

PENNSYLVANIA COMMISSION ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY  
CONSTABLES' EDUCATION AND TRAINING BOARD

**Approved Minutes of the August 11, 2022 Meeting**

**Members Present**

Chair Craig Westover, Constable, Venango Co.  
Francis Peitz, Constable,  
Allegheny County  
Major Joanne Reed, PA State Police  
Patricia Norwood-Foden, Court Admin,  
Chester County  
Vice-Chair John Bruno, Constable,  
Dauphin County

**Commission Staff Present**

Sherry Leffler, Constables' Program  
Tracy Beaver, Constables' Program  
Nicholas Hartman, Constables' Program  
Sally Barry, PCCD  
Dorthey Jacobelli, PCCD  
Theresa Ford, PCCD  
Megan Staub, PCCD  
Debra Sandifer, PCCD

**Visitors**

Steve Shelow, PSU JASI  
Tony Mucha, PSU JASI  
Anthony Luongo, Temple University  
Constable Abraham Smith, Westmoreland County  
Constable Scott Davis, Dauphin County  
Constable Herbert Brown, Bradford County  
Constable Michael Ludwig, Montgomery County  
Constable Kevin Herrick, Lackawanna County  
Constable John Emerick, Somerset County  
Constable Rick Salazon, York County  
Constable Joseph McElahney, Westmoreland County  
Constable Scott Warren, Montgomery County  
Constable Kurt Thompson, Lancaster County  
Constable Dominique Brown, Franklin County  
Constable Troy Hay, Bedford County

Please note, additional Constables were attending the Board Meeting, but did not elect to be recognized.

**I. Call to Order:**

The Constables' Education and Training Board (Board) meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, August 11, 2022 via in-person, and Teams. The Board Meeting was held in a hybrid style according to the Sunshine Act to make in-person an available option.

Ms. Leffler explained that the meeting is being recorded. Chair Westover established that a quorum of Board members was present.

## **II. Action Items:**

Chair Westover asked Mr. Nicholas Hartman to introduce the first Action Item: Unapproved Draft Minutes of May 5, 2022 Meeting. This can be found on pages 2 through 12 of the Board packet. The Board did not request the item be read and did not offer any discussion. There was no comment by Public Voice.

Vice-Chair Bruno made a motion to approve the Unapproved Draft Minutes, with Constable Peitz as the second.

VOTING AYE: Peitz, Norwood-Foden, Westover, Reed, Bruno

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Westover introduced the second Action Item: Unapproved Financial Report for May 5, 2022. This can be found on pages 13 through 18 of the Board packet. Ms. Dorthy Jacobelli provided the balance from the previous year as \$2,478,756.38, reported that from fee collections for July 1, 2021 thru June 30, 2022 as \$1,277,817.56 which leaves a total funds available as of June 30, 2022, of \$3,756,573.94. Both the financial expenditures and financial commitments totaled \$670,253.90 and \$2,758,959.42 respectfully as of June 30, 2022 for a grand total of \$3,429,213.32. The uncommitted balance as of June 30, 2022 was \$327,360.32. Monies generated by class payments totaled \$255,007.25. Chair Westover then asked for a motion to approve the Unapproved Fiscal Report for March 31, 2022.

Chair Westover asked for a motion and it was provided by Vice-Chair Bruno and seconded by Major Reed.

VOTING AYE: Peitz, Norwood-Foden, Westover, Reed, Bruno

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Westover introduced the third Action Item: Instructor Certifications. This can be found on pages 19 through 23 of the Board packet. Mr. Nicholas Hartman was asked to introduce the instructors for Board approval: Kevin Barrett (General, Communication, and Firearms), Daniel Bell (General, and Firearms), James Kulak (General, and Communications – Crisis Intervention, and Firearms), Phil Mirabile (General, Communication, Physical Skills, and Firearms), and Daniel Schaefer (General, Communication, and Firearms). All the nominated instructors meet the requirements for Board certification to teach their associated topics. There were no comments made by the Board or Public Voice.

Chair Westover made the motion for approval, with Vice-Chair Bruno seconding the motion.

