Director of EMS Jon Rudnicki, Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District

County of Sacramento | Behavioral Health Crisis System

<p>Crisis levels can fluctuate, therefore level of response will be dynamic and will be based on immediate safety needs.</p> <p>CALLS AND RESPONSES CAN BE FLUID AND OVERLAP – DISPATCH VIA TRIAGE</p>	EMERGENT	IMMEDIATE RISK TO PUBLIC SAFETY CRIME	M MEDICAL AID FIRE DEPT/EMS RESPONSE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anyone in need of medical attention. • Injuries • Fire Rescue • Call Center or BHS Response Team contacts 911
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anyone in immediate danger (consistent with LE partner's policy). • Direct/immediate threats to others' lives. • Actively engaging with a weapon. • Reported crime that requires some level of investigation. <hr/> ACTION RESPONSE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law enforcement response via 911. 	
	MODERATE RISK	CALLER NEEDS HELP IN PERSON	
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public not in immediate danger. • May be a danger to self, others, gravely disabled. • Community response is necessary. <hr/> ACTION RESPONSE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer to 911 if needed. • Co-response: 911 and CCIT* for public safety related calls. • Community response by Sacramento County BHS CWRT**. • Crisis intervention, crisis screening, de-escalation, safety planning. • Connect caller, parent/caregiver to community support. • Referral and resource linkage, coordination of care. 	
	IMMEDIATE REMOTE	CALLER NEEDS IMMEDIATE HELP VIA CALL	
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In crisis now: can/will accept immediate remote help. • Caller is engaged and responsive with phone intervention. • May include suicidal individuals without a plan that's not immediate threat to self or others. <hr/> ACTION RESPONSE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May include response by 988 or HOPE Line. • Crisis intervention, crisis screening, de-escalation, safety planning. • Identification of coping strategies, stabilization services. • Connect caller, parent/caregiver to community support. • Referral and resource linkage, coordination of care. • Call resolved via phone. 	
	NO CRISIS OR RESOLVED	CALLER NEEDS SUPPORTS/SERVICES NO IMMEDIATE RISK	
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual, or parent/caregiver needs support services. <hr/> ACTION RESPONSE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Call Center will determine the level of service needed and link the individual to services and support within the community. 	