

## Commission Meeting – February 5, 2025

Commission meeting started at 1:00 p.m., Commission Chairman Chief Trouten called the meeting to order.

Immediately after the call to order, Chief Trouten called for a moment of silence to be held for fallen officer Jason Roscow from the North Las Vegas Police Department.

Audio picked up at 1:14 with Chief Floyd putting on record the posting locations of the agenda.

## 1 STATE OF NEVADA

## 2 COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

3  
4 A Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Commission  
5 on Peace Officer Standards and Training was held on Wednesday,  
6 February 5, 2025 commencing at 1:00 p.m. at 5587 Wa Pai Shone  
7 Avenue, Carson City, Nevada.

8  
9 COMMISSIONERS:

10 Tyler Trouten, Chairman

11 Dan Coverley

12 Kevin McKinney

13 Oliver Miller

14 Russ Niel

15 Jamie Prosser

16 Tim Shea

17 Rob Straube

18 George Togliatti

19 Tiffany Young

## 20 STAFF:

21 Kathy Floyd, POST F

22 Geordan Goebel, Attorney General's Office

23 Mike Sherlock, POST F

24  
25 TRANSCRIBED BY: Marsha Steverman-Meech

## INDEX

ITEM: PAGE:

## REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Call to Order  | 4  |
| 2. Roll call of Commission Members  | 4  |
| 3. Public Comment   | 5  |
| 4. Approval of minutes from the October 17, 2024 regularly<br>scheduled POST Commission meeting   | 6  |
| 5. Executive Director's Report  | 6  |
| 6. Policy change related to the processing of Gross<br>Misdemeanor convictions of peace officers (NAC<br>289.390(1)(e)).  | 11 |
| 7. Request from the Boulder City Police Department for an<br>Executive Certificate for their employee Chief Timothy<br>Shea, pursuant to NAC 289.270(1)(b).             | 13 |
| 8. Request from the Boulder City Police Department for an<br>Executive Certificate for their employee Lieutenant<br>Thomas Healing, pursuant to NAC 289.270(1)(a).      | 14 |
| 9. Request from the North Las Vegas Police Department for<br>an Executive Certificate for their employee Captain<br>Mario Perez, pursuant to NAC 289.279(1)(a).         | 15 |
| 10. Request from the Eleventh Judicial District Youth and<br>Family Services for a 6-month extension past the one-year<br>requirement (NRS 289.55) in order to meet the |    |

1	requirements for certification for their employee Deputy	
2	Chief Juvenile Probation Officer Nicole Mathias.	16
3	11. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(i) on the revocation	
4	of Charles N. Beck's Category I and III basic	
5	certificate(s).	17
6	12. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.390(1)(g) and NAC	
7	289.290(1)(i) on the revocation of Lejohshona Bess's	
8	Category III basic certificate.	19
9	13. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(e) on the revocation	
10	of Mark A. Lawson's Category I basic certificate.	20
11	14. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(g) on the revocation	
12	of De'Wayne Lyons's Category III basic certificate.	25
13	15. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(g) on the revocation	
14	of Dario A. Sanchez's Category III basic certificate.	25
15	16. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(g) on the revocation	
16	of Andrew L. Trujillo's Category III basic certificate.	26
17	17. Public Comment	27
18	18. Schedule upcoming Commission Meeting	27
19	19. Adjournment	28

## PROCEEDINGS

FLOYD: Meeting agenda has been posted in compliance with NRS 241.020. The agenda was physically posted at the POST Administration Building and the Nevada State Library in Carson City, and electronically posted at post.nv.gov, State of Nevada website at notice.nv.gov, and emailed to all single point of contacts and administrators on the POST listserv.

TROUTEN: Thank you. We will now commence with roll call. I'm Ty Trouten from Elko Police Department.

STRAUBE: Rob Straube, City of Las Vegas Department of Public Safety.

PROSSER: Jamie Prosser, Las Vegas Metro.

COVERLEY: Dan Coverley, Douglas County.

TOGLIATTI: George Togliatti, Nevada Department of Public Safety.

MILLER: Oliver Miller, Reno Police Department.

MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, Carlin Police Department.

NIEL: Russ Niel, State Gambling.

SHEA: Tim Shea, Boulder City Police.

YOUNG: Tiffany Young, community member.

FLOYD: Kathy Floyd with POST.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock from POST.

GOEBEL: Geordan Goebel, Attorney General's Office.

1 TROUTEN: Thank you. I believe we are all  
2 present. Outstanding. We'll now move on to public comment.  
3 Commission may not take any action on any matter considered  
4 under this item until that matter is specifically included on a  
5 future agenda as an action item. There will be another  
6 opportunity for public comment at the end of the meeting. If  
7 you wish to make public comment, if you would please come up to  
8 the table, speak loudly into the microphone and state your name  
9 before presenting your views. Do we have any public comment?

10 JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Commission, Aaron  
11 Johnson, Boulder City Police Department. I'd like to make  
12 comment on Item Number 7. I take full responsibility for that  
13 one. That is my fault. An officer came up to me a month or so  
14 ago and suggested that he realized that Chief Shea was eligible  
15 for his executive certificate, asked me what I thought and I  
16 said let's put him in for it. And last week when my boss saw  
17 the agenda item, he was less than pleased. So I just want to  
18 make sure for the record that this is my fault. I apologize.  
19 Thank you.

20 TROUTEN: Thank you.

21 SHEA: Former Deputy Chief Johnson (inaudible)  
22 to the desert for his protection hearing.

23 TROUTEN: Is there any additional public comment?  
24 All right, hearing none, we'll close public comment, move on to  
25 Item 4, discussion, public comment, and for possible actions,

1 approval of the minutes from October 17, 2024, regularly  
2 scheduled POST Commission meeting. Ask first, and I think we  
3 have a little snafu on the packet that they were there then not  
4 there. Has the Board been able to read the minutes or see the  
5 minutes? So this may be an item we'll have the table for next  
6 time and do two in a row.

7 SHERLOCK: If they didn't see it, right?

8 FLOYD: No, the book that had the minutes was  
9 taken down yesterday. So if nobody read them before yesterday,  
10 then no, they're not there. They will be up this afternoon  
11 though.

12 TROUTEN: (Inaudible.) Okay. So for that we'll  
13 just take no action, let it come back around to us unless  
14 somebody has anything contrary to that. All right, we'll move  
15 on then to Item 5, information, Executive Director's Report.

16 SHERLOCK: Thanks. Mike Sherlock for the record.  
17 So we are entering the fun time of legislative session, both in  
18 terms of bills and budget. Just real quick, we're hopeful that  
19 our request that was approved through the Governor's budget  
20 remains, which specifically we're interested in that new data  
21 management program that was approved. So we're hoping it stays  
22 there through final approval of that budget in terms of that  
23 particular item. In terms of bills, you know, we received  
24 fiscal notes, we've received quite a few, but nothing earth  
25 shattering in terms of bills. We have seen a couple bills

1 adding peace officers such as an IG, bill to create an IG  
2 Office, which would be in this bill, Category II, officers  
3 upgrading Department of Insurance Investigators to Category II  
4 officers. No real impact on us in terms of budget currently.  
5 It was a little surprising in the past, the legislature has made  
6 it clear that there was no desire to add peace officers, so  
7 these bills are a little unusual I think from that perspective  
8 but nothing, again, too earth shattering. We received or we're  
9 looking for comments on a bill to add human trafficking training  
10 to law enforcement dispatchers, both at the basic training level  
11 and as an annual requirement. Again, no real fiscal impact for  
12 us because we already do that in other disciplines. Once again,  
13 there's a bill to allow non-citizens to be eligible for  
14 employment as peace officers. That bill specifically directs  
15 the Commission in its current form right now, and it's early,  
16 we've already provided some feedback, but prohibits the  
17 commission from prohibiting legal, resident non-citizens from  
18 being peace officers. Currently, statute and regulations  
19 require citizenship. I know we talked about this last time with  
20 the last bill and not sure where the Sheriffs and Chiefs will  
21 be. Our position is always that you don't take away our ability  
22 to do a thorough and complete background on a law enforcement or  
23 policing applicant, and we'll see what happens. I will say the  
24 difference between this bill and the last bill is it does make  
25 specific that they have to be legal residents of the United



1 States so it would limit it to green card holders, permanent  
2 residence. I've said in the past, and we've talked about it in  
3 the past, that the California rule that recently passed says you  
4 have to be a legal resident, a green card holder who is eligible  
5 for naturalization. That's a little bit better position from  
6 our perspective because if you understand immigration law, you  
7 aren't eligible for naturalization till five years of holding  
8 that green card. So that would allow at least five years of  
9 background on that applicant, should we move away from the  
10 citizenship requirement. There are other issues, as I know you  
11 know, where an oath office is required. It does sort of put a  
12 block on things because Supreme Court's pretty clear that an  
13 oath of office is ineffective if they're not a citizen of the  
14 country they're making the oath to, and so we'll see how that  
15 happens or how that plays out. I can tell you that SB2 in  
16 California, that agencies that require an oath of office are not  
17 mandated to allow non-citizen applicants. I can't say what  
18 we'll do here in Nevada when it comes to that, if it comes to  
19 that. And who knows again, yeah, it's early in the session,  
20 we'll see what happens with that. I don't recall any other real  
21 directly related bills so far that have come through. We've  
22 gotten a lot of fiscal note requests, but nothing that directly  
23 affects POST or certification or policing from our training  
24 standpoint. So we'll see what happens. We're currently  
25 administering a couple new grants that we recently received.

1 One of those we're going to present training via an outside  
2 vendor that addresses sort of the high-level management or  
3 creation of a wellness program within a policing agency, so look  
4 for that training course to come out very soon. The intent is  
5 to help agencies meet the requirements of the mental wellness or  
6 behavioral wellness requirements passed in AB 336 a couple  
7 sessions ago. That training will be coming out very soon. We  
8 just received the money today actually. We are expanding or  
9 increasing some of our reality based or scenario based training  
10 equipment and at the same time, looking to loan some of our  
11 training equipment that does not meet our basic training needs  
12 anymore out to agencies to allow them to use those resources. I  
13 just want to get out there that we have 16 stress vests that are  
14 in really basically brand new shape. These are shock vests if  
15 people don't know what the training vests are. They just don't  
16 meet our needs. Our academies are too big now. We have 16 of  
17 'em and it is hard to change 'em out constantly for trainees,  
18 but they would be a great training tool or training aid for  
19 individual agencies should they need them or should they want  
20 them, and we'll probably give those out via lottery or something  
21 like that. But get ahold of us on those. We also have two milo  
22 simulators, use-of-force simulators that we are looking to loan  
23 out. We've moved to VR programs for our use-of-force type  
24 training. Again, these are great training aids and we'd be  
25 looking to permanently loan these to an agency that could make

1 use of those. So don't be afraid to get ahold of us for that  
2 stuff. In the interest of time, I'll leave it at that and send  
3 it back to you, Chairman.

4 TROUTEN: Thank you. Director Sherlock, just  
5 looking through the packet again, I know this question -- I  
6 believe Jamie brought this up last time about what happens with  
7 entities that are not meeting the audits, what the follow up  
8 looks like, what the accountability is on them, and I noticed on  
9 this one we had -- again looks like a consistent theme of issues  
10 with backgrounds and then one with training.

11 SHERLOCK: Yeah. Thank you. That is one thing I  
12 wanted to bring. Mike Sherlock for the record. So, you know,  
13 we talked last time and we are seeing some issues. Just to give  
14 the Commission a sort of background, by statute we are mandated  
15 to audit academies annually so every academy we audit annually,  
16 once a year. Agencies, we inspect, as the statute says, and  
17 audit for compliance with the provisions of the chapter, one  
18 third a year. So every three years an agency will be audited  
19 for compliance, background, that type of thing. Agencies that  
20 fail the background then are audited, you know, after 90 days to  
21 see if they're backing compliance and so you don't wait three  
22 years. But we still are seeing repeat offenders in terms of  
23 backgrounds and we are looking -- and we're hoping for the  
24 support of the Commission on this as sort of a remedy. We are  
25 looking at those, by policy, those repeat offenders that don't

1 seem to catch up with what the regulations require to require  
2 them to provide to us those backgrounds real time. So after  
3 failing twice, we would then require that they provide proof  
4 that they are meeting the regulatory requirement instead of  
5 waiting to go do another audit but in real time. And we think  
6 hopefully -- and for us it's about education. A lot of times  
7 there's some misunderstanding in what the regulatory  
8 requirements are, and we think that that sort of real-time  
9 feedback from us would help those agencies that are repeat  
10 offenders to come into compliance. Let's be honest, we don't  
11 have any real teeth, anything like that other than, you know,  
12 public documents that record those violations of the regulations  
13 but we feel that if we're able to look at those real time, we  
14 can, again, educate the agencies on what is required under the  
15 regulations and get them into compliance.

16 TROUTEN: Any questions, comments from the Board  
17 about information? All right, hearing none, we'll move on to  
18 Item Number 6. This is for discussion and possible action,  
19 update regarding gross misdemeanor convictions process or the  
20 process related to employing agencies and revocations for this  
21 Board. I'll go over to Director Sherlock for some background,  
22 please.

23 SHERLOCK: Sure. So Mike Sherlock for the record.  
24 So after last session we came back and reviewed the issues  
25 related to gross misdemeanors and again, in the interest of

1 time, I'll keep this super short. Let me just say that a  
2 regulation change is not prudent, but we believe the process, we  
3 hope in providing you with a list of the criminal convictions  
4 that are coming before us prior to going to an agenda item and  
5 prior to a hearing, providing that information to the Commission  
6 and their status in terms of employment or any other inquiries  
7 you might have, you can get back to us on using that document.  
8 Again, without getting into the weeds, based on what the  
9 comments were last meeting, we're hoping that this sort of  
10 covers the concerns the Commission may have with gross  
11 misdemeanor convictions, and will suffice to meet those needs  
12 that, that were expressed in lieu of a regulation change.

13 TROUTEN: Thank you, Director, and I do appreciate  
14 the information of seeing the cases that are coming before us  
15 potentially that have been reported but are still awaiting  
16 adjudication, things like that. I think that really helps us  
17 kind of see a picture of what's going on. Are there comments or  
18 questions from the Board on this matter? Okay, hearing none, I  
19 don't know that there's necessarily any action to take. I think  
20 we'll try this for a while and make sure that we're getting this  
21 information, see what's going and see if that fulfills the  
22 needs.

23 SHERLOCK: So again, Mike Sherlock for the record.  
24 From a staff perspective, we'd like to see a motion that we

1 continue with this document in lieu of the regulation change and  
2 see if that works.

3 TROUTEN: All right, then I would entertain a  
4 motion.

5 COVERLEY: Dan Coverley. So moved.

6 TROUTEN: I have a motion. Do I have a second?

7 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney. I'll second.

8 TROUTEN: There's a motion and a second to  
9 continue with the document. Any further discussion? All Board  
10 members vote by saying aye.

11 MEMBERS: Aye.

12 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye.  
13 Motion carries. Move on to Item 7. This is a good one.  
14 Appreciate you leading this way, Chief Shea, that is good.  
15 Request from the Boulder City Police Department for an executive  
16 certificate for their employee Chief Timothy Shea, pursuant to  
17 NAC 289.270(1)(b). Possible action may include approval or  
18 denial of the requested executive certificate. Director  
19 Sherlock.

20 SHERLOCK: So, thank you, Mike Sherlock for the  
21 record. So staff has reviewed the application for Chief Shea  
22 for an executive certificate. I have had some talks with Chief  
23 Shea about some of our concerns, mostly his short time on the  
24 job in law enforcement, but we did find that despite the  
25 conspiracy apparently that prompted this, we do find that Chief

1 Shea meets or exceeds the requirements of the executive  
2 certificate and the staff would recommend that the Commission  
3 approve that certificate.

4 TROUTEN: Outstanding. Is there a motion from the  
5 Board?

6 YOUNG: (Inaudible) to approve.

7 TROUTEN: Thank you. Do I have a second?

8 NIEL: Russ Niel. I second.

9 TROUTEN: Have a motion and a second. All those  
10 in favor please signify by saying aye.

11 MEMBERS: Aye.

12 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye.  
13 Congratulations, Chief. Item number 8, request from the Boulder  
14 City Police Department for an executive certificate for their  
15 employee Lieutenant Thomas Healing pursuant to NAC  
16 289.270(1)(a). Possible action may include approval or denial  
17 of the requested executive certificate. Director Sherlock.

18 SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. Not sure  
19 if the lieutenant was part of that conspiracy, but staff has  
20 reviewed Lieutenant Thomas Healing's application for an  
21 executive certificate and find he meet the requirements and  
22 would recommend the Commission approve.

23 TROUTEN: Thank you. Do we have a motion?

24 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, I'll move.

25 TROUTEN: And do we have a second?

1 COVERLEY: Dan Coverley, second.

2 TROUTEN: Motion and second to grant. All those  
3 in favor please signify by saying aye.

4 MEMBERS: Aye.

5 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye. Item  
6 9, request from North Las Vegas Police Department for an  
7 executive certificate for their employee Captain Mario Perez  
8 Pursuant to NAC 289.270(1)(a). Possible action may include  
9 approval or denial of requested executive certificate. Once  
10 again, Director Sherlock.

11 SHERLOCK: Thank you. Mike Sherlock for the  
12 record, staff has reviewed Captain Mario Perez's application for  
13 an executive certificate and find he does meet the requirements  
14 and would recommend the Commission approve that certificate.

15 TROUTEN: Thank you. Any discussion? If not,  
16 would entertain a motion to approve.

17 SHEA: Tim Shea. I'll make a motion to  
18 approve.

19 TROUTEN: Thank you, sir. Do we have a second?

20 MILLER: Oliver Miller. Second.

21 TROUTEN: Thank you. We have motion, second to  
22 approve. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

23 MEMBERS: Aye.

24 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye.  
25 Motion carries. Just take a second to commend those



1 individuals, all of them. I love it when I see these  
2 certificates coming up and also monthly postings of people who  
3 are working on their intermediates and advanced. That's  
4 excellent. Move on to Item 10, discussion for possible action,  
5 request from the 11th Judicial District Youth and Family  
6 Services for a six-month extension past the one-year  
7 requirement, NRS 289.550, in order to meet the requirements for  
8 certification for their employee, Deputy Chief Juvenile  
9 Probation Officer Nicole Mathias, hire date January 15, 2024,  
10 extension to July 15, 2025. Possible action may include  
11 approval or denial of the requested extension. Is there anyone  
12 here to speak on her behalf from that department?

13 SHERLOCK: Chief, Mike Sherlock for the record. So  
14 they had sent the letter, I think it's in your book. Staff  
15 would recommend the extension of time. In this particular case,  
16 I believe the applicant was injured was part of the delay and  
17 frankly, here at POST, we're struggling with getting the numbers  
18 necessary to have an academy for the CAT IIs. We just don't  
19 hire enough particularly in the north and that's been some of  
20 our time. So when you combine the injury from the last academy  
21 and our inability to have enough bodies to start a new academy,  
22 we do have one starting in March perhaps if we get the numbers,  
23 so that's been part of the delay. So staff would recommend the  
24 extension of time in this particular case for this CAT II  
25 certificate applicant.

1 TROUTEN: All right, thank you sir. Are there  
2 questions, concerns? Public comments? Is there a motion from  
3 the Board.

4 COVERLEY: Dan Coverley, so moved.

5 TROUTEN: Okay, we have a motion to extend. Is  
6 there a second?

7 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser, second.

8 TROUTEN: All right, motion, second. All those in  
9 favor please signify by saying aye.

10 MEMBERS: Aye.

11 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye.  
12 Thank you. Item 11, discussion for possible action, hearing  
13 pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(i) on the revocation of Charles N.  
14 Beck's, formerly employed with the Fallon Police Department,  
15 Category I and III basic certificates based on a conviction of  
16 misdemeanor crime of domestic violence as defined in 18 U.S.C  
17 921(a)(33). The conviction that have led to this are Count II:  
18 battery that constitutes domestic violence. First offense,  
19 violation of NRS 200.485(1)(A), 200.481 and 33.018, a  
20 misdemeanor. Possible action may be revocation of the Category  
21 I and III basic certificates, and I'll turn this over to our  
22 Attorney General's representative.

23 GOEBEL: Thanks, Commissioner, Geordan Goebel for  
24 the record. Although we're on item 11 in your booklet, we have  
25 revocation items 11 through 16. Each one of those in the

1 booklet has individualized exhibits specific to that agenda  
2 item. All of those exhibits, I'm going to be asking Chief Floyd  
3 a few questions for foundation authenticity and due process. So  
4 with that, Chief Floyd, the records and exhibits that are  
5 contained in these materials where the offense is addressed in  
6 agenda items 11 through 16, did you obtain those records and  
7 exhibits directly from the courts or employing agencies?

8 FLOYD: Yes I did.

9 GOEBEL: Have you maintained those documents in  
10 ordinary course of your record keeping since you obtained them  
11 from the courts and agencies?

12 FLOYD: Yes, I have.

13 GOEBEL: And are the versions of those documents  
14 that are contained in the meeting materials here true and  
15 accurate copies of those materials?

16 FLOYD: Yes, they are.

17 GOEBEL: With that, these documents are valid  
18 public records and may be considered by the Commission for the  
19 agenda items 11 through 16.

20 TROUTEN: Thank you, sir. Are there any questions  
21 or comments from the Board overall on these documents? Are  
22 there any questions or comments specific to Mr. Charles N. Beck  
23 and his POST Category I and III certificates? Public comment?  
24 Hearing none, I would ask for a motion from the Board.

25 SHEA: Tim Shea, I'll make a motion to revoke.

1 TROUTEN: Have a motion to revoke by Tim Shea. Is  
2 there a second.

3 NIEL: Russ Niel, I second.

4 TROUTEN: Thank you. All those in favor please  
5 signify by saying aye.

6 MEMBERS: Aye.

7 TROUTEN: Any opposed? I also vote aye. Thank  
8 you. Onto Item Number 12, this is discussion and for possible  
9 action, hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(g), and NAC  
10 289.290(1)(i) on the revocation, I'm going to kill that name,  
11 Lejohshona -- I slaughtered that, Lejohshona Bess's, formerly  
12 employed with the Nevada Department of Corrections, Category III  
13 basic certificate based on a conviction of or entry of a plea of  
14 guilty, guilty but mentally ill, or nolo contendere to a felony  
15 and conviction of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence. The  
16 convictions which have led to this action are Count I: coercion,  
17 a Category B felony in violation of NRS 207.190 and NOC 53159;  
18 and Count II: battery constituting domestic violence misdemeanor  
19 in violation of NRS 200.485(1)(A), 200.481(1)(A), 33.018, and  
20 NOC 50235. Action can be for revocation or not of the Category  
21 III basic certificate. Again, we've already had background  
22 information spoken about so we can move on to the Board. Is  
23 there any comment or questions from the Board relative to this  
24 certificate? Public comments on this side? Hearing none, would  
25 entertain a motion from the Board relative to this certificate.

1 COVERLEY: Dan Coverley, make a motion to revoke.

2 TROUTEN: We have a motion to revoke. Do we have  
3 a second?

4 YOUNG: Tiffany Young, I second.

5 TROUTEN: Thank you. Motion and a second. All  
6 those in favor of revocation please signify by saying aye.

7 MEMBERS: Aye.

8 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye.  
9 Motion carries. Item 13, hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(e)  
10 on the revocation of Mark A. Lawson's formerly employed with the  
11 University Police Department-Northern Command Category I basic  
12 certificate based on a conviction of, or entry of a plea of  
13 guilty, guilty but mentally ill, or nolo contendere to a gross  
14 misdemeanor. The convictions, let's see, is that a conviction  
15 or? The conviction that led to this action are Count I:  
16 conspiracy to possess a drug that may not be introduced into  
17 interstate commerce in violation of NRS 454.351(1) and NRS  
18 199.480(3)(g), a gross misdemeanor. Possible action may be  
19 revocation of the Category I basic certificate, and then also I  
20 do believe there is a letter attached to this one in the packet  
21 where he has articulated he is willing to surrender his  
22 certificate.

23 SHERLOCK: Yeah, Mike Sherlock for the record. So  
24 staff wouldn't be opposed to tabling or continuing this  
25 particular hearing. He has indicated that he is willing to

1 voluntarily surrender his certificate, which would not require a  
2 hearing, and if the Commission's willing to do that, we're not  
3 opposed to that. We can reach out to him and go from there and  
4 voluntary surrender that certificate rather throughout here.

5 TROUTEN: And then does that still require that  
6 his name goes on the National Decertification Index?

7 SHERLOCK: It does, yes.

8 TROUTEN: Thank you. Are there questions,  
9 comments, discussion from the Board?

10 SHEA: Tim Shea. I just have a question. On a  
11 case like this, this is one of the ones we were talking about  
12 previously because it's a gross misdemeanor, we would have  
13 something from the Department indicating either they opposed or  
14 proved it, or they only send us something if the proposed  
15 (inaudible).

16 SHERLOCK: So Mike Sherlock for the record. So  
17 this would be a good example why we recommended not changing the  
18 regulation to allow you as a Commission to make decisions and in  
19 this case, it's like every other gross misdemeanor we've dealt  
20 with in the last 20 years. There's only been 18 of them. The  
21 person has been terminated from their employment. There is no  
22 employer to recommend action or that would want to recommend  
23 action based on that termination. In this case, it's an  
24 interesting case because the investigating agency actually  
25 contacted us wanting to know why this person has not been on the

1 agenda for revocation and so yes, this is a good example of why  
2 we're suggesting maybe the document that we produce is better  
3 suited for your purpose for these type of cases. In this case,  
4 this person is willing to voluntarily surrender their  
5 certificate, which sort of -- it's the whole argument anyway in  
6 terms of bringing them before you with or without the agency.  
7 And so again, we're not opposed to -- staff would support  
8 allowing him the opportunity to voluntarily surrender.

9 TROUTEN: So I guess my preference would be that  
10 any motion then would indicate that if the Board chooses to go  
11 this way, that the surrender of the certificate must occur prior  
12 to the need to agendize next Commission meeting.

13 SHERLOCK: Sure.

14 TROUTEN: And does not take place before then, so  
15 that we know that it goes back up for revocation.

16 SHERLOCK: Correct.

17 TROUTEN: Any comments?

18 SHEA: So he's changed his mind over the  
19 letter?

20 SHERLOCK: So Mike Sherlock for the record. And  
21 for due diligence, we have to notify people of the hearing. He  
22 was notified and his letter was in response to the notification  
23 of the revocation hearing. And so in that letter, as you can  
24 see, he's asking, you know, if we not do the hearing, he's

1 willing to voluntarily surrender to avoid the hearing  
2 essentially is what he's asking.

3 SHEA: By writing this letter to you and your  
4 staff to review this case, I was hoping you reconsidered not to  
5 revoke my Nevada POST certification based on a few different  
6 points of clarification and other factors I would consider  
7 honorable. So he's changed his mind from that statement?

8 FLOYD: It's later on in the letter.

9 SHERLOCK: He changes -- Mike Sherlock for the  
10 record. I believe he changed his mind mid-letter, but --

11 COVERLEY: I'm ready for a motion.

12 SHERLOCK: Yeah, he's saying -- again, not  
13 understanding the full process, staff doesn't have the ability  
14 to, you know, conduct a hearing and he doesn't understand that.  
15 But in the letter, he eventually says he's willing to  
16 voluntarily surrender. We want to give him that opportunity.

17 FLOYD: At the end of the letter.

18 SHERLOCK: At the end of the letter.

19 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser. He also says in the  
20 letter that he's trying to fight the conviction. So is he going  
21 to hold onto the certificate until that process is done?

22 SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. Again,  
23 I'm not sure. So just for your perspective, if he does overturn  
24 that conviction and he wants to bring that before you, you do  
25 have the authority to get it back to him anyway. So it's sort



1 of again, he may be trying to do that, you know, it doesn't  
2 change -- it won't affect him.

3 PROSSER: Jamie Prosser moves to allow the  
4 gentleman to turn in his certificate.

5 TROUTEN: Is there a second?

6 MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney. I'll second.

7 TROUTEN: I have a motion and a second to allow  
8 Mr. Lawson to surrender his certificate. All those in favor,  
9 please say aye.

10 MEMBERS: Aye.

11 TROUTEN: Are there any opposed? And I also vote  
12 aye. Thank you. And now to Item 14, discussion --

13 YOUNG: I'm sorry. This is Tiffany Young. Does  
14 the motion need to include that if it's not turned in that it  
15 comes back before the Commission?

16 TROUTEN: Because we've already had the vote and  
17 aware of it, I guess if we don't see it next time, it just goes  
18 on the agenda.

19 SHERLOCK: So Mike Sherlock for the record. Again,  
20 by regulation, we will bring it back to you even without that on  
21 there to allow you to make that decision.

22 YOUNG: Okay.

23 TROUTEN: So it'll be back on the agenda if he  
24 doesn't do it.

25 YOUNG: Thank you.

1           TROUTEN:           Item 14, discussion, possible action  
2 hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(g) on the revocation of  
3 De'Wayne Lyons's, formerly employed with the Nevada Department  
4 of Corrections, Category III basic certificate based on the  
5 conviction of or entry of a plea of guilty, guilty but mentally  
6 ill, or nolo contendere to a felony. The convictions which have  
7 led to this action are Count I: furnishing a weapon, facsimile,  
8 intoxicant, or controlled substance to state prisoner, Category  
9 B Felony, in violation of NRS 212.160(1)(a), NOC 53434, action  
10 of the Category III basic certificate. We've already gone  
11 through the documentation side so I'll open this up to the Board  
12 for comments, questions, and discussion. Hearing none, is there  
13 any comment from the public on this matter? Hearing none, open  
14 for a motion.

15           MCKINNEY:           Kevin McKinney, I move to revoke.

16           TROUTEN:           Have a motion to revoke. Is there a  
17 second?

18           NIEL:           Russ Niel. I second.

19           TROUTEN:           Motion and second. All in favor of  
20 revocation, please signify by saying aye.

21           MEMBERS:           Aye.

22           TROUTEN:           Any opposed? I also vote aye. Item 15,  
23 discussion and for possible action, hearing pursuant to NAC  
24 289.290(1)(g) on the revocation of Dario A. Sanchez's, formerly  
25 employed with the Nevada Department of Corrections, Category III

1 basic certificate based on the conviction of or entry of a plea  
2 of guilty, guilty but mentally ill, or nolo contendere to a  
3 felony. The convictions which led to this action are Count I:  
4 oppression under color of office with use of physical force,  
5 Category D Felony, in violation of NRS 197.200(1)(a), NRS  
6 197.200(1)(d), NRS 197.200(2)(a), NOC 52313. Action can be  
7 revocation of the Category III basic certificate. Is there any  
8 discussion or comment from the Board? Hearing none, is their  
9 comment from the public? I would entertain a motion.

10 STRAUBE: Straube. Motion to revoke.

11 TROUTEN: Motion to revoke. Do we have a second?

12 PROSSER: Prosser second.

13 TROUTEN: Motion and second. All in favor of  
14 revocation of POST certificate, please say aye.

15 MEMBERS: Aye.

16 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye.

17 Thank goodness we're on to 16, the last one of these. Hearing  
18 pursuant to NAC 289.290(1)(g) on the revocation of Andrew L.  
19 Trujillo's, formerly employed with the Nevada Department of  
20 Corrections, Category III basic certificate based on a  
21 conviction of, or entry of a plea of guilty, guilty but mentally  
22 ill, or nolo contendere to a felony. The conviction which has  
23 led to this action is Count I: oppression under color of office  
24 with use of physical force, a Category D Felony, in violation of  
25 NRS 197.200(1)(a), NRS 197.200(1)(d), NRS 197.200(2)(a), and NOC

1 52313. Possible action can be revocation of the Category III  
2 basic certificate. Discussion or comments from the Board?  
3 Discussion or comments from the public? Hearing none, I would  
4 entertain a motion.

5 MILLER: (Inaudible), I make a motion to revoke.

6 TROUTEN: Motion to revoke. Do I have a second?

7 COVERLEY: Dan Coverley, second.

8 TROUTEN: Motion and second. All those in favor  
9 of revocation please signify by saying aye.

10 MEMBERS: Aye.

11 TROUTEN: Any opposed? And I also vote aye. That  
12 moves us on to public comment, Item 17. Again, the Commission  
13 cannot take any action on any matter considered under this item  
14 until the matter is specifically included on an agenda at future  
15 time as an action item. Is there any public comment? Hearing  
16 none, we will close public comment. Item 18, talking about  
17 scheduling our next upcoming Commission meeting, which should be  
18 right around the memorial.

19 SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. So at  
20 this point, it looks like the Sheriff's and Chief's meeting will  
21 be up here on April 30th. As the usual schedule, the Peace  
22 Officer Memorial will be on the 1st in the afternoon. So we  
23 would recommend we have a meeting the morning of May 1st and  
24 then allow people to get over to the memorial after that.

1           TROUTEN:           Thank you, sir. Any discussion on that  
2 item? That works. Entertain a motion for the next meeting to  
3 be May 1st, 2025 in Carson City.

4           MCKINNEY:          Kevin McKinney I'll move next meeting to  
5 be May 1st.

6           TROUTEN:          Okay. We have a motion. Is there a  
7 second?

8           YOUNG:            Tiffany Young. I'll second.

9           TROUTEN:          We have a motion, second. All those in  
10 favor, please say aye.

11          MEMBERS:          Aye.

12          TROUTEN:          I also vote aye. That concludes action  
13 items. Is there any discussion from the Board member or  
14 comments? If not, move for adjournment.

15          PROSSER:          Jamie Prosser moves to adjourn.

16          TROUTEN:          Motion to adjourn. Second?

17          COVERLEY:         (Inaudible.) I'll second.

18          TROUTEN:          That was beyond stereo. Motion and  
19 second. All in favor, please say aye.

20          MEMBERS:          Aye.

21          TROUTEN:          Motion carries. We are adjourned.

22 Thank you all.