STATE OF NEVADA

COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

MEETING TRANSCRIPT

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2026

COVERLEY: The post-commission, meeting workshop and public hearing is called to order for July 14th, 2026. For the record, the time is 10:05. Let's go to Kathy Floyd for information on the legal postings and open meetings compliance.

FLOYD: The public hearing workshop notices and meeting agenda have been posted in compliance with NRS 241.020. These notices and agenda were physically posted at the Post Administration Building and the Nevada State Library in Carson City, and electronically posted at the Nevada POST website at post.nv.gov, the legislative website at leg.state.nv.gov, State of Nevada website at notice.nv.gov, and emailed to all single point of contacts and agency administrators on the post Listserve.

COVERLEY: All right, thank you. We'll now do a roll call. I'll start with myself, Sheriff Dan Coverley. Douglas Coverley. I am the chairman.

TOGLIATTI: Okay. George Togliatti, Director of Nevada Department of Public Safety.

YOUNG: Dr. Tiffany Young, community member.

MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, Carlin Police Department.

BOVEDA: Esmeralda Boveda, LVMPD, Deputy Chief.

WALKER: Jason Walker, Assistant Sheriff, Washoe County Sheriff's Office.

SHEA: Tim Shea, Boulder City Police.

FLOYD: Kathy Floyd, Nevada Post.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock from Post.

NOLAN: John Nolan, the Attorney General's Office.

NIEL: Russell Niel, Deputy Chief State Gaming.

COVERLEY: Item Number 3, public comment. The opportunity for public comment is reserved for any matter listed below on the agenda as well as any matter within the jurisdiction of the commission. No action on such-- no action on such an item may be taken by the commission unless and until the matter has been noticed as an action item. No comments may be made regarding a matter that is or may be the subject of a formal complaint before the commission. Comment may not be limited based on viewpoint. Do we have any public comment? Seeing none, we will go to the public hearing. Item Number Four, public hearing on proposed regulations, LCB file R109-26 and R110-26. The purpose of this hearing is to solicit comments from interested persons on the following topics that may be addressed in proposed regulation. This public hearing has been previously noticed pur -- pursuant to the requirements of NRS Chapter 233B. Item Number One, discussion and for possible

action. The commission to discuss and take possible action to adopt or amend their regulations as follows. LCB file R109-26, amendment of NAC 289.140, which updates the minimum hours of training for Category I and II basic academies. Requires all Category I academies to be in person and removes all Category III performance objectives from the Category I academies. B LCB file R110-26 amendment of NAC 289.300, which updates the requirements for basic academy certification requirements and to remove all reference to choke hold and academy training. Mike Sherlock for details.

SHERLOCK: Thank you. Mike Sherlock for the record. So just first -- just a remind -- reminder where we are. So initially we had a motion to address basic training regulations. After that we had a workshop where language was presented and the Commission then voted to move forward with that language, which was developed at the workshop. That language was then sent to LCB, for their suggestions or changes which of -- often happen, just based on regulation standards or legal issues. Not to beat a dead horse, you have the language in the -- in your books. That language was returned to us from LCB with a little -- or actually no changes, which is a little unusual, but we're glad they did it. Those changes again include things like hours, category restrictions on -- on presenting academies, and allows the commission discretion on -- on who has an academy in some

circumstances. And again, removed Cat III from Cat I for a lot of reasons. So we are now at the point of a public hearing related to that final language or that language. And also as to whether to adopt that language. After the hearing, you will have the opportunity to move to final adoption. Again, in your books you see the language. So I'll send it back to you, Mr. Chairman, for the public hearing phase. Barring any changes to that language, staff would recommend adoption of these two LCB files in our regulations.

COVERLEY: All right. Do we have any public comment on this item? Any comments from the commission? All right. At this time, I'm looking for a motion to adopt both LCB file R109-26 and R110-26.

YOUNG: Kevin McKinney, I'll -- I'll move to adopt both.

COVERLEY: Motion by Kevin McKinney. Do I have a second?

NIEL: Russell Niel I'll second.

COVERLEY: And a second by Russell Niel. All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSION: Aye.

SHEA: Aye.

COVERLEY: I also vote aye. Any opposed? Motion passes unanimously. Item five workshop discussion and for possible action. Proposed amendments to NAC 289.290. Possible action may be approval of proposed language. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: First, Mr. Chairman if I could -- we -- can we get these -- the two other commissioners on record? We forgot them and the two on Teams. Just to acknowledge that they're here.

COVERLEY: All right. Those on Zoom, Chief and Sheriff, what was your vote?

MGGILL: Sheriff (inaudible).

STRAUB: I vote aye. Rob Straub, Assistant Chief, City of Las Vegas Department of Public Safety for the record.

COVERLEY: Okay.

SHERLOCK: All right.

COVERLEY: We're good.

SHERLOCK: All --

COVERLEY: Perfect.

SHERLOCK: All right, so to the workshop. So just a quick reminder, this workshop is to develop and present language related to updating our revocation and suspension language and other issues under NAC 289.290. If you'll recall, last meeting there was a motion to begin the rulemaking in those areas. We have discussed the need to update areas that have been somewhat confusing or ineffective for the intended purpose. Our DAGs have done a great job looking at other states and the legal issues surrounding our regulations in that area and helped to develop the sample language you see in your books. Kathy here to my right also worked hard on these. Again,

looking at what other states are doing and what sort of the industry standards are in terms of how they regulate our profession. I will say that -- having done that, we're a bit behind in our revocation areas, and this goes a long way to bringing us up to reality and sort of the industry standards again. This -- what is going on now is a workshop where language is presented and where the commission may hear from stakeholders regarding these updates. I will lay this initial language for all to see out and to allow relevant comments. So you have the language in front of you. Let me just quickly explain and focus only on the changes. So if you look at 289.290, number 1A, we've had some issues in the past and recently, and we're really seeking to clean up that pros -- provision. So we simply add that providing false information, not only to obtain the certificate, which is what the regulation currently says, but also presenting false information to maintain that basic cer -- certificate would be cause for revocation. I think that's really a no-brainer in our world if you lie, you die. And, so whether it's to maintain that certificate or get the certificate, it should apply and that's the change you see there. The next area of Section 1I, here we look to clarify those convictions where we see attempts to create loopholes that undermine the intent of those regulations and sort of ensuring the integrity of the profession. We are awful -- the commission is awful, o --

often struggling because that conviction, though it did not meet our specific regulation, there were clear conduct issues within that conviction that are inconsistent with being a peace officer. So we simply seek here to add the statement of where you, as the commission -- again it's always the commission's decision, find that there is a documented history of physical violence you may still revoke regardless of the specific crime they are convicted of. And that just claims that -- that section again and allows the commission to decide on those issues. And again, after all -- it -- all it is the commission's certificate in question, and you should decide the fate on conduct issues like that. We just extended the language to allow your decision to revoke or suspend regardless of the misdemeanor conviction or on that basis alone. This is already addressed in the hiring side of our regulations, but it was not addressed on the certification side, so that simply cleans up that issue. Then again, based on the analysis of our DAGs and -- and what other -- other states in our profession, these seven areas are added to help clarify and remove confusion. Although this -- the areas may have been covered before, it was not clear, and these additions help clarify each area. So first under 289.290.1.j, we look to clarify the moral turpitude areas by adding convictions for crime that fall under dishonesty and other Brady or moral tuper -- turpitude standards. So this does

require a conviction for us to bring them to you, but include things such as forgery, embezzlement, false pretenses, larceny, extortion, theft, fraud, all which would fall under Brady anyway. And again, understand that Brady is already contained in the hiring standard. It just never was included in the certification standard, which has caused issues, right? In the past, and just real quick, to give you an example, in our ability to prevent sort of rogue officers traveling from one agency to another under the hiring standard where that Brady issue has not been arbitrated yet, they could get hired onto another agency. We've seen them get hired to another -- onto another agency. Before that, there's a sustained Brady issue. But once they're hired, we have no -- we have no way to act, because it wasn't part of certification only about hiring. So this cleans up that issue. Next CN, 1K which would allow us to bring to you cases where there's a sustained finding. Again, meaning there's an investigation. We don't investigate here. That involves a moral turpitude issue or reckless disregard of public safety. This would allow us to bring you those cases to the commission to decide whether or not it's appropriate to revoke or not. Again, this requires a finding of such conduct before staff would even be able to bring it to the commission anyway. But we do need that ability to bring that to you as a matter of clarity. Next -- next is Section 1L. Here again, we look to get away from some of the

loopholes of the past, allowing certain conduct to be transferred from one agency to another. This allows you to decide whether specific conduct that tends to jeopardize public trust in our profession should be sanctioned. And again, it's -- it just allows us to bring it to you. 1M is somewhat similar, but again allows the commission to decide whether malfeasance -- misfeasance, or nonfeasance in office rises to the level of suspension or revocation. In the past, we haven't even been able to bring that to you, so this would allow that. 1N simply cla -- clarifies the necessity to lawfully have the ability to possess a firearm as a condition of certification. And when you lose that right under state law or federal law, you may be revoked. And that's come up quite a bit for us on revocation hearings on whether or not the ability to have a firearm is somehow connected to the policing. I think we all agree it is, but we've had some issues there and this simply seeks to clarify that. And again, I can't emphasize enough, and that's still the commission's decision, but it allows us to bring it to you. 1O simply adds the Bra -- Brady issue found in the hiring prohibition again -- area to the certification area, let's see. And finally in 1P, it simply adds excessive force or unreasonable force to that conduct that can be brought to you for action. Again, understanding excessive or unreasonable force is an agency issue and require -- would require some finding of that before

we could even bring it forward to you. So we're not deciding on what excessive force is or unreasonable force, but it allows us to bring it to you where there's a finding of that at the agency level. This again, simply bring -- brings us closer to sort of the national industry standards and what is considered actional -- actionable conduct. So again, I would just simply remind the commissioners, this is simply proposed language. If you vote to continue with this process, you will have more opportunity to see and accept or change that final language going forward, but we believe these small changes address many of the issues dating back many years, frankly in some areas. It helps us to bring the commission closer to national standards while clarifying areas, that are already included in our regulations. So at the conclusion of the workshop, staff would recommend continuing the rulemaking on these regulations. And I'll send it back to you, Mr. Chairman.

COVERLEY: Thank you. Is there any public comment or from the audience who wants to comment on this? Any comments or input from commissioners?

MCKINNEY: I have a -- I have a couple comments. One I -- I was looking at -- do we do it in this proposed -- do we need to -- I guess one is a question. Do we need to include all three categories or four categories of certification? Or do you -- we believe that this covers it as a (inaudible)?

SHERLOCK: So I -- Mike Sherlock for the record. So...It

is all? So 289.290 doesn't differentiate between categories. It's all certification, one, two and three. And reserve, frankly. So, by making these changes --

MCKINNEY: And then my second question is, some of these proposed changes seem to be subjective in nature. And I'm curious if that is gonna increase potential liability for this commission.

NOLAN: Hello. I mean, yes. The short answer potentially it could. But as a licensing body, it's the commission's responsibility to enforce standards and therefore it would open the possibility. I don't want to misspeak, but potentially the commission could appoint a hearing officer in the future to hear these types of matters that would then make a recommendation to the commission that you would adopt, which would be able to somewhat limit liability for the commission for some of these. And ultimately, it's the commission's final determination whether or not somebody would be suspended, revoked, or some other sanction revoked on their certificate. And so it would be hopefully a careful deliberation before any finding would be made or decision would be made. But yes, with anything that you would do as a validator's potential for liability.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. I think I -- to my -- (inaudible) You can cut me off if I'm wrong. But you know, I've been here a long time. We -- we do in the

background that maybe the commission isn't aware of, but we do get drug into litigation on occasion. But I've never seen it rise to the level on the individual or the commission itself. Usually I'm the one named in the litigation and we've been successful because I think we do a -- a good job of what we do. And I don't think this changes that in terms of liability for -- for the commission itself.

SHEA: Tim Shea, for the record, I have -- I have mostly some questions, and I understand where you're trying to go but, it's changing dramatically --

INAUDIBLE: So --

SHEA: -- how these are coming before us and the way they get here and what could occur or not occur. So on I, it says it was a conviction of a misdemeanor crime of violence. Now it's saying, or a finding of a documented history of physical violence. I'm not sure what that means. Who makes this finding? We don't really define this here. We're leaving this open to a future interpretation. What documentation is required? A newspaper article to a newspaper. We don't say what's document is required. Who provides a documentation? Where does it come from? And what constitutes physical violence? You know, where is that definition of physical violence for this? And then it goes on to say, for the conviction of the employee for such a misdemeanor or a finding of a documented history of physical violence. Again, this

section originally carries these actions of suspension and revocation based on conviction. Now it only requires a finding that a nebulous physical violence occurred. It's pretty ambiguous. No timeframe. No number of events. No clarification of just who can make a finding that equates to a conviction. Because this did not require a conviction, which means a court of competent jurisdiction did not make a determination. Now it is just a finding of an action that is not defined where the finding comes from and what the action really is. When I go down to K, a sustained finding of any act that involves moral turpitude or a reckless disregard for the safety of the public or any person. Again, what is a finding? Who makes this finding? Who decides something is reckless? We need a definition of just what is moral turpitude. In Nevada, we lack a single definition of moral turpitude. Other agencies of the State do d -- identify it in their sections. We don't in ours. It's -- it's not there anywhere. So we're evaluating this on a case by case basis through a common law principles. And generally, it refers to any conduct or crime that is inherently based, violent or depraved and represents an extreme departure from accepted step -- standards of morality, justice, and honesty. Because moral turpitude functions as a character assessment for professional licenses to state employment. Different Nevada agencies provide specific regulatory definitions tailored to their respective fields. We

-- we don't have anything like that. So I don't know what definition we'd be using. And I'm sure if we looked at our different agencies, we may have this in our policies, but we may have different definitions by whatever agency you belong to. And on letter L, it says, "Any conduct or pattern of conduct that tends to disrupt, diminish, or otherwise jeopardize public trust in the law enforcement profession." I really don't know what that means. It's ambiguous. How does one come to the -- this come to the attention of the commission? Are we to decide that someone has established a pattern? Conduct that tends to disrupt, diminish, or otherwise jeopardize public trust in the law enforcement profession. This isn't -- isn't this what an internal processes are for within departments? Are we gonna now have to review all complaints to see if it meets the commission's nebulous standards? How do we find out about these acts? And from news reports, direct complaints from citizens, and who will be doing the investigation to reach the standards of 289. I'm really concerned that we are gonna be getting into an area where we are basically gonna make decisions for departments that their people have violated certain standards and therefore we're gonna de-certify, which means I now get to terminate somebody without doing any investigation at all. And because we don't clearly define these -- these actions, we don't clearly lay out what they are, they're open to

interpretation. And 10 years from now, when we are all gone -- probably be long dead. I think people are gonna look at this and we'll have possibly completely different actions opening this commission up to litigation where -- because by these ambiguities. And where's the due process that 289 guarantees peace officers in the state? It doesn't exist in this document. It doesn't ever refer to an investigation done under, for example, 289, which gives us then a foundation saying, okay, they've met those legal standards, now we can move forward. I just think that this needs a lot more work and definitions and clear patterns of what we are gonna do and what we're gonna look at.

SHERLOCK: So I -- I'll let you answer that. Just -- I just want to give you some history. First of all, we're -- we're unique in the country. You want -- what you're saying, you're advocating for criminal conviction. Criminal convictions require -- require beyond a reasonable doubt. Yes, we are moving more to conduct because this body is based on a preponderance of evidence, not a conviction. Now, when we talk about physical violence -- physical violence is already in our regulations. You are prohibited from hiring someone who has a documented history of physical violence. We do have a definition from it because the Supreme Court has ruled that a domestic violence regardless of the conviction, is a -- is a documented history of physical violence. A police report where

they're alleged to have committed an act of violence is a documented history of physical violence. The reason we're -- we're looking to -- and those are the reasons we're trying to move forward and -- and get more to -- in front of you to decide what is acceptable conduct for a peace officer. We have a big problem with -- with sort of rogue officers, again moving from one department to another with no criminal convictions. But that doesn't mean they should be pe -- peace officers. It doesn't -- it -- you -- you know what I mean? And so we're -- we've been stuck in this sort of limbo where we're only bringing things to you to decide based on criminal convictions. And that puts us in a very bad position. So --

INAUDIBLE: All right.

SHERLOCK: -- I get that. Now, in terms of --

INAUDIBLE: Can I move on to that --

SHERLOCK: -- what a sustained act is, for us, clearly that's not from the media. That's an internal investigation by a -- an agency within our jurisdiction or a court.

SHEA: That -- I -- I wasn't advocating only for convictions. What I was saying is that in this document, as it's presented, there's nothing in there that determines who does these things. I agree that things can be brought before us based upon an internal investigation that are in 289. It doesn't say that in here. It's nebulous and it's ambiguous where this comes from.

SHEA: And who does the investigation? How do we find out those things? I just believe those things should all be clarified and laid out so there's no misunderstanding. There's no ambiguous words. There's nothing open to interpretation because we are making life-altering decisions for people. And I -- that's all I'm saying. It needs to be --

SHERLOCK: So --

SHEA: -- clearer.

SHERLOCK: Sorry, Chief. So, if we added a line that, where there is an internal investigation sustained or a criminal finding -- again, I mean, that's how we interpret it, but I -- I get that.

SHEA: Yeah. I -- I understand how you interpret it. But after we're long gone, what we say here is not gonna be remembered. And things could change. And I -- I think that if we're being stewards for the future, we want to make sure our language is absolutely clear. Our intent is laid out perfectly in black and white, so it's understood. And it's all reviewed to make sure that the things that are coming before us and that -- 'Cause we'll, we could end up with people coming before us who agencies have no intent to terminate. And we would be terminating them -- for them even if they didn't want it to occur.

SHERLOCK: Sorry, so I took all your --

INAUDIBLE: No -- no.

MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, if I can get it for the record -- if I could add, I also -- you know, I -- I believe we're -- we're going in the right direction.

SHEA: Yeah.

MCKINNEY: Again, my concern is -- and I -- I speak anecdotally but, several of these recent revocation hearings, we haven't gotten a full picture. I -- I come away with these -- at these hearings going, "I don't know what happened," --

INAUDIBLE: Mm-hmm.

MCKINNEY: -- you know, at the department. You know, with the investigation, with the findings, with -- and it, it almost feels like by creating even more subjectivity to this NAC, w -- we're -- you know, Director Sherlock indicates we're not an investigating body. But it almost becomes to where we do have to investigate to -- to make a finding. Because we're not getting a full picture a lot of times as it is now. And I -- I worry that it'll be worse with -- with some of these changes.

NOLAN: All right. So before I get to your comments, I want to go back to some of the things you said. So I -- I would just clarify, there is a robust due process set forth in -- in 289.290. Could that be cleaned up and tightened a little bit? Yes, but they do get notice. The commission by itself or through its authority in the regs can appoint a hearing officer. Through that process, they can present evidence, hire

an attorney, they get -- you know, advanced notice to appear. They can -- you know, put it off to prepare. So there's lots of procedural checks in place. In addition to that, you know, you all have discretionary act immunity, sovereign immunity, qualified immunity that would apply as long as there's nothing illegal that took place in the deliberations or the findings as you consider it. Going back to moral turpitude, I would just clarify that definition has been defined by the Nevada Supreme Court since 1938. It's clear, other licensing bodies use and have that language, real estate and insurance come up because that's what I've experienced within the past, but my understanding is others as well, but don't quote me, this is a transcript. The -- the case for that State ex rel. Conklin versus Buckingham, Nevada 50 -- 59 Nevada 36. I can provide copies of that. We've discussed that privately with Mike and Kathy before, so there's that. I would also echo what Mike said in terms of a finding a newspaper report I would hope would never be enough for this commission or for any hearing officer that would be appointed by this commission. It should be some formal administrative proceeding, I don't think it would be limited to only a court proceeding, but some formal body in some way that's looked -- looked into the matter. Yeah, I think those would be kind of my -- my big -- big kind of answers. If there's anything I'm missing, please feel free to push me and I'll -- I'll try my best to answer. But off the

top of my head, that's kind of. I hope that helps a little bit.

SHEA: It does. But again, my -- my only concerns are from years of having to write manuals and all this is that things need to be clear. And they need to lay a -- a path to the future for people that are gonna read what we did here and make interpretations from what we wrote. And I think it's important that we not end up in a position where we de-certify people that really didn't go through an investigation. And like Chief McKinney was saying, I -- we -- we've done that.

SHERLOCK: Yeah, and I, Mike Sherlock for the record. So I -- I agree we can add that language of an internal finding, but I hope you also understand that some of the issues for us are non-disclosures, agencies will give you a finding, but not the basis of the finding.

SHEA: Mm-hmm.

SHERLOCK: And so a lot of what we -- what we're tasked with deciding is bringing to you is -- is this finding, not the basis of the finding.

SHEA: Mm-hmm.

SHERLOCK: Is this finding that this off -- officer did this conduct, is that consistent with being a certified officer?

SHEA: Mm-hmm.

SHERLOCK: And that's what we get stuck with, you know?

Agencies are trying to protect their own from a liability standpoint. So sometimes it is difficult. I just want to get that out there. But I don't think there's any problem with adding to those areas that are conduct that says based on a finding by an internal affairs investigation or a court find -- you know, language in that area. And I -- I think that's okay. I do worry about those non-disclosures but, you know that it is what it is.

COVERLEY: Any further comment? I only have one comment, Dan Coverly for the record. I think that these types of issues where we are reviewing the NAC and the language and stuff is -- that's one of the main purposes of this commission. And -- and I agree with Chief Shea and -- and Chief McKinney that it is important. You will never have the perfect document that someone dis -- you know what I mean? So I think the other huge responsibility that we have as a commission is to ensure or to help ensure that the men and women that are serving in our state of law enforcement officers are the best that we can have and that we hold a high standard. And if they fail to meet that standard or something occurs, then -- then it's our responsibility to -- to ensure that they're not affecting their communities, and that -- that's a heavy lift. That's -- that's a big responsibility. So --

COVERLEY: So let's see. We've got some proposed language, I think, right? So we need a motion for -- how do we want to

do this?

INAUDIBLE: (Inaudible).

COVERLEY: Okay sure.

SHERLOCK: I -- I think you could -- you -- you could make a motion to continue the rulemaking. Am I right?

COVERLEY: Yes.

SHERLOCK: And with the suggestions from -- that received during the workshop, we can make changes to that.

COVERLEY: Okay.

SHERLOCK: And bring it back to you.

COVERLEY: Let's do that. We'll, looking for a motion to continue the rulemaking and further discussion on this matter.

SHEA: I'll make a motion to continue the rulemaking and continue this matter.

WALKER: Jason Walker, second.

COVERLEY: All right. We have a motion by Chief Shea and a second by Assistant Sheriff Walker. All in favor say aye.

COMMISSION: Aye.

COVERLEY: Chief, what do you say?

STRAUBE: That was an aye for me

COVERLEY: Aye for me. Okay.

INAUDIBLE: All right. I also vote aye.

INAUDIBLE: Thank you.

INAUDIBLE: Oh no (inaudible).

COVERLEY: All right. We're going to now go to our

regularly scheduled commission meeting, discussion and for possible action approval of minutes from April 30th, 2026 workshop and meeting. Any discussion? Do I have a motion to approve the meeting minutes?

WALKER: Jason Walker, a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

SHEA: Tim Shea, I'll second.

COVERLEY: All right. Motion by Jason Walker, second by Chief Shea. All in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

STRAUBE: Aye

MCGILL: Sheriff McGill aye.

COVERLEY: All right. I also vote aye. All passage unanimous. Now let's go to Item number 2, Executive Director report. Mike Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Thanks. Mike Sherlock for the record. I'll try to be quick. First everybody knows it's bu -- budget build time for us in the State. It's a two year budget. At this point, we're asking for two new positions to sort of assist with our oversight mission, reduce travel, that kind of thing by having a position in Las Vegas and to better assist agencies in complying with POST regulations. I think recent events sort of justify this need. Just for clarification, we essentially have fewer staff today at POST than we did in 2007. So clearly our State has grown since then, and our

workload has with it, and we have fewer bodies. You know, in terms of our training vis -- division, I -- I want to first recognize a staff member --

INAUDIBLE: (Inaudible).

SHERLOCK: First -- first -- for those who do not know, UNR has partnered with POST and designated our basic academy operation as a field practicum, with -- with our training specialist, Leighton Barbin. Barbin is engaged in UNR's social work program, and he has emphasized behavior -- behavioral health issues within our profession. I got a letter from UNR faculty and facilitators recently recognizing Leighton, and that the projects Leighton has been involved in are s -- are not simply academic exercises. They're helping shape conversations, policies, training, opportunities, and wellness practices -- practices that have potential to influence law enforcement agencies throughout Nevada. Leighton has developed and provided wellness training and curriculum across the State helping agencies in their desire to comply with mandates, but also to improve the beh -- behavioral health response of their agencies. I hope everybody really recognizes that this type of recognition from outside of traditional law enforcement agency, you know, goes a long way to keeping POST and -- and peace officer hiring certification and maintenance standards in the forefront, and it's sort of a positive perception rather than the negative that we deal with quite often. So I

just wanted to thank Leighton for his work, excellent job in what he's doing in behavioral health. Let's see what else is going on. A lot of you know, I've been on the Board on and off for -- of our national org -- organization d -- dedicated to POST directors nationally and internationally. It's called IADLEST. I was recently convinced to run for vice president again, which I did, and now I'm being thrust in the president of that organization position. But if you don't know, IADLEST created the NDI system, which is the National Decertification Index, that has -- that tracks revoked officers across the country. Congress recently adopted NDI as the official national database for revocations. And we've used that here in Nevada for many years, but now all States are joining in. A -- IADLEST additionally created the national certification program for law enforcement training, which we -- of course, support here in Nevada, as part of our regulations and requirements. And now the federal government is mandating that same thing for their law enforcement training, as are many States. IADLEST has quite a few projects across the country and administers between 8 and $20 million --

SHERLOCK: -- and federal grants each year. We have joint committees with IACP and NSA. And I just feel from our perspective, it's a benefit to Nevada that we have sort of a big voice in that organization when we're looking at grants where -- where that grant money goes and who gets to be part

of that. The only -- for me, I've been asked to speak at CLEA Conference in Omaha. I'm not real excited about traveling anymore, but I think again it's good to keep Nevada sort of in the national conversation on standards and what's going on. And so I appreciate them. And they're paying for it, so it's all within our budget. I also want to thank DOC, NDOT and DPS and the FBI for working with us on -- we are -- as-- as we're speaking, they're moving dirt over at the prison, for our own dedicated firearms range. We have been sharing that with DPS and the FBI and DOC. It's on DOC property, but they will -- after several meetings, we're able to get this done. They're moved -- and -- and NDOT has agreed to move the dirt for us and -- and build that over there, so we're happy about that. We are going to use grant funds to have the NRA design team come out and make sure that the range is within those specs and ready to go. It just allows us to operate our academy without interfering -- interfering with our own schedule or DPS's schedule or FBI schedule, that kind of thing. But also as a resource for those other agencies when they are in a bind and need another range. So we're really happy about that, in terms of our basic training and our firearm classes, that kind of thing. Finally, you know, I want to talk a little bit about compliance training. We seem to be getting so-called whistleblowers now calling posts on issues related to annual training requirements. I know you've seen the news and can

figure out why that is. But I can see that a lot of the calls that come into us and -- and that make it to me, people are not real versed in what those requirements are in terms of annual compliance. So I just want to make sure that everybody in this room is aware. I think you all know that first we require 12 hours of training in specific subjects. Please understand that these are not what staff would ne -- necessarily recommend. And staff actually believes there are much more important areas where we would like to see peace officer training. That said, these are mandated by statute and are required of all certified officer regardless of rank or position. These were legislatively mandated and not a POST Commission endeavor, as I believe it should have been. The areas often misunderstood by those calling us so are the critical or perishable skills training. Regulations require that each certified officer must demonstrate proficiency and any -- and all firearms authorized to be carried by that, each individual. And that has to be done twice annually. A certified officer must demonstrate proficiency in any less lethal weapon authorized to be carried by that individual. An officer must demonstrate proficiency in arrest control techniques. This one gets a little more in depth because it requires training in handcuffing, taking --take downs, self-defense, and weapons retention. So that's the only one that really is specific on what that part of that proficiency is.

Then finally, each officer -- certified officer must review their agency use of force -- use of force policy. So I want you to understand what that means from a regulatory or from a -- an oversight standpoint. First, the word authorize is used. So if you're authorized to use a firearm within your agency or authorized to use a less lethal option within your agency, you must demonstrate proficiency annually to your agency. If you want to tell us, you know, a chief or a captain, the sheriff does not authorize the -- you to utilize a long gun or a riot baton, POST isn't going to argue that. That -- that is an agency decision. However, I hope you all understand the liability issues, right? If you have -- I -- some civil unrest situation and everybody's needed and your captain grabs a riot baton and goes out to deal with the riot, there's an issue, I think from liability, but that's between you and your legal advisors. Okay? But again, as an agency, you control the authorization, not POST. It's that simple. The second area is similar in that employing agencies determine what proficiency is for each of those areas. Firearms, arrest control, and less lethal. This should be addressed by your legal advisors, right? Nothing proh -- prohibits under our regulations an agency for having different requirements based on rank or assignment. As long as those areas within the regulation are met. So that said, again, I would be careful. If you tell us -- you report to us that you're exempt because you don't make

an arrest -- you don't make arrests, you don't carry handcuffs, or you don't carry up firearms, and so you don't do any of that training. You may be getting yourself into a bad position, because our authority, our jurisdiction only applies to those who exercise peace officer powers. If you're telling us that you will never exercise peace officer powers, that's a problem from our oversight standpoint. And I hope you understand that. So hopefully everyone understands what that means. Again, you know, we encourage policies that fit your needs and have been reviewed by your legal advisor. I would add there are limits, of course, on having different standards within the ranks. If you're -- again, if your firearms proficiency standard for command staff is one shot -- you know, one round from the two yard line, and you can hit anywhere in the white. Personally, I think that's a liability issue going down the road. But again, we are not here to decide what your agency needs are or what your proficiency standards in your particular circumstances are. That's why it's written that way. We are not gonna tell you that every officer has to do a certain thing on the range or with arrest control and that kind of thing beyond the handcuffing, you know, take downs and weapon retention. So, our -- our main point is with all the media and the phone calls we get is to understand that we -- that the agency determines what proficiency is, not POST. And that should be reviewed with

your own legal advisors, right? We just say you have to do these things. You determine what the proficiency is. With that, if anybody has any questions, I'm here for you, but I'll yield back to Mr. Chairman, and we can move on.

COVERLEY: All right. Any comments or questions? All right. Item Number Three, discussion for possible action. A request from the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office for a six month extension past the one year requirement for NRS 289.550 to become post certified for their employees. Deputy Damon Aiken, hire date, July 21st, 2025. And Deputy Bertha Lenhardt, hire date of June 9th, 2025. Let's go to Director Sherlock for background.

SHERLOCK: So Mike Sherlock for the record, here you can see in your books, Humboldt has some staffing issues. They -- these are Cat 2, Cat 3 positions. They just have not been able to get the training completed. They've made the decision to enroll these two particular individuals in our Category 1 training. Based on their request, staff would recommend the extension. I'm not sure if Humboldt is here, but if so they may be able to answer any questions. But staff supports the extension.

COVERLEY: There is a representative from the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office.

KUSKIE: Undersheriff Damon Kuskie. Good morning, Commission. I'll be happy to answer any questions. These two,

they did pass the online portion of the hybrid Cat 2, 3. They're in the process of doing the 40-hour DT and 40-hour range. However, with our number of staffing, that is getting hard to do. So we just decided to enroll them in the Cal -- Academy that starts today. To do that. So we are asking for the extension.

COVERLEY: All right. Any comments or questions from the commission? All right. Looking for a motion to grant the six month time extension. Time extension to be certified for Mr. Aiken and Ms. Lenhardt.

WALKER: Jason Walker, motion for the approval of the extension.

SHEA: Tim Shea, I'll second.

COVERLEY: All right. We have a motion by Jason Walker and a second by Chief Shea. All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

COVERLEY: All right. Our Zoom participants also vote aye. Aye vote aye. Passage unanimously.

KUSKIE: Thank you, commission.

COVERLEY: Thank you. Item number four, discussion and for possible action. Request from the Esmeralda Justice Court for an extension of time beyond the one year requirement become post-certified for NRS 289-220 for their employee, Joseph Bowman, for a -- with a hire date of September 9th, 2025. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. Here in Esmeralda Justice Court has had issues trying to simply start the category two training. Much of it will being our fault to be honest, after the cyber attack and then our attack and then our transition to a new training and data management platform, along with our new delivery system. This extension will -- will allow them to finally enroll in our Cat 2 hybrid program. Staff would recommend the six month extension beyond the one year expiration date. And again, I'm not sure if Esmeralda County's here or not. Our courts are here. I don't think they are. But we would support that -- that extension.

COVERLEY: And Dan Coverley for the record, based on the hiccups that Post has had tech-wise, is it reasonable to think that they would be able to accomplish that in six months or would they need more?

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. Yeah, for sure. They would be able to. With that six-month extension past the one year, it shouldn't be an issue whatsoever.

COVERLEY: Any questions or comments? All right. Looking for a motion to approve the six-month extension of time beyond the one year for Joseph Bowman.

MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, I'll make that motion.

WALKER: Jason Walker, second.

COVERLEY: All right. We have a motion by Kevin McKinney and a second by Jason Walker. All in favor? Say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

MCGILL: Sheriff McGill aye

COVERLEY: I also vote aye. I assume -- Chief we get a nod. There we go. that's aye. Pass is unanimous.

STRAUBE: Aye.

COVERLEY: All right. Item number five, request from the Mineral County Sheriff's Office for a six-month extension past the one-year requirement for NRS 289.550 in order to meet requirements for certi -- certification for their employee, Dakota Palomino, hire date July 9th, 2025. Extension to January 9th, 2027. Possible action may be approval or denial of six-month extension. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. Here Mineral County's letter is in your book. I'm not sure if they're here or not. It -- it's not real clear, but I do know they're having some critical staffing issues. In -- in this case, Deputy Palomino is working in the jail, and the extension would allow the attendance to our January aca -- January Academy here at Post. Staff then, a -- as such would recommend the extension for six months beyond the one-year expiration date.

COVERLEY: Any comments or questions? Looking for a motion to approve the six-month extension of time beyond the one year for Dakota Palomino.

WALKER: Jason Walker, motion for the approval of the

extension.

BOVEDA: Esmaralda Boveda, second that.

COVERLEY: All right. We have a motion by Jason Walker and a second by Esmeralda. All in favor? Say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

MCGILL: Joe McGill aye.

STRAUBE: Rob Straube aye.

COVERLEY: I also vote aye. Passes unanimously. Item number six, discussion and for possible action. A request from the Nevada Gaming Control Board for an executive certificate for their employee, Deputy Chief Russell Neal. Pursuant to NAC 289.2701B, possible action may include approval or denial of the requested executive certificate. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Thank you. Mike Sherlock for the record here, staff went over the application with a fine-tooth comb, and with some reluctance, staff would recommend the commission award the executive certificate. I'm kidding. You know, Russ has been a great partner here at POST and as longtime commissioner, his insight and expertise are clear. And his application reflects he has met and exceeds the standards required for this certificate. And the staff would recommend the commission award the executive certificate to Russ Niel.

COVERLEY: Any discussion or questions? Anybody want to put Russ under the microscope? All right, looking for a motion to approve the executive certificate for Deputy Chief Russ

Niel.

YOUNG: Dr. Young here. I have a motion to approve the executive certificate.

WALKER: Jason Walker, second.

COVERLEY: All right. Motion by Dr. Young. We'll second by Jason Walker. All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

COVERLEY: All right.

NIEL: I abstain.

COVERLEY: I vote aye. So passes. Nine. Yays and one abstention. All right, Item number seven, discussion for possible action. The next four items will be hearings regarding revocation --

COVERLEY: -- and/or suspension of basic certificates. Let's now go to our Deputy Attorney General Nolan for evidentiary foundation.

NOLAN: Good morning, Chairman Coverley and members of the commission. John Nolan, N-O-L-A-N, Deputy Attorney General appearing on behalf of POST. Today, the commission is scheduled to consider multiple revocation matter -- matters as set forth in agenda Items seven through 10, each arising of the -- under the commission's statutory and regulatory authority governing peace officer certification. By way of b -- brief background, these proceedings arise under NRS 289.510, which authorizes the commission to establish minimum standards

for the certification and de-certification of peace officers. Pursuant to that authority, the commission has adopted NAC 289.290, which sets forth the standards for denial, suspension, and revocation of certification, including those based on criminal convictions and other disqualifying conduct. Each of the matters before you today involves alleged conduct and in many cases, criminal convictions that fall within those regulatory standards. Each subject officer has been provided notice of these proceedings and an opportunity to appear, present evidence, and be heard before the commission. For -- for purposes of these hearings and before the commission considers each individual item, I will establish the evidentiary foundation for the materials contained in the revocation packets for agenda items seven through 10, so that the commission may properly consider and rely upon those materials in making its determinations. Chief Floyd, I have several questions regarding the materials contained in the revocation packets for agenda items seven through 10. Did you obtain the documents and materials contained in those packets, including court records, judgments of convictions, and agency records directly from the originating courts or their respective employing agencies?

FLOYD: Yes, I did.

NOLAN: Are those documents the same records that POST relies upon in carrying out its statutory duties relating to

certification and de-certification?

FLOYD: Yes, they are.

NOLAN: Have you maintained those materials in the ordinary course of POST's records and responsibilities?

FLOYD: Yes, I have.

NOLAN: To your knowledge, are the documents contained in the commission materials true and accurate copies of the records you received from the courts and agencies?

FLOYD: Yes, they are.

NOLAN: Where applicable, do those materials include certified court records or official agency records reflecting the charges, pleas, or convictions at issue in each case?

FLOYD: Yes, they are.

NOLAN: Thank you. So based on that testimony, the materials before the commission constitute reliable public records, including certified court and agency records, and are properly before you for consideration. These materials establish the underlying conduct, charges, and convictions relevant to the revocation standards set forth in NAC 289.290. Under NRS 233B.123, evidence may be admitted, if it is of a type commonly relied upon by reasonable and prudent persons in the conduct of their affairs and documentary evidence may re - - be received in the form of authenticated copies. The materials provided to the commission meet that standard and may be relied upon in determining each action item. Mr.

Chairman, at this time, I would ask that the materials contained in the revocation packets for agenda items seven through 10 be admitted into the record.

COVERLEY: All right. Item number seven, I am going to excuse myself from this item and abstain due to a conflict regarding the election for Sheriff in Douglas County. I'm going to ask that Russ Niel read it into the record and call for the vote.

NIEL: Russ Niel for the record. Item seven for discussion and for possible action. Next four items -- where am I at? (Inaudible) The next four items will be hearings regarding revocation and/or suspension of basic certificates. Let's go to our Deputy Attorney General Nolan for the evidentiary foundation. The --

NIEL: Or done that? -- Who did that? I'm going off the script here. Thank you, Mr. Nolan. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.290.1.f and h for the possible revocation of the Category 2 and 3 basic certificates held by Jesse N. Chulay, former employee of the Douglas County Juvenile Probation Department, based on the convictions and/or pleas of guilty to a misdemeanor. Convictions, pleas which have led to this action are. Count one, theft, a violation of NRS 205.08321A, 1B, and 1J, and NRS 205.0835, 1 and 2A, a misdemeanor. Count two, theft, violation of NRS 205.0832, 1A, 1B, and 1J. And NRS 205.0835, 1 and 2A, a misdemeanor. Count three, theft. A violation

of NRS 205.08321A, 1B, and 1J, and NRS 205.0835 1 and 2A, a misdemeanor. Possible action may be revocation of the Category 2 and basic Certificates. Let’s go to Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. So as you can see in your material, the employing agency is requesting the commission revoke Mr. Chulay's certificate based on the conviction of three separate theft charges or cases. 289.290.1.h allows an agency to request revocation based on a misdemeanor conviction as is the case here. Additionally, staff would submit that theft in -- in -- in particular in this case where theft is of public monies. The action undermines public trust is clearly a Brady issue and is inconsistent with our moral turpitude standards and our profession. As sta -- as such staff would support the agency's request for revocation and re -- recommend the commission revoke the Category 2 and Category 3 certificate of Mr. Chulay.

NIEL: Does the former employee agency wish to speak? Do you have any here?

SHERLOCK: I don't believe they're here.

NIEL: Is Mr. Chulay here to speak? It does not appear so. Any comments or discussion from the commissioners? Okay, looking for a motion to revoke the basic POST certificate of Mr. Chulay.

WALKER: Jason Walker, motion for the revocation of

Category 2 and Category 3 certificates.

BOVEDA: I'll second that.

NIEL: We have a motion from Sheriff Walker and a second from Esmeralda?

BOVEDA: Mm-hmm.

NIEL: All in favor say Aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

MCGILL: Sheriff McGill Aye.

STRAUBE: Rob Straube Aye.

NIEL: Motion carries. I also vote aye. Moving on to the next item.

COVERLEY: All right. Item number eight, discussion for possible action hearing pursuant to NAC 289.2901F and G for the possible revocation of the Category 3 basic certificate held by Alan Islas, former employee of the Nevada Department of Corrections based on the convictions and/or pleas of guilty to a felony. The conviction pleas which have led to this action are: Count one, driving under the influence, Category B felony, NRS 484C. 110, 484C. 400, and 484C.105. Possible action may be revocation of the Category 3 basic certificate. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. Here, Mr. Isla was convicted of a felony DUI. In addition to this conviction and conduct being inconsistent with the policing profession, he is prohibited from being a certified peace officer as a

convicted felon. As such, staff recommends revocation of Mr. Isla's Category 3 certificate.

COVERLEY: Any comments or discussion from the commission? All right, looking for a motion to revoke the basic POST certificate for Mr. Islas.

MCKINNEY: Kevin McKinney, I'll move to revoke Mr. Isla's Category 3 certificate.

YOUNG: Dr. Young, I'll second.

COVERLEY: All right, we have a motion by Kevin McKinney, a second by Dr. Young. All in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

COVERLEY: Chief Straub? Give me a thumbs up if you vote aye.

STRAUB: Aye -- aye.

COVERLEY: There we go. I also vote aye. Motion passes unanimously. Item number nine, discussion and for possible action, hearing pursuant to NAC 289.2901F and G for the possible revocation of Category 3, basic certificate held by Luis Sencion Gonzalez, former employee of the Nevada Department of Corrections, based on the convictions and/or pleas of a guilt -- guilty to a felony. The convictions, pleas which have led to this action: are Count 1, lure or attempt to lure child or mentally ill person with use of computer technology to engage in sexual conduct. A violation of NRS 201.560.4A, a Category B felony. Possible action may be the

revocation of the Category 3 basic certificate. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock, for the record, in this case, Mr. Sencion Gonzalez was convicted of a felony. And again, with a felony conviction, he is prohibited from being employed as a peace officer. In addition, the conduct leading to the conviction is clearly inconsistent with the policing profession. Staff would re -- recommend the revocation of Mr. Sencion Gonzalez Category 3 certificate.

COVERLEY: Is anyone here from the Department of Corrections?

SHERLOCK: (Inaudible).

COVERLEY: Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of Mr. Sencion Gonzalez? Any commission comments? All right. So, looking for a motion regarding the Category 3 certificates of Mr. Sencion Gonzalez.

TOGLIATTI: George Togliatti, I'll make a motion.

BOVEDA: Esmeralda Boveda. I'll second that.

COVERLEY: All right, we have a motion by Director Togliatti, second by Deputy Chief Boveda. All in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

COVERLEY: I also vote aye. Passes unanimously. Item number 10, discussion and for possible action. Hearing pursuant to NAC 289.2901F and G for the possible revocation of

the Category 3 basic certificate held by Elizabeth L. Vasquez, former employee of the Nevada Department of Corrections, based on the convictions and/or pleas of guilty to a felony. The convictions pleas which have led to this action are: Count one, furnishing a portable telecommunications device to a state prisoner, a Category E felony in violation of NRS 212.165.1. Possible action may be revocation of a Category 3 basic certificate. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. Here again, another felony conviction. We would add that the conduct leading to the charges were also job related. The conviction itself prohibits her from working as a peace officer, but the conduct is also inconsistent with our profession and staff would recommend Ms. Vasquez Category 3 certificate be revoked.

COVERLEY: Does the employee agency wish to speak? And is anyone here to speak on behalf of Ms. Vasquez? Any comments from the commission? All right, looking for a motion regarding the Category 3 certificates of Ms. Vasquez.

WALKER: Jason Walker, motion.

SHEA: Tim Shea I'll second.

COVERLEY: All right, we have a motion by Jason Walker, second by Chief Shea. All in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

MCGILL: Joe McGill aye.

COVERLEY: I also vote aye. Chief --

INAUDIBLE: He gave a thumbs up.

COVERLEY: I know. His name blanks.

FLOYD: Straub.

INAUDIBLE: Straub.

COVERLEY: Straub. Yes, thank you. Pass it unanimously. All right. Item number 11, public comment. This opportunity for public comment is reserved for any matter listed below on the agenda as well as any matter within the jurisdiction of the commission. No action on such an item may be taken by the commission unless and until the matter has been noticed as an action item. No comments may be made regarding a matter that is or may be the subject of a formal complaint before the commission. Comment may not be limited based on viewpoint. Do we have any public comment? All right, hearing none. Move on to item number 12. Discussion of possible actions. Schedule upcoming public hearing and regularly scheduled meeting. Director Sherlock.

SHERLOCK: Mike Sherlock for the record. So, it looks like Sheriff's and Chief's annual con -- conference will once again be at South Point, I believe.

COVERLEY: Yes.

SHERLOCK: And that's August, or October 26th through the 28th. You know, I'll leave it up to the commission, but given some of the issues of trying to have our meeting on the last day, doesn't always work well because people are ready to

leave, that kind of thing. I talked to Pam about perhaps having it in the afternoon of Monday the 23rd. That way I'm pretty sure that everybody that's coming from the north will already be there.

YOUNG: The 26th?

SHERLOCK: That is --

INAUDIBLE: That's a mistake.

SHERLOCK: Oh 26th, sorry about that. And so, it's a better option. She's working on making sure we have a room for that, but -- and I can confirm with her if Monday the 26th in the afternoon is acceptable to the commission. October 26th.

COVERLEY: Dan Coverley for the record, I agree with that.

COVERLEY: Having it at the end is.

SHERLOCK: (Inaudible).

COVERLEY: And then in the past Esmeralda, we've used your --

BOVEDA: Yeah.

COVERLEY: -- K9 Training facility.

BOVEDA: Yeah. We can still have it if, however you want to work it.

COVERLEY: Okay.

BOVEDA: If you want to let me know now, I'll -- I'll make sure we're good to go. Or if you want me to wait till you work out with Pam.

SHERLOCK: Yeah, Pam wasn't sure. So, I -- I'm good with

it. If you guys don't mind traveling over to the K9 facility or wherever you want to do it.

BOVEDA: It's -- it's open to you guys. You just let me know and we will -- we'll be there.

COVERLEY: I think it would be easier for --

SHERLOCK: Then we're relying on the conference.

COVERLEY: Okay.

SHERLOCK: Yeah, can you check on that --

BOVEDA: Yes.

SHERLOCK: -- and just let me know?

BOVEDA: So, it's ours. So, Monday, that afternoon -- just -- it's -- it's -- it's --

SHERLOCK: Yeah, like 1:00 o'clock on the 26th.

BOVEDA: Okay.

SHERLOCK: Give people a chance to get down there and get out of the other meeting.

BOVEDA: I'll have it reserved for that.

SHERLOCK: Thanks.

BOVEDA: All right.

COVERLEY: Perfect. I just want to take this moment to thank Kathy for all her hard work on preparing these meetings. They don't happen. If it was up to me, it'd be a huge mess. So, thank you, Kathy. And Director Sherlock and Mr. Nolan for their hard work. So, appreciate it. With that, for a motion to adjourn.

YOUNG: Dr. Young, let me adjourn.

NIEL: Ms. Niel second.

COVERLEY: All right. All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

[end of meeting]