VOTING AYE: Peitz, Norwood-Foden, Westover, Reed, Bruno

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Westover asked Ms. Leffler to introduce the fourth Action Item: Basic Training Waivers for Law Enforcement Officers. This can be found on pages 24-28 of the Board packet. Ms. Leffler explained that at the May 5, 2022 Board Meeting the Board had asked Program Staff to provide additional information regarding the Law Enforcement Examination for the 80-Hour Basic Training Classes. This information includes the Issue, History and Background, and how the Law Enforcement Waiver Exam is tied to the Regulations in Title 37. Program Staff completed a formal review, and analysis of the Law Enforcement Waivers. Program Staff listed out the known facts: there is no legal requirement to provide the Law Enforcement Waiver; the Board has had the Waiver Exam in practice for 26 years; Constables who are certified under Act 120 may apply for a Waiver. Ms. Leffler then provided the statistic that from 1996-2021 150 Law Enforcement Waiver Applications were approved, 134 Constables took the exam, and of the 134 who took the exam, 126 Constables passed the exam. Of the 126 Constables who passed the exam, only 16 are currently certified. Ms. Leffler explained more detail can be found on page 28. Ms. Leffler explained the Assumptions regarding the Law Enforcement Waiver Exam contain: if retained, the Board wants to have a clear standard for the Waiver Exam; the Board wants to ensure Constables being certified under Act 49 have met the same standard regarding the education in the role, function, and purpose of Constables serving the judiciary; there will still be a need for a Law Enforcement waiver of some type; criteria for any type of waiver to be reviewed, and updated in the Regulations. Possible Constraints are the amount of time for any changes to Title 37 to be approved by the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC) which could take one to two years. Ms. Leffler explained the Tasks needed to update the Law Enforcement Waiver Regulation would include: develop changes to the regulation, and validate (proposed changes reviewed by PCCD legal counsel, Board, and the Commission); submit regulation changes thru the IRRC process, and the amount of Program Staff time devoted to these tasks. Ms. Leffler reviewed the Critical Information to be considered: what would be the net gain, or goal in revising the regulation; and would the changes to the regulation result in reduced liability. The issue was restated that the Board would like to review, validate, and revise as needed the current Law Enforcement Waiver regulation to ensure that it is equitable, and consistent with the Board requirements for Act 49 initial certification. Ms. Leffler explained a constable / deputy seeking a LE waiver completes the waiver application (attached) and submits it to PCCD. If the application is complete and the constable meets the criteria on the application, staff notify the constable in writing and schedule them to take the waiver exam. The current exam is 100 questions, proportionally covering the subjects from the 80-Hour Basic Training. If the constable passes the waiver exam, they are notified and once they have filed liability insurance, the constable is certified. Ms. Leffler then introduced the Courses of Actions and reminded the Board that they have options when it comes to the Course of Actions, such as merging two options together. Program staff has come up with three Courses of Action that contain Pros and Cons.

Ms. Leffler then introduced the three proposed Courses of Action.

Course of Action 1: Eliminate the waiver all together.

Pros: ensures a constable has training relevant to working as a constable for the courts; same training standard applies to all constables; reduces potential for conflict/mis-interpretation of

Board Regulations; eliminates work for staff – for a small percentage of the year; follows the CETB elimination of the Firearms Waiver for Law Enforcement in 2009.

Cons: Board has established precedent of 26 years of providing a LE waiver; changes required in the Constables' Certification, Education and Training System (CCETS).

Course of Action 2: Eliminate waiver test – training only option.

Pros: ensures constable has training relevant to working as a constable for the courts; reduces potential for conflict of regulations Constable is required to pay and attend basic for: Role of the Constable (4 hrs.), Civil Law (12 hrs.), Criminal Law (8 hrs.), Prisoner Transport (4 hrs.), for a total of 28 hours; Sheriff and Deputy Sheriff eliminated waiver exam in approximately 2004.

Cons: basic classes in time and location vary every year; number of Basics vary each year; constable may have to wait to attend next available training; changes to CCETS.

Course of Action 3: Status quo.

Pros: minor updates to Regulations for clarity; changes required to CCETS; continue to provide LE waiver for obtaining Act 49 certification.

Cons: basic classes in time and location vary every year; number of Basics vary each year; constable may have to wait to attend next available basic training; potential changes required to CCETS.

Ms. Leffler explained that Program Staff created screening criteria to score the Courses of Action. In order to objectively compare the developed Courses of Action, screening criteria was developed that centered on what staff considered the most critical factors of the issue. The most obvious screening criteria were reducing liability and maintaining standards. Additional screening criteria selected were, economy of time and the ability to validate the results as additional screening criteria.

Summarized, screening criteria are:

Maintain Standards - To keep the current training quality and standards the Board has developed over the life of the program.

Reduce Liability – to make sure the Board is keeping Regulations current with changes in generally accepted practices.

Economy of Time – the best use of Board and staff time.

Ease of Validation – checking an applicant's training credentials is standardized and consistent.

The objective was to employ an empirical approach for the screening criteria. First, staff arrayed the Courses of Action down the left side and Screening Criteria across the top of an intersecting grid. Of the four screening criteria, Maintain Standards and Reduce Liability were determined to be the most important. The most important criteria were assigned a weighted value and the remaining screening criteria were left unweighted. Ms. Leffler explained that based on the scoring, Course of Action 1 received the highest score which is the removal of the Waiver Exam completely. Chair Westover asked Major Reed if there is any type of Waiver Exam for State Police to which Major Reed answered no there is not, and that everyone will

go through the same training. Chair Westover recognized the amount of time that staff spends on the Waiver Exam application and processing and felt that Program Staff provided enough information to support the removal of the Law Enforcement Waiver Exam. Chair Westover asked Major Reed to clarify her answer, asking that the purpose of no waiver was to make sure that everyone was receiving the same level of training, to which Major Reed answered yes. Chair Westover explained in his experiences with being in the class room that Law Enforcement Waiver Exam Constables struggled to understand their authority and added that Act 120 training does not include the information provided in Civil Law, such as levies, and the selling of property. Chair Westover also explained that Act 120 is not cookie-cutter, and therefore not everyone receives the same level of education. Chair Westover voiced his support for Course of Action 1, Constable Peitz agreed with Chair Westover, and Vice-Chair Bruno on the elimination of the Law Enforcement Waiver Exam. Ms. Norwood-Foden asked the question with the elimination of the Law Enforcement Waiver, would increase of number of Constables taking the Basic Training being an issue for planning, and allowing Constables to secure seating in Basic Training. Ms. Leffler explained that Program Staff receives few Law Enforcement Waiver Exams on a non-election year. Ms. Leffler stated that Program Staff has only received nine waiver applications, and three have not met the requirements, which have come to the Board for reconsideration, and have been denied. Vice-Chair Bruno reiterated the uniqueness of being a Constable, and why the Basic Training is so important.

Vice-Chair Bruno made the motion for approval, with Chair Westover seconding the motion. VOTING AYE: Peitz, Norwood-Foden, Westover, Reed, Bruno

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Westover introduced the second topic: Weapon Optics. Chair Westover provided the Board with his experience of new Constables using optics during the Basic Firearms Training Course. Chair Westover explained that the optics were being washed out due to the sunlight, settings were needing to be changed to adjust, and that the rear iron-sights had been removed from the firearm. Chair Westover explained as a Firearm Instructor, whom has attended national trainings, that in most trainings you are not permitted optics until after a person can demonstrate the correct use of the iron sights. Chair Westover explained he felt this was a disservice to new Constables attending Basic Firearms Training. However, Chair Westover said after the completion of Basic Firearms, he is not opposed to optics at the Annual Firearms Qualification Course. Chair Westover explained his concern is that if the optics go down, and a person is not adequately prepared to use the iron-sights that the firearm has become useless. Chair Westover wanted to share this topic with the Board, and to hear the other Board Members opinions. Chair Westover then asked Major Reed if the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) has the same prohibition of optics being used when teaching firearms. Major Reed explained that PSP has not determined if they will be allowed or not, because they are now researching the different types of optics made available. When it comes to rifle, Major Reed explained that both optics, and iron sights are being used in the qualification. Major Reed

explained that optics are a tool, and that they do not replace the use of iron-sights. Chair Westover explained optics are a tool to enhance, but various factors can negatively impact the use of optics. Vice-Chair Bruno reinforced that iron-sights are basic and asked if this is a Regulation change. Chair Westover stated that Basic Firearms has not been reviewed recently and asked for Program Staff to obtain Board Certified Firearms Instructors, and review the Basic Firearms Course, with optics being addressed. Ms. Leffler explained that Program Staff has already begun identifying Firearms Instructors to come to PCCD to review the Basic Firearms curriculum. Ms. Leffler also explained that the Board could make a Board Policy to not allow optics at Basic Firearms. Chair Westover asked what the timeline would be. Ms. Leffler explained that this would be a large undertaking, but could not be accomplished by the start of 2023, and Ms. Leffler provided the option that if the Board feels strongly about not allowing optics at Basic Firearms, the Board could make a change that would not allow optics at Basic Firearms, but allow them at Annual Firearms. Ms. Leffler explained that this would be an internal policy change, and that Program Staff would inform the Training Delivery Contractors of not allowing optics at Basic Firearms, but allowing optics at Annual Firearms, and inform the Constable population of the change, as well. Ms. Leffler also explained that the decision regarding optics could be a Board Regulation. Ms. Leffler said that this process could take six to eight months, if not a year to complete. Chair Westover restated the issues that optics had created and would like to address the issue during the review of Basic Firearms. Chair Westover also asked other instructors at the Basic Firearms, that he attended, what their opinions on optics were at Basic Firearms, and none of the instructors supported the use of optics at Basic Firearms. Chair Westover asked the Board for their opinions on the plan to address optics at the Basic Firearms review. Ms. Leffler explained that whatever the decision is, Program Staff will begin to implement the change with the Basic Firearms courses that remain in the year 2022. Ms. Norwood-Foden asked if not allowing optics at Basic Firearms would impact any students in the remaining Basic Firearms courses for the year. Chair Westover explained that gun manufactures are pushing optics as the catch all mechanic to shooting and did not anticipate that optics would be at Basic Firearms. Chair Westover reiterated his concern about the removal of iron-sights impacting sight alignment. Chair Westover said he would like to stop the use of optics at Basic Firearms now. Chair Westover asked if the Board would support the recommendation for the review of the Basic Firearms. All Board Members agreed with the recommendation.

### **III. Discussion Items:**

Ms. Leffler introduced the first Discussion Item: Program Supervisor's Report.

Ms. Leffler introduced statistics regarding Continuing Education to the Board for the status of 2022 Training: 39 training classes scheduled, with 25 being completed, and 7 canceled. These statistics were as of August 10, 2022. 580 Constables have successfully completed the 8-hour in-person Continuing Education class. For Online Classes: Crisis Intervention is 38% or 308 completions (there were 9 first attempt failures, and 1 second attempt failure); Legal Updates is 33%, or 267 completions (there were 11 first attempt failures, with 2 second attempt failures, and 1 successful retake); Service of Criminal Warrants is 34%, or 278 completions (there were 2 first attempt failures). 220 Constables have completed all 2022 Continuing Education requirements. Ms. Leffler provided a reminder that the due date to complete classes is in November 18, 2022 at 5 pm.

Ms. Leffler introduced statistics regarding Annual Firearms to the Board, of 40 classes scheduled, with 21 being completed, and 6 canceled. 380 Constables have attempted qualification, and of the 380, 316 successfully completed Annual Firearms with their primary weapon, or primary, and secondary weapon. There was a 4.4% total failure rate of annual qualifications thus far.

Ms. Leffler explained that there are currently four Basic Training classes scheduled: one in the East with 30 Constables successfully completing and 28 of which are certified, another set for October in the East. Two Basic Training scheduled in the West, with 30 enrolled Constables, 29 Constables successfully completed the Basic Training, and 1 subject failure that will be attending a retake; the second Basic Training that is currently happening with 29 enrolled Constables that will run Friday night, Saturday, and Sunday for four weekends in August. There are no wait lists or reserving of spots. There will be Basic Firearms Courses (four, in total) following each Basic Training Courses for new Constables to enroll into, and there has been a fourth Basic Firearms Training Course added to accommodate the number of potential Constables due to Basic Firearms Training Courses being a smaller class size. The first Basic Firearms Training Course was held at Westmoreland County Community College beginning on May 13, 2022, with all 20 Constables successfully completing. The second Basic Firearms Training Course had 24 Constables enrolled, 17 who successfully completed the Course, 1 excused absence, 5 failures, and 1 weapon malfunction. The last two Basic Firearms Courses are currently being filled. Ms. Leffler added that the training schedule for 2023 is being completed, and the Constables who were not able to enroll into the 80-Hour Basic Training Course this year will have first-come first-serve ability to enroll in 2023 Courses. Ms. Leffler said that there will be a Basic Firearms course early in 2023 that will be available for those who completed Basic Training in 2022 but could not enroll into a Basic Firearms Training Course. Ms. Leffler provided the statistic that six Basic Training courses, and six Basic Firearms Training Courses will be offered in 2023.

Ms. Leffler explained that Program Staff continue to work with the Training Delivery Contractors on confirming dates, and locations for the 2023 Basic Training and Basic Firearms Training Courses. The first Basic Training, and Basic Firearms are scheduled for mid-January of 2023. Staff will be reaching out to 181 Constables, and Deputy Constables (who are currently registered in CCETS) who were unable to enroll in Basic Training for 2022.

Ms. Leffler provided the statistic that Program Staff have processed over 215 class payments for Basic Training, Basic Firearms, No Shows, and Failures in 2022.

Ms. Leffler provided the statistic that eight individuals have been approved to take the Law Enforcement Basic Training Waiver exam. Three have passed, one is scheduled for testing on August 29, 2022, and four have been contacted to schedule, but have not responded.

Ms. Leffler stated that Program Staff will continue to mail 2022 ID Cards each Monday, as Program Staff receive Terms of Office, and completed Continuing Education grades for 2022.

Ms. Leffler explained, that as of April 2021, there are 901 Constables, and Deputy Constables who are active, and certified, and for 2022 there are 789 certified Constables. 614 of the 901 Constables, and Deputy Constables are Firearms Certified. 4713 Constables have either

completed the Basic Training or passed the Waiver Exam throughout the life of the Program since 1996.

Ms. Leffler stated that both PSU-JASI, and Temple University have removed their mandatory mask mandates.

Ms. Leffler introduced the second Discussion Item, Board Regulation Revision Discussion. Ms. Leffler presented the Regulations changes and explained that based on the Board decision regarding the removal of the Law Enforcement Waiver Exam, that additional sections will be removed from the Board Regulations. Ms. Leffler said that Program Staff made the updates from the May 5, 2022 Board Meeting, and there was inconsistency regarding the words “training year” and “calendar year” and moving forward “calendar year” will be used throughout the Regulations. Ms. Leffler addressed the formatting issues that Ms. Norwood-Foden found. Ms. Leffler is hopeful that in November, Program Staff will be able to provide a draft of the Board Regulations with the completed changes. If there are no additional changes, Ms. Leffler said she would accept the changes, to provide a clean document for the Board to review at the November meeting, which will include the Board’s recent decision on the removal of the Law Enforcement Waiver Exam. Ms. Leffler reiterated the process of reviewing and submitting the Regulation changes to IRRC.

Chair Westover asked what the status of meetings at PCCD is, and Ms. Leffler explained that the Commission Meeting will be held as a hybrid meeting. Once Program Staff receive confirmation that the equipment is working correctly, in person meetings will be possible at PCCD. Ms. Leffler anticipates that the November Board Meeting may be hybrid.

#### **IV. Other Business:**

Chair Westover asked if there was any Other Business, and none was presented.

#### **V. Public Voice:**

Constable Michael Ludwig asked for an update regarding the use of the GI Bill to pay for Basic Training, and what the Program Policy is for filling vacancies in Basic Training. Ms. Leffler explained that Program Staff has presented the training curriculum to the Veteran’s Administration (VA) for review, and approval. Program Staff is meeting the following week regarding this topic. Program Staff is awaiting the decision from VA regarding the acceptance of our training curriculum. Ms. Leffler explained that several cancellations had occurred in Basic Training, and that Program Staff goes through the list of Constables not currently enrolled in Basic Training, and contacts those individuals based upon when they registered into CCETS. Ms. Leffler said that it was understood that Constable Ludwig had a spot in the October class, and that Program Staff does not reach out to enrollments into existing filled classes, because a Constable has an existing enrollment spot in the Basic Training. Ms. Leffler also explained the administrative process regarding enrollment, and how Program Staff did not feel they had enough time to fill the spot based on the cancellation being two weeks away from the beginning of the class. Constable Ludwig voiced his opinion and dissatisfaction with Program Staff and Ms. Leffler responded that his opinion was noted and thanked him for his comments.

Constable Dominique Brown asked if there are prohibitions about working with the dog warden in his county. Chair Westover asked if the Constable would be accompanying the dog warden. Constable Brown explained that the dog warden is asking if Constable Brown can be trained to assist the dog warden. Chair Westover recommended asking an attorney if it is allowable with a person being a Constable and reiterated that the focus of the Program is train to provide judiciary support under Act 49. Chair Westover said that the Board cannot make any comment, and that the dog warden should speak to someone at their agency for a determination. Ms. Leffler agreed with Chair Westover's comment. Vice-Chair Bruno stated how a conflict of interest can occur. Constable Brown told the Board that he is also a Councilman for Chambersburg, and has contacted the County Solicitor, and provided clarifying information regarding his question saying his county felt there is no conflict. Vice-Chair Bruno asked if Constable Brown was a Councilman, and Constable Brown said yes. Constable Peitz then asked Constable Brown how he is holding two elected offices. