

STATE OF NEVADA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

A Workshop and Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training was held on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, commencing at 10:00 a.m. at 5587 Wa Pai Shone Avenue, Carson City, Nevada.

COMMISSIONERS:

- Jason Soto, Chairman
- Michael Allen
- Kevin McKinney
- Tim Shea
- George Togliatti
- Tyler Trouten
- Russell Niel
- Tiffany Young
- Rob Straube
- Jamie Prosser

STAFF:

- Kathy Floyd, POST F
- Nathan Hastings, Attorney General's Office
- Mike Sherlock, POST F

TRANSCRIBED BY: Transcriber Name

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX

ITEM:	PAGE:
WORKSHOP	
1. Call to order	5
2. Roll call of Commission Members	5
Topic	
A. Continued discussion regarding the establishment of a new regulation pursuant to Assembly Bill 336 which requires the POST Commission to adopt a regulation establishing "standards for an annual behavior wellness visit for peace officers to aid in preserving the emotional and mental health of the peace officer and assessing the conditions that may affect the performance of the duties by the peace officer." The draft language for the proposed regulation is as follows: <i>"The employing agency shall implement an annual behavior wellness program for each of its officers to aid in the preserving of the emotional and mental health of its officers and assessing conditions that may affect the performance of duties by its officers."</i>	6
3. Public Comment	9
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING AGENDA ITEMS	
1. Approval of minutes from the July 19, 2022, public comment hearing, workshop, and regularly scheduled meeting	19
2. Executive Director's Report	20

1	a. Training Division	20
2	b. Standards Division	22
3	c. Administration	22
4	1. Reappointment of Chief Kevin McKinney	
5	3. Continued discussion regarding the establishment of a	
6	new regulation pursuant to Assembly Bill 336 which	
7	requires the POST Commission to adopt a regulation	
8	establishing "standards for an annual behavior wellness	
9	visit for peace officers to aid in preserving the	
10	emotional and mental health of the peace officer and	
11	assessing the conditions that may affect the performance	
12	of the duties by the peace officer." The draft language	
13	for the proposed regulation is as follows: <i>"The</i>	
14	<i>employing agency shall implement an annual behavior</i>	
15	<i>wellness program for each of its officers to aid in the</i>	
16	<i>preserving of the emotional and mental health of its</i>	
17	<i>officers and assessing conditions that may affect the</i>	
18	<i>performance of duties by its officers."</i>	33
19	4. Request from Pershing County Sheriff's Office for a 6-	
20	month extension pursuant to NRS 289.550 for the	
21	following Deputies to meet the certification	
22	requirement:	
23	Deputy Zach Newman - hire date July 21, 2021; extension	
24	to January 21, 2023	
25	Deputy Dawn Noble - hire date February 16, 2022;	
	extension to August 2023	43
	5. Public Comments	45

6. Schedule Upcoming Commission Meeting - November

45

7. Adjournment

46

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

3 SOTO: Hey, we're gonna (inaudible).

4 FLOYD: (inaudible) meeting.

5 SOTO: Meeting to order, Post Commission meeting and
6 workshop is called to order for September 21st, 2022. It is --
7 for the record, the time is 10 a.m. I'm gonna turn this over
8 to Kathy Floyd for information on the legal postings and open
9 meeting compliance.

10 FLOYD: The workshop notice and meeting agenda had been
11 posted in compliance with NRS 241.202 -- 020. The meeting
12 agenda was physically posted at the POST administration
13 building and the Nevada state library in Carson City. The
14 meeting agenda has been electronically posted at post.nv.gov.
15 The state of Nevada website at notice.nv.gov. The legislative
16 website at leg.state.nv.us, and email to all SPOC and Admins
17 on the POST Listserv.

18 SOTO: Okay. All right. I'm gonna go to roll call.
19 I'll start with myself. Jason Soto, Reno Police Department,
20 and we'll start over on Kathy side and just go around.

21 FLOYD: Kathy Floyd, POST.

22 SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock from POST.

23 HASTINGS: Nathan Hastings, Attorney's General's office.

24 TROUTEN: Ty Trouten, Elko Police Department.

25 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, Carlin Police Department.

1 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police
2 Department.

3 NIEL: Russ Niel, Gaming Control Board.

4 ALLEN: Mike Allen, Humboldt County Sheriff's office.

5 SOTO: Do we have anybody on the phone?

6 FLOYD: Chief Shea?

7 SHEA: Yeah, Tim Shea from Boulder City. I'm here.

8 SOTO: Okay. All right. We're gonna start this off
9 today with the workshop. Purpose -- purpose of the workshop
10 is to solicit comments from the interested persons on the
11 following topic that may be addressed in future proposed
12 regulations. This workshop has been previously noticed
13 pursuant to the requirements of NRS chapter 233B. This
14 workshop is intended to solicit and continue discussion on
15 assembly bill 336, which requires an annual behavior wellness
16 component as an annual requirement for certified officers.
17 I'm gonna turn this over to Mike Sherlock for some background
18 on this subject.

19 SHERLOCK: Thanks chief. Mike Sherlock for the record.
20 So again, this workshop is a continuation of workshop we had
21 at the last meeting and an agenda item. It is in response to
22 AB 336 from the last legislative session, which mandated POST
23 create regulation to implement an annual behavior wellness
24 component within agencies. So this has been a bill with much
25 discussion with staff and -- and some research. Looking at

1 other states, IACP has a pretty extensive study on this topic,
2 as I'm sure, the commission knows, staff has been concerned
3 from the outset, and it really -- we want to try to prevent
4 the commission from becoming embroiled in some sort of labor
5 issue or fitness for duty issue, that kind of thing. But also
6 to avoid being the entity that -- that forces some sort of
7 unfunded fiscal issue for agencies. So we've really gone
8 round and round about this particular bill. That being said,
9 there is a bill that requires us to take some action. It
10 should be noted that we were advised that there were some
11 fiscal notes, just to give you a perspective, when this BDR
12 was going through. Metro, I think, had the largest fiscal
13 note, but there were some fairly large fiscal notes tied to
14 this bill originally, and -- and most of those addressed
15 whether or not an agency would be mandated to require an
16 annual psych visit, a physical vi -- visit with a mental
17 health professional. So we have received some input and a lot
18 of inquiries on this proposed regulation. Most of the -- the
19 ones that I've received are related to whether or not an
20 agency's current officer wellness program would be in
21 compliance with what the commission has in mind. Just as an
22 example, I talked to Chief Owens down at Las Vegas Paiute
23 Tribal yesterday, his concerns kind of reflect the -- those of
24 others. A mandated visit with a mental health professional
25 would likely be cost prohibitive for his agency, for example,

1 and they would not be able to comply if that was the mandate.
2 On the other hand, if the issue is simply implementation of an
3 officer wellness program with some discretion on how agencies
4 interpret their check-ins or visits or program, it would be
5 something that -- that they support and -- and could comply
6 with. We have the same concerns as I stated, you know, in
7 fears of triggering, a fitness for duty exam, that kind of
8 thing without cause. If you look in your books under the
9 workshop, we have a page of three examples of possible
10 language for this regulation. Again, we're not real
11 comfortable, but, you know, I'm not sure that we have any more
12 discretion considering the language of that particular bill.
13 Last, I would add that this bill requires a POST shall
14 established standards for an annual wellness program. Under
15 this bill, I know there's some concerns last time about that
16 wording, you know, establishing standards. Staff would --
17 would submit that by creating this re -- regulation that
18 mandates an officer wellness component is the standard and we
19 have complied with that requirement. We don't see it as
20 developing some standard that is a pass fail for a wellness
21 program or something like that. It was more about -- and
22 again, I've spoken to the author of this bill and -- and prior
23 to it passing, that kind of thing. So anyway, that -- that
24 standard would be created with this regulation. These langu -
25 - language samples established the -- the POST regulatory

1 standard to have such a program, so we think we'd be in
2 compliance with that bill. So with that, I would suggest, Mr.
3 Chairman, we open the discussion. Do anyone here wishes to
4 try input for the workshop?

5 SOTO: All right. Thank you, Mr. Sherlock. Do we
6 have any comments from anybody from public that wants to speak
7 on this topic today? Okay. Seems as there's none. I'd --
8 I'd like to ask for comments from commissioners. I think I
9 can start in terms of just some thoughts that I had initially.
10 After looking at this bill and -- and trying to understand its
11 intent and its requirements, I think that I would agree with
12 Mr. Sherlock in terms of having a component, not making it a
13 necessary to where you have to go see a license professional,
14 because I do think that's cost prohibitive and there -- there
15 is no -- there was no identification for funding of that. But
16 I think to have some type of wellness program within your
17 agency, I think -- personally, I think that would suffice. I
18 think that's something that could be looked at and monitored
19 by POST, and I think that was the intent, right, just to have
20 options available for the men and women of this profession, so
21 that they -- that they understand that there's a component to
22 wellness that they can draw from, if they need to. So that's
23 just my initial thoughts on the bill. I'll turn it over to
24 our commissioners and see if we have any additional thoughts
25 or input that anybody wants to give for this discussion.

1 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser for the record. Forgive me, I
2 don't know, Sherlock, if you can comment, you said that you
3 spoke to the author of the bill and you believe that this
4 verbiage will satisfy what they're looking for. Have you run
5 this verbiage by the author of the bill by chance to see if
6 they would be satisfied with this verbiage?

7 SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. No, we -- we did
8 -- well originally when I spoke --

9 UNIDENTIFIED: With -- this was Monroe Moreno.

10 SHERLOCK: Ms. Monroe Moreno -- our concern were -- was
11 the fitness for duty language. They tried to clean it up a
12 little bit. It is what it is. But they very -- very clearly
13 to me stated that their goal was to reduce and have an effect
14 on officer suicide. And so there was very specific wording
15 that you had -- the original bill was you had to have a visit
16 with a psychologist or psychiatrist, that was all removed.
17 The word visit was left. Again, I think just because they
18 didn't know how to change that wording, but I'm pretty
19 comfortable with her -- with the intent of that bill being
20 that they want agencies to have some program that can assist
21 an officers mental wellbeing. And so I'm pretty comfortable
22 with that, but -- but I haven't sent her any language, like,
23 you know -- once the bill's passed, we're gonna -- but -- but
24 I'm comfortable with that, I think, from our --

25 SOTO: And I -- I --

1 SHERLOCK: -- perspective, you know. We're accomplishing
2 what she wanted.

3 SOTO: If I could add to that too, I think, correct me
4 if I'm wrong Mr. Sherlock, but the request from that
5 individual and that bill was for POST to put something in
6 place, a process in place that can address that. So that's --
7 that's what we're trying to achieve here. Meaning, they gave
8 us the authority to come up with whatever language it is that
9 would satisfy this bill, which is what we're doing now. And -
10 - and since they removed the professional from it, that was
11 enough for us to say, okay, then we could do it internally,
12 what's that gonna look like?

13 SHERLOCK: Yes. Mike Sherlock for the record. I would --
14 I would only add one other thing. I think that from the
15 legislative perspective, they wanted to ensure that POST
16 ensured that this happened. So we've already talked about
17 from an audit standpoint, well, we would do it, you know,
18 during our normal audits that just ensure that they have --
19 that an agency has officer wellness program in place and it's
20 active, and -- and -- and again, I think that meets the other
21 half of that intent from POST perspective that we are going to
22 ensure that agencies have an officer wellness program.

23 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney. I -- is there -- is there
24 going to be a --similar to the training component where the
25 officer, you know, will have to provide proof that he attended

1 this program or participated in this program to maintain a
2 certification?

3 SHERLOCK: No, I -- again, Mike Sherlock for the record.
4 So we -- we look at this as -- as an agency level issue. So
5 we would cert -- we would simply ensure that there's a pro --
6 you know, obviously, we don't want to get involved in you
7 know, the visit itself or the, you know -- what they're doing
8 on an individual level. So from our perspective, and again,
9 looking at our audits, that -- that's simply what we would do
10 is -- is ensure that there is an officer wellness component
11 within the policy of that agency, not necessarily what's going
12 on with individuals. So we just wouldn't --

13 MCKINNEY: Okay.

14 SHERLOCK: -- get in there. So -- and there was some
15 discussion about that, whether it's part of the annual
16 training hour component, and we don't see it that way. I
17 don't think the bills built that way. It's just more that --
18 to ensure that there is a program in place at the agency
19 level, not the individual.

20 SOTO: Also just for discussion since we're talking
21 about it. I think that some of the conversations that I've
22 had for the difficulties of putting a wellness component
23 together for maybe smaller agencies that don't have the
24 budget, most of, if not all of the larger agencies, have some
25 sort of wellness component now, and I would be happy to share

1 that with, you know, ours or in some more larger agencies
2 throughout the state so that they -- they have a -- a pallet,
3 if you will, in terms of what that looks like, and you could
4 pair it down obviously to your -- to your department size.
5 But I think we have -- I think we have a pretty good wellness
6 program in place now at many of our agencies and now it's just
7 about giving it throughout the state and meeting this
8 requirement.

9 SHERLOCK: Yeah. Mike Sherlock for the record. And
10 that's been our experience. I think most agencies have a
11 pretty robust officer wellness program in place, and we just
12 didn't want to put POST in the position of telling them, their
13 officer wellness program is not good enough for, you know --
14 as long as we're within the parameters of the intent of that
15 bill, I think, we're -- we're pretty good. As far as the
16 standard, I just wanted to add one more thing. As far as the
17 standards component requiring a standard, we did put a large
18 fiscal note in. It was kicked back because the interpretation
19 by LCB, and of course we don't have that, but was that the
20 fiscal note was invalid because they did not perceive that as
21 establishing the standards of good mental health. Right.
22 It's more about just a standard that you have a, you know,
23 program in place. So that's why we take that wording, not as
24 us developing a, you know -- that type of standard. We, you
25 know -- we wouldn't have the funding for that and they agreed

1 with that.

2 TROUTEN: Ty Trouten for the record. Just to be clear
3 and to address the concern raised by the chief you mentioned
4 before, Mr. Sherlock. There will be a financial impact,
5 whether it is a visit or a program. Having an -- in the midst
6 of the investigation, this is trying to set up our program
7 now. Whether you do it with something as simple as available
8 survey that is attached to your annual physical fitness
9 evaluation, and then read by doctor who can be considered
10 under the most definitions I've seen as a mental or behavioral
11 wellness provider, there's a price tag. If you're going to
12 put a behavioral wellness professional on retainer, or in our
13 case, pay them to drive at \$130 an hour out to our area,
14 there's a price tag. And then you're talking about -- if they
15 meet with an officer, there's a price tag. So regardless,
16 there's going to be a substantial financial impact to every
17 single agency. Some investigation, Kevin McKinney can speak
18 to this as well, even things like cop line, you know, that are
19 available, EAPs. There's not necessarily a price tag
20 directly, but if POST were to require then there must be some
21 sort of documentation or accounting that every officer
22 participated annually, then those two items would not work
23 because both EAP and cop line are 100 percent confidential.
24 They will not even tell you that they have spoken to an
25 officer. So really it relegates you down to something more

1 local, even if it's virtual. So just to put on the record,
2 there will be a price tag, regardless of the language.

3 SHERLOCK: Yeah. Mike Sherlock for the record. We and --
4 I, in fact, spoke to Jim Owens about this yesterday. We were
5 at a conference recently, there are some resources out there
6 right now that we're gonna try to compile those if you don't
7 have a program. One in particular that I really like, they --
8 it's a large company, but they will -- if it's police only not
9 police fire, but police only, they provide a service for free
10 right now. I, you know -- they could start charging, but --
11 and it's one on one contact. They have a app for the phone
12 and it's a pretty cool, you know, officer wellness program.
13 So there are some resources out there, but -- no, I -- I
14 understand what you're saying. But the fact remains, we have
15 this bill that is requiring, you know, POST to -- to regulate
16 this area.

17 SOTO: I'm glad that Chief McKinney brought it up and
18 -- and Mike, you touched on it briefly. Jason Soto for the
19 record. The -- the confidentiality of this and not making
20 that an issue, I think it needs to be said on record. The
21 reason that's -- that is important is if you want to get buy
22 in from the agencies and especially the line level people that
23 we're -- that we're trying to have an effect on, if we don't
24 keep that confidentiality piece as, you know, open and
25 transparent as we can, you're not gonna get any buy in. It's

1 gonna -- there will be no on this. So I think that's the
2 important piece that we -- we really need to understand, make
3 it a -- a priority, and it sounds like we have, for sure.

4 ALLEN: So Mike Allen for the record. I just want a
5 little bit of clarification. So I'm hearing differences from
6 what Director Sherlock's saying is in what Commissioner
7 Trouten just brought up. So is it your understanding,
8 Director Sherlock, that we're gonna have to do an annual psych
9 on -- on this 'cause that's what it sounded like.

10 SHERLOCK: Yeah -- no -- Mike Sherlock for the record.
11 It's actually the opposite that. I think -- just to give you
12 some background on the bill too as it went through, the
13 original language on the BDR before we spoke to -- to the
14 author was, it required a psych visit at the time of their
15 heart and lung medical. And as you can see, that is no longer
16 in the bill, right, because -- we had a long discussion about
17 that. Everything from -- from a fitness for duty issue
18 mandating that, to the fact that frankly, there's a good
19 number of POST certified officers that are not part of the
20 heart and lung and don't do a medical exam every year. But
21 the fact that they removed that psych mandate component,
22 again, it's just another indication is that -- that is not
23 what the intent was. I truly believe the intent is officer
24 wellness, and so I -- I do not believe it requires a licensed,
25 you know -- a visit with a licensed mental health

1 professional. And -- and because language was removed that
2 did do that.

3 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney for the record. However, the
4 NRS does say standards for an annual behavioral wellness
5 visit. It doesn't say a behavioral wellness program. It says
6 an annual behavioral wellness visit. So I think -- I -- I
7 mean, the way I'm reading the law that they want annual visits
8 for peace officers.

9 SHERLOCK: Yeah, Mike Sherlock for the record. So that's
10 been some of our struggle, right, is the visit isn't defined.
11 We don't want to take away an agency that has, you know, a
12 peer support unit where that goes around to roll call and
13 meets with them annually and visits with them, right. We
14 don't want to take away some of the discretion from agencies
15 that have their own individual program already in place, and -
16 - and frankly, I'd like to see agencies and you can see some
17 of the language that we've thrown out there, let agencies sort
18 of define what that term visit or that word visit means, so
19 they can, you know, continue to use the programs that they
20 have in place that are working. But yeah, I -- I -- I get
21 that's a tough one with the word visit there, but again, I
22 think the intent is to have an officer wellness program within
23 the agency. How agencies want to interpret that particular
24 word, I think is best left to individual agencies.

25 SOOT: For the record, Jason Soto. For my -- my take

1 and my interpretation on that, when we put our wellness
2 program together, the visit piece is the visit is actually
3 being -- so at least once a year, we'll go over the options
4 available to our men and women of our agency, unless your
5 visit -- now within that component, we do offer things such as
6 EAP or, you know, if somebody's struggling in -- in one area
7 or another, you know, avenues to which they can -- they can go
8 to and actually choose to do an in person visit. But we have
9 to at least visit the, you know -- offer -- that -- that's my
10 interpretation. It's loose, I get it. It's -- and it's not -
11 - even in the -- even in the -- the law itself, it's not
12 specific. So if we can at least visit the topic once a year,
13 which I think is required by this -- which is required by this
14 bill, then if we want to further that, or if the officer wants
15 to further that, he or she can.

16 SHERLOCK: Yeah, Mike Sherlock -- Sherlock for the record.
17 I -- and -- and I think that as well within the intent.

18 SOTO: I do too.

19 SHERLOCK: You know, again, staff has a problem with the
20 other sentence to assess their ability to carry out their
21 duties. That's -- that's another issue, but after discussion,
22 you see our sample language, we left that in there. But --

23 SOTO: Yep. Well, we knew this was gonna be a tough
24 one when -- when -- when we saw the bill. I think we've
25 mitigated a lot of the concerns that we have. This is what we

1 come forward with, you know, and see how it works. Any other
2 comments from any of our commission?

3 SHEA: Chief, I don't know if you can hear me. Tim
4 Shea here on the phone.

5 SOTO: Yep.

6 SHEA: I agree with Chief Soto. I -- I think he has
7 the best interpretation I've heard in quite a while on this,
8 that the visits, and it's not as actually defined if we do it
9 internally and have a process for a follow up, I think would
10 meet that language. 'Cause there's not definition what the
11 visit has to be of -- in other words, it doesn't have to be
12 with the mental health professional if I read this right.

13 SHERLOCK: Yeah. Mike Sherlock for the record. And I
14 would agree with that, when you look at the removal of the
15 definition of a visit, seems to me, you know, open the door
16 so.

17 SOTO: All right. Anything else from any of our
18 commissioners? Okay. Seeing as though there's not, we're
19 gonna go ahead and close this workshop and move on to the
20 actual commission meeting and we'll move to item number 1,
21 discussion, public comment, and for possible action approval
22 of minutes from the July 19th, 2022 regularly -- regularly
23 scheduled POST commission meeting. Do we have any public
24 comment on that? Okay. Any comments from commissioners?
25 Seems though there's none, I'm looking for a motion to approve

1 the minutes.

2 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney. I, so move.

3 SOTO: Motion. Can I get a second?

4 NIEL: I'll second, Russ Niel.

5 SOTO: Got a second. All in favor, say aye.

6 MEMBERS: Aye.

7 SOTO: Opposed? Motion carries unanimously. Item

8 number 2, information executive director report. I'm gonna

9 turn this over to Mr. Sherlock for an update on POST activity.

10 SHERLOCK: Okay, thank you. Mike Sherlock for the record.

11 First, let me introduce Nate Hastings. He's from the Attorney

12 General's office. Nate is taking over for the retired Mike

13 Jensen, who by the way, didn't walk away, he ran. I think

14 he's already in Belgium living there. I've actually spoken to

15 Nate on some personnel and records request issues, I think in

16 the past with -- with great success. So we really look

17 forward to working with Nate. I just hope he is ready for you

18 guys, but we'll -- we'll get him there, you know, one way or

19 another -- one way or another, but please welcome Nate, our

20 new attorney general assistant here.

21 HASTINGS: Thank you.

22 SOTO: Welcome.

23 SHERLOCK: Quickly, I'll go through basic training. We --

24 I think I talked before we had a national group come in and --

25 and do a study on our academy and how we present our academy

1 and that kind of thing. We had a conference call yesterday
2 with some of their key findings, in terms of training delivery
3 and retention of that training. A couple of key points. The
4 study really confirmed kind of our anecdotal belief in -- in
5 relation to remote learning or online learning and -- and that
6 kind of thing. Retention and successful application of a
7 concept taught in person and then reinforced through practical
8 applications afterwards or hands on performance based
9 training. And then tested were -- that group was
10 substantially better than any other method of learning that --
11 that we used in our academy or we let them do in our academy.
12 So -- and that's -- we do have very disciplined performance
13 based training here now, and that was validated at -- in terms
14 of retention of what they learned, they did much better. The
15 second best, if you will, in terms of retention, were those
16 who learned online and then participated in a performance
17 based, you know, training session and then tested. They were
18 the second best, although they were substantially lower than
19 the in person learning people overall, and the worst in terms
20 of retention, were those that only learned online and then
21 tested, which is kind of what we believe that most people knew
22 going in. It is interesting. It kind of sort of validates
23 our belief and our decisions going through the pandemic and
24 how we handled that in terms of learning and running the
25 academy. So we're good with that. Over in advanced training,

1 we've got a bunch -- we've revamped, redone all of our
2 curriculum. We have basic instructor development coming up
3 this month, basic -- basic investigations course that we just
4 revamped, both in October and November. We'll do a -- in
5 December a newly elected Sheriff's and Chiefs course and
6 apparently, there'll be a few new sheriffs and chiefs out
7 there in December. And then we have a whole line of first
8 line supervisor courses ready to go. Over in standards,
9 obviously we're busy with regulations related to the last
10 legislative session. We have three separate regs at the
11 commission that -- that you guys have -- the commission has
12 approved and it's on the LCB commission meeting next week,
13 correct?

14 FLOYD: 27th.

15 SHERLOCK: 27th. So we'll be prepared for that and we
16 have to go through that process. But once that's done, it'll
17 be done for those three particular regulations. You know, I
18 will say we are already into the next legislative session as
19 some of you already know. BDRs are already out there. You
20 know, we try to do our best working with legislators. There
21 are some that actually contact us if a bill would affect POST.
22 That said, currently there's a majority that have the attitude
23 that we should track the bills and contact them. If we have
24 something to say about a bill that -- that mentions POST or
25 law enforcement or training, which is kind of crazy if you ask

1 me, but it is what it is. But when you consider last session,
2 there were over a thou -- one thousand bills. We could not
3 track them all, right. And their system did not alert us when
4 it should have. So sometimes these bills go flying through
5 and -- and we don't -- so if you know bills that you believe
6 staff should look at or comment on, just let us know. You've
7 all heard the latest dispatcher issue, and I -- I would simply
8 say that, I'm with Chief Soto on putting pressure on the
9 legislature to introduce BDRs, at first identify funding for
10 POST to deal with these issues 'cause we're frankly, in big
11 trouble. So, you know, I know you're tired of hearing our
12 budget woes, but it has really reached critical stage. We
13 have bills that now are not being paid, as we lack the actual
14 cash to pay those, regardless of what were authorized. Though
15 I will say, we just got some money from Clark County today,
16 which helps, but court assessments are trending lower again.
17 I'm not sure what is going on, but I got in trouble at
18 legislature judicial committee for giving my opinion that
19 going civil with traffic citations is going to affect our
20 funding and even more so than what we're seeing right now, and
21 I stand by that. If we see what's going on, it's definitely
22 gonna affect our funding. Our biggest problem was we've --
23 we've spent years building up our reserves to get through
24 revenue issues. So the first couple months of a fiscal year,
25 we don't have court assessments coming in and so we use our

1 reserve to operate those couple months. Last year in terms of
2 authorization, we were \$900,000 short in court assessment
3 revenue. I know that doesn't sound like a lot, but we're
4 small 900,000 for us is a huge percentage of our budget. We
5 were down, we believed because court assessment revenue was
6 directly affected by the COVID response. There's no doubt
7 about it. So we requested that this shortage, as a result of
8 COVID, be made up via the COVID relief or ARPA funds through
9 the governor's office. We were denied last time and instead,
10 the governor's office decided to sweep our entire reserve to
11 make up the shortfall to cover that loss of -- loss of
12 revenue, and then that didn't even cover our loss so we got
13 like 200,000 in our ARPA funds. Again, we've spent years
14 building that reserve fund and to sweep it just prior to our
15 fis -- new fiscal year is a big problem. Now we don't have
16 that reserve, court assessments are down. As a result just
17 before today, we're -- we have 38,000 in bills that were
18 unpaid. We have payroll next Friday, we have no cash for. So
19 it -- I -- I don't know how to stress it anymore. We -- our
20 funding revenue with a hundred percent court assessments has
21 become a problem. You know, we're going to try to put
22 pressure on the GFO to allow us to borrow money from the
23 general fund. My -- my new idea, and I've tried many
24 different ideas with both legislature and the governor is to
25 borrow money from the general fund and my preference would be

1 to borrow our entire budget upfront and let the state take the
2 court assessment money that we would get. And to me, it just
3 makes sense. That way if court assessments come in short,
4 general fund eats it, not us, not training, not law
5 enforcement issues. So pretty sure that's not gonna fly, but
6 we're gonna try that. Just to give you another example, the
7 next IFC, which is interim finance committee, is October 20.
8 Once again, we did not get approved for any ARPA funds at all.
9 We're not on the agenda, not a single dollar to make up for
10 revenue shortfall to expand training based on mandates from
11 the legislature, nothing. And you can see I'm frustrated,
12 there's a large pot of money in that ARPA fund and we only ask
13 for a small fraction of it and we can't get it. So my big
14 point is, if you have contact with the governor's office, if
15 you have interaction with -- with GFO to continue to put us in
16 the forefront, because, you know, frankly, we're in trouble.
17 We'll be -- we'll be borrowing money next week, in fact. But
18 we really need to look at a different revenue stream for us.
19 I've made several proposals and as you guys know, legislators,
20 they don't want to be part of any new tax or new funding.
21 It's not -- it's not a great position for them to be in
22 sometimes, and I get it, but we -- we need to get our funding
23 fixed and -- and it's just the way it is. So hopefully we can
24 do that. So that's our budget woes at this point.

25 SOTO: Yeah. Thank you for that overview, Mike, and -

1 - and you know, I'm -- I'm gonna go back a little bit, you
2 know. So as -- as a commissioner, there's a chair for
3 commissioner and chair for -- for POST. We -- we -- we
4 brought this up several years ago in terms of financing. I
5 think a lot of it got buried and lost in COVID. But I think
6 what's important to put on record is when it comes to the
7 funding of POST, so a lot of these -- these bills and this new
8 legislature that's put into place, it has to do with -- for
9 these legislators that are putting these bills into place has
10 to do with the training and product that comes from their
11 sworn law enforcement officers. That's why we have hopes.
12 That's why we have this committee for that oversight and that
13 there is a cost that is associated with that. Now, once COVID
14 came everything, like I said, kind of got buried, but I --
15 another thing that got buried is -- because we were also
16 inundated with working through COVID in a worldwide pandemic
17 and police reform and everything else that -- that -- that
18 came with, you know, the past two years, we haven't done, I
19 believe, a good enough job following some of these bills that
20 -- that you brought up earlier. So my suggestion to this
21 committee is when we see something where there is going to be
22 a fiscal impact, like -- like we were talking with dispatch,
23 obviously share it with the group. But I know that, at least
24 my agency and several other agencies that I've been in contact
25 with, are gonna be doing a better job of speaking up and

1 tracking those and making it known for these legislators that
2 if there's a cost, we have to find a way to fund that. We
3 just cannot continue to stack this type of work on top of
4 agencies, on top of our profession, on top of POST without
5 finding a way to fund it. And I think that we can do a better
6 job of expressing that to not only our governor's office
7 'cause I've had conversations with them in the past, but also
8 with, you know, our communities and our state, and I think
9 you're gonna start seeing more of that. So I just want to let
10 everybody know that up front here on a record and we'll do a
11 better job on that end. But that we do have to start finding
12 mechanisms in which we can fund POST, this office, because
13 it's been grossly underfunded now for 10 -- for a decade, and
14 we need to take a look at that piece, and then also we need to
15 do a better job as commissioners in terms of when we have
16 these unfunded mandates that are coming forward, letting that
17 be known in legislature because I think that's an important
18 piece to where there was no -- there was no pushback because
19 we just had -- we were overwhelmed with work. We're not
20 overwhelmed with work, we understand the fiscal impacts and
21 we're gonna -- we're gonna do a better job of making that
22 known. Any other comments from our commissioners in terms of
23 -- Mike's update for --

24 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser for the record. I believe in one
25 of our previous meetings, you had mentioned that there's

1 currently an audit underway and that that will be available in
2 November.

3 SHERLOCK: Yah. Mike Sherlock for the record. They
4 pushed it back. I will say that the audit people tried to
5 help us from that standpoint, already. Particularly trying to
6 get us on this October IFC and they were unsuccessful, but
7 they continue with the audit and -- and our -- the audit will
8 emphasize our, you know, lack of a good revenue source. But
9 they keep putting it back. I don't know if they'll be done in
10 November or not, but -- it -- it's somewhat encouraging, but
11 the fact that they were unable to get us in now has me
12 worried, you know, that kind of thing.

13 SOTO: Can I make one more comment? Jason Soto for
14 the record. Investing in POST, investing in the funding in
15 POST will save us money in the long run. Okay. That's --
16 that's what we're all trying to achieve, to include our
17 legislators that I've had many conversations with, is
18 investing in POST, making sure that we have training in place
19 that turns out a better product from law enforcement, from
20 sworn law enforcement, in general, is going to save us money
21 in the long run. And I think that's what we've been missing
22 in that or trying to cut corners everywhere, and you really
23 can't do it when it comes to the training of the men and women
24 of this profession. So investing a little bit of money in our
25 training process, which is POST, is going to provide a better

1 product and it's going to save all of us money in -- in the
2 state of Nevada in doing so. That's the point that I think
3 gets missed again and again and again. It's not like our
4 hands are just out saying we need more money. We actually
5 need money to do -- to -- to put out a better product in terms
6 of law enforcement in this state. It's -- it's -- it's --
7 it's a decade behind now and we can't do that anymore. All
8 right.

9 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney for the record. I -- I echo
10 Chief Soto's comments. My -- my question is, I -- I believe I
11 know the answer to, isn't the funding for POST set by Nevada
12 revised statute?

13 SHERLOCK: So Mike Sherlock for the record. Yes and no.
14 So yeah, we are. We are court assessed funded, 98 percent.
15 The other 2 percent is the 500 or 300 we charged for the
16 academy. But also, under the NRS is the courts can take up to
17 51 percent and this last cycle, they took their full amount.
18 Prior to that, they were taking about 47 percent. And I'm not
19 -- I don't know that that is the main cause of the reduction,
20 but ultimately, it's just not a good reliable stream for us in
21 terms of court assessments, but -- but it is by statute. The
22 amount we get is not by statute. So we end up with 16 percent
23 -- well that fluctuates a little bit, of the 49 percent that
24 gets split up.

25 MCKINNEY: Right. Kevin McKinney again. But the revenue

1 source is set by statute. So I believe -- I believe we, as
2 the commission, should look to change the NRS so that we can
3 develop a -- another funding source in some manner.

4 SHERLOCK: Correct. Mike Sherlock for the record. So the
5 issue is finding someone to carry a BDR. If you're talking
6 about our source or our revenue stream is finding someone
7 willing -- and I've met with many and had several proposals
8 that other states use that are very good with very little
9 impact in terms of taxes at all. But it's -- you have to find
10 someone to -- to carry those BDRs.

11 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser for the record. One question,
12 and I apologize for my ignorance, but you had made a comment
13 reference, we all know what the issues and concerns about
14 dispatchers are. And I apologize, I don't think I've been
15 looped in on that.

16 SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. So my point
17 there is, you know, as we get into legislative session, we're
18 already getting contacts and, you know, there's a BD --
19 there's a proposed BDR that we got involved in because we have
20 dispatchers voluntarily under our umbrella now, and a group of
21 dispatchers, some of your people, in fact, I think, would like
22 to make it mandatory that they're under the umbrella of POST.
23 And so there's a BDR and there's reasons that they want that.
24 They're -- we're the only state that they're not in the west
25 and all those kind of things. So the -- the Per -- PK O'Neals

1 proposing this bill is out there and there were some comments
2 made. He -- he's asking for feedback from sheriff and chiefs,
3 and so there were some comments made there. So that's why I
4 said that -- that it's out there. He's looking to see if
5 there would be any support for it and --

6 PROSSER: So --

7 SHERLOCK: -- make them mandatory.

8 PROSSER: That would also have a fiscal impact on you,
9 correct?

10 SHERLOCK: In the long run -- Mike Sherlock for the
11 record. Yeah. In the long run, it probably would. Although
12 we already have the infrastructure -- infrastructure in place,
13 we do this now on a voluntary basis and many may agencies
14 already mandated, so we're already doing it. But if you think
15 of it down the road, yes. Right. Because then you have to
16 look at we're certified, do we revoke them, do we create the
17 hiring standard like we do on the sworn side? So there could
18 be a fiscal impact down the road on that. Again, and I'm with
19 Chief Soto's suggestion on this. When we have these bills,
20 they should identify funding first. I -- I wish they worked
21 that way. They -- they don't, but if we could pressure
22 legislators, it would be -- it would be huge if we could look
23 at things from the funding first side of things.

24 SOTO: Yeah. And I, you know, to me, it's not even --
25 Chief Soto for the record. It's not even pressure, it's

1 educate them on -- there is no way to -- to carry this out
2 with the staffing shortages that we have throughout our state
3 of Nevada. Every single agency has staffing challenges right
4 now, and they have so much on their plates. We have to start
5 identifying revenue to bring in additional personnel,
6 additional technology, additional ways to complete these --
7 these -- these -- these mandates that are put in front of us.
8 We have to start doing that. We have to start being more
9 responsible on the legislative side so that we can do that,
10 because we do want to get better at what we do. We want to
11 have better equipment. We want to have more people to be able
12 to carry this out and it's not that it's a bad idea. I think
13 the intention behind it is fantastic, it's just, how are we
14 gonna do that in reality. So I think that there's a lot of
15 education that needs to occur. That goes back to what I was
16 saying at the beginning of this, as commissioner, as
17 commissioners, as chair, as the director, we're going to start
18 bringing more information to them saying, Hey, look, this is -
19 - this is great, but here's what we need to do in order to get
20 there. And then if we can get a bill like that to, you know,
21 somebody carry that, then we can start making some real change
22 in terms of, I think, what we're all trying to achieve. Any
23 other comments from any of our commission on the executive
24 director report? Okay, we're gonna move on to item number 3,
25 discussion, public comment, and for possible action.

1 Continued discussion regarding the establishment of a new
2 regulation pursuant to assembly bill 336, which requires a
3 POST commission to adopt a regulation establishing standards
4 for an annual behavior wellness visit for peace officers to
5 aid in preserving the emotional and mental health of the peace
6 officer in assessing the conditions that may affect the
7 performance of the duties by the peace officer. The draft
8 language for the proposed regulation is as follows. The
9 employee agency shall implement an annual behavior wellness
10 program for each of its officers to aid in the preserving of
11 the emotional and mental health of its officers and assessing
12 conditions that may affect the performance of duties by its
13 officers. I'm gonna turn this over to Mr. Sherlock for
14 information on this item.

15 SHERLOCK: So Mike Sherlock for the record. Again, this
16 item pertains to the workshop it's based on AB 336, man --
17 mandating that commission to exercise its regulatory function.
18 So staff would recommend that the commission continue the rule
19 making on this issue. For our benefit, we would suggest that
20 it -- there -- that the motion, if there is a motion, to
21 continue the rule making that you give us some sort of
22 direction. You know, again, we might have to have Mr.
23 Hastings in here, but a motion that allows us to use the
24 language that we presented here, there's three others, would
25 be helpful. I suppose you could have a motion that, you know,

1 continues the rule making with language consistent with the
2 proposals and, you know -- but that kind of leaves staff in
3 limbo. We don't know what to send over to LCB. But again,
4 it's -- it's up to the commission, but some direction on
5 language would help us is all -- is all I'm trying to say.

6 SOTO: Maybe language that's cons -- that's consistent
7 with the discussion that we just had on this -- on this
8 process. Right. We understand now what a visit is. We've
9 had conversation about being in agreement on that. You've
10 given us some sample language, so language that's consistent
11 with our discussion and the language provided in this packet
12 to continue through with process. Does that sound --

13 SHERLOCK: Yeah. Mike Sherlock for the record. I think
14 for us, it -- it's good. You -- you're still going to have to
15 approve it when it comes back anyway, but that would be
16 helpful to us. Is -- is that too broad or is it a --

17 HASTINGS: My -- this is Nathan Hastings for record. My
18 only concern would be whether the -- so the -- the agenda --
19 the -- the notice for the workshop, as I understand, included
20 the language -- let me frame it this way. So in -- in the --
21 in the workbook that the members have, there's the sample --
22 sorry, the sample language, that includes like two other
23 options, but that's not -- but that language -- right, I'm
24 just trying to find that page in the packet so I can refer the
25 commissioners to it, but -- okay. So it's the -- on the tab

1 that says workshop topic, it's the fourth page there. There -
2 - there's these three options that have been given by staff
3 for review. But as I understand it, what was placed in the
4 notice of the public meeting is effectively only the first of
5 those options, correct? So I don't -- I -- I -- I would be
6 hesitant to have a motion made that gave staff the direction
7 to move forward in the rule making process with anything other
8 than the language that was just in the notice, unless or until
9 the other options are -- would -- would be openly discussed in
10 the workshop, and because they haven't been to -- to this
11 point. So I guess what I'm saying is if the -- if there -- if
12 the commission had the appetite that the -- the potential
13 action under this action item would be to direct any language
14 that pertain to the other ones that would need to be openly
15 discussed in the workshop, because -- because that language
16 wasn't already included in -- in like the notice in the
17 agenda. So if the -- if the appetite is to move forward with
18 language that's similar to -- substantially similar to what
19 has been noticed, then I think you're fine. Okay. Does that
20 make sense?

21 SHERLOCK: Yeah. So Mike Sherlock for the record. And --
22 and we're -- we're good with that. I think there's no, you
23 know, preference of any of these. We're just throwing those
24 out there for the commission and if -- and if the commission
25 is okay with that language or substantial language -- 'cause

1 you know, LCB will change it. I mean there will be some
2 changes, they always do.

3 HASTINGS: Yeah.

4 SHERLOCK: But we could move forward with that if that's
5 the intent of the commission.

6 SOTO: Okay. I think I understand what you're saying
7 and I -- and I'm looking at that page and I'm -- I'm actually
8 comfortable with -- with what we have in -- in the packet to
9 just looking at our samples of what we have here. I think
10 that those -- and -- and I suppose that then I would be
11 looking for a motion -- asking for a motion to continue the
12 rulemaking process. We have language, and then we'll see what
13 comes out of LCB.

14 SHERLOCK: Yeah.

15 SOTO: So I guess that's what (inaudible) motion
16 (inaudible).

17 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney. I -- I have one question for
18 Mr. Hastings. Based upon what -- what is -- what is written
19 down here, do you feel that -- I mean do -- are you
20 comfortable with that following with NRS? I mean --

21 HASTINGS: I guess -- Nathan Hastings for the record.
22 I'll frame it this way. Based on what Mr. Sherlock has
23 explained about the way that -- during the -- during the
24 session, the fiscal note was turned back and -- and staff was
25 given to understand that particulars about, let's say adopting

1 standards or -- or mandating a particular type of visit or --
2 or standards in the way that they have, like their training
3 standards was not -- was what was not what was intended by the
4 legislature. That puts the -- that puts the commission in the
5 position of having to figure out something else that visit and
6 standards have to mean, meaning it's something different than
7 the typical kind of standards that are under like training,
8 for example. So that, yes, I think makes sense and I think
9 it's defensible. And worst case, if LCB kicks something back,
10 you're -- you're just in a place of having to say, okay, well
11 this is what LCB kicked back to us and they don't necessarily
12 agree with exactly the way you're looking at it.

13 MCKINNEY: Okay.

14 HASTINGS: Yeah.

15 MCKINNEY: Yeah. Kevin McKinney. Again, my data -- the
16 NRS, that was my concern was the visit versus program and it -
17 - it just -- I -- I'm -- I just worry that this might not be
18 in, you know, inconsistent in the language and creates a --
19 some sort of issue.

20 HASTINGS: So I will say this, I'm not making a
21 suggestion, I'm just pointing out That if you do look at the
22 section that I -- that's in your packet that I was referring
23 to earlier, which has not been noticed to the public in terms
24 of those other options. One way to look at those other
25 options is that they -- in other words, the -- the one that's

1 in the -- the agenda and the one that's option number 1,
2 amongst those options, just uses this word program. The other
3 ones -- sorry, list by saying, may include, but then listing
4 some options that theoretically can be characterized as a
5 description of standards. The word program, just itself is a
6 little bit harder admittedly, to like say that the word
7 program, you know, mean or provides standards. Whereas at the
8 very least, the other two options, what they -- what they
9 could be read to do is they're not mandating particulars, but
10 they're saying a program which may include enlists options
11 that can be seen as things that in -- within the industry have
12 been determined by the commission, which is the expert entity
13 on how to govern these things or how to -- how to -- how to
14 structure these things within the industry that -- that have
15 been seen by the commission with -- within its purview and
16 knowledge of the kinds of things that are important as quote,
17 unquote, standards.

18 SOTO: Jason Soto for the record. I think it's
19 important to point out too -- I -- I think that's the piece
20 that -- that was learned after the fact, which is a reason we
21 got that, which may include, because if you made it a
22 mandatory -- that's what I -- that's what I was pointing out
23 early on. If you made it a mandatory visit, then what you're
24 going to get is you're going to get men and women in this
25 profession going in and saying, everything's fine, that's it,

1 that's all you're gonna get. Because if they say something
2 else, then it could turn into a fitness for duty and we're
3 completely sidestepping the issue that's -- that -- that's
4 been put in front of us in the first place. Which is why I
5 think, which may include a visit. That's an important piece
6 of what we're talking about here. So you -- you give them
7 this program that you have in place. There's your -- there's
8 your mandatory piece. You might get some officers or some
9 individuals who understand that they might need a little bit
10 more than what it is -- that are off that -- that these
11 departments are offering their people and it might include a
12 visit. But then you have that confidentiality piece to where
13 you can go in and be honest about what he or she might be
14 struggling with. That's the part where I -- I think we have
15 to be really careful, and I think that was an unintended
16 consequence of when this was put together that maybe we didn't
17 -- we didn't understand as well as we understand now.

18 HASTINGS: Nathan Hastings for the record. If you do look
19 at those options in terms of, you know, language that -- that
20 the commission could direct staff to have the -- in what first
21 goes to LCB in the draft, now part of the process, I will just
22 point out and I apologize that I didn't notice this before,
23 but like option number 1 uses the language, an annual
24 behavioral wellness program, but the -- that key term
25 behavioral wellness, whereas the -- these draft options of two

1 and three are saying mental health wellness. I would just
2 suggest that if the commission does have an appetite to go
3 forward and have a motion that directs language towards like
4 those second or third option, that the term be behavioral
5 wellness not mental health because behavioral wellness is the
6 term that's in the statute. So -- and then I'll -- I'll --
7 just this last comment on that point is that I think even
8 though the agenda didn't have those options in them, if one of
9 you in making a motion, or if in the discussion part before a
10 motion, you can get that language just kind of on the record
11 then I think you're fine. If that makes sense. And I'm happy
12 to answer any clarifying questions about that.

13 SOTO: And I think that does make sense. And I agree
14 -- I would agree the behavioral health. So again, there just
15 such a stigma around all of this, that --

16 HASTINGS: Just to clarify. If -- if -- if someone -- if
17 -- if the commission -- if there's a motion and the commission
18 takes action to direct staff to move forward in the rulemaking
19 process by sending language to LCB, even though what was in
20 the agenda was just language -- was the language that that's
21 in italic in the notice part of the agenda, if -- if you read
22 into the record that based on the -- 'cause that's what public
23 comment hearings are all about is providing an opportunity to
24 potentially modify what you've got in your notice before it
25 goes to LCB, that's the whole point of giving public comment,

1 even the comment and discussion of the Board -- or the
2 commission, I'm sorry. So if -- if -- like I said, if -- if
3 the appetite is to direct the -- to direct staff to move
4 forward in the rule making process by using some of this
5 additional language, just put it in the record and in your
6 motion.

7 SOTO: Okay. I think we got that. So -- so then what
8 I would be looking for is a motion to continue the rule making
9 process with -- with language that's consistent with what we
10 have here in front of us, and I -- I -- I like the term
11 wellness -- behavioral wellness and not (inaudible).

12 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney for the record. I as well, I
13 believe, but behavior wellness is a more inclusive word than
14 mental health 'cause it encompasses emotional, other issues
15 that occur.

16 SOTO: Okay. All right. So then I guess that's what
17 I'm looking for is a -- is a motion.

18 PROSSER: So for clarification, were you guys talking
19 about removing emotional mental health in -- instead of that -
20 - that those four words putting in behavioral wellness?

21 SOTO: Yes. I mean, you could still have mental
22 health in the -- in the description, I mean -- but I -- I
23 think the -- I -- I like the -- I like the -- the -- the first
24 pull where it says, annual behavioral wellness program. That
25 just --

1 SHERLOCK: Yeah. Mike Sherlock for the record. So if
2 we're -- if you wanna stay consistent with the -- the bill
3 itself, behavioral health wellness is -- is consistent with
4 that language. But further on where you're talking -- the --
5 preserving the emotional mental health of the peace officer,
6 that's also in the language of the bill, so I think --

7 SOTO: Yeah.

8 SHERLOCK: -- both of them are okay there. Yeah.

9 MCKINNEY: Okay.

10 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney for the record. I'll -- I'll
11 make a motion that we continue with the rule making process
12 with this language, the employing agency shall implement a
13 behavioral health wellness program, which may include, but not
14 limited to an annual evaluation for each officer, peer support
15 programs, suicide prevention, psychological services, stress
16 management, and employee assistance programs to aid in
17 preserving the emotional and mental health of the peace
18 officer and assessing conditions that may affect the
19 performance of duties by the peace officer.

20 SOTO: Motion to second.

21 TROUTEN: Ty Trouten for the record. I would be willing
22 to second if there's the insertion of the annual behavioral
23 wellness program that was admitted on the first part.

24 HASTINGS: Nathan Hastings. I think that's a good point
25 because the -- that -- the word annual is in the statute and -

1 - and that was in your option that was already in the agenda.

2 So I think that --

3 TROUTEN: Could I -- do I need to reread the -- or just -

4 -

5 HASTINGS: I think you can just say, I'm in my motion

6 consistent with what he -- with his --

7 TROUTEN: I -- I will amend my motion to include an

8 annual behavioral health wellness program.

9 HASTINGS: Okay.

10 SOTO: So I have a motion and second. All those in

11 favor say, aye.

12 MEMBERS: Aye.

13 SOTO: Motion carries unanimously. Thank you. All

14 right. Item number 4, discussion, public comment, and for

15 possible action requests from Pershing County Sheriff's office

16 for a six month extension pursuant to NRS 289.550 for the

17 following deputies to meet the certification requirement.

18 Deputies Zach Newman, hire date July 21st -- first, 2021

19 extension of January 21st, 2023. Deputy Dawn Noble, hired

20 date February 16th, 2022 extension to August 2023. Is there

21 any he -- is there anyone here from Pershing County available

22 or that wants to speak on this topic?

23 SHERLOCK: Chief, apparently they have called and said,

24 they're not gonna make it so I can give you a quick synopsis

25 on their request.

1 SOTO: Okay. Sure.

2 SHERLOCK: So we received a request. This is from the
3 Undersheriff Blon --Blondheim (phonetic). Deputy Newman,
4 again, was employed in July of 2021, was released -- recently
5 released from NNLEA for failure to meet standards and so that
6 -- that year is quickly coming up and they're gonna have to
7 put him back through an academy. Deputy Noble was employed in
8 February, but has not been able to intend -- attend an academy
9 due to continuous complications from COVID, and then there's
10 the issue of start dates and that kind of thing. So based on
11 what's going on in terms of hiring and that kind of thing,
12 staff would recommend that the extension is granted by the
13 commission.

14 SOTO: Okay. So I'm looking for a motion to grant a
15 six month extension for Deputy Zack Newman and Deputy Dawn
16 Noble.

17 ALLEN: Mike Allen, I'll make the motion to extend the
18 six month extension for the POST requirements for Deputy Zach
19 Newman and Deputy Dawn Noble.

20 SOTO: So I have motion, looking for a second.

21 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser for second.

22 SOTO: Motion to second. All those in favor, say aye.

23 MEMBERS: Aye.

24 SOTO: Opposed.

25 SHEA: AYE.

1 SOTO: Motion carries. Let's see. Item number 5,
2 discussion, public comment, and for possible action. Just a
3 note, commission may not act on any matter considered under
4 this item until the matter is specifically included on an
5 agenda as an action item. Do we have any public comment
6 today? Okay. Seems as there's none. Moving on to item
7 number 6, discussion, public comment, and for possible action,
8 schedule of an upcoming commission meeting. And I'm turn this
9 over to Mike Sherlock on information related upcoming
10 commission meeting dates.

11 SHERLOCK: So Mike Sherlock for the record. So we would
12 recommend our next meeting date be November 17th, say 9 a.m.
13 at South Point in Las Vegas. This coincides with the
14 Sheriff's and Chiefs annual conference, and lead of course,
15 they were able to secure room for us on the 17th, which would
16 be the morning after the last day that conference, so we would
17 recommend that we do our meeting at that time.

18 SOTO: So I'm looking for a motion then to schedule
19 the next meeting for November 17th, 2022. Did you say 9 a.m.?

20 SHERLOCK: 9 a.m.

21 SOTO: 9 a.m., Las Vegas, South Point.

22 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser, makes the motion.

23 SOTO: I have a motion to get a second.

24 NIEL: Russ Niel, I'll second.

25 SOTO: Motion to second. All those in favor, say aye.

1 MEMBERS: Aye.

2 SOTO: Motion carries unanimously. And item number -
3 7, discussion, public comment and for possible action. I'm
4 looking for a motion to adjourn.

5 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser, moves to adjourn.

6 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, I'll second.

7 SOTO: All this in favor say, aye.

8 MEMBERS: Aye.

9 SOTO: Adjourned. Thank you everyone. (inaudible).

10 FLOYD: Thank you, Chief Shea, you are off the hook.
11 Have a good.

12 SHEA: Thank you. Bye. Bye.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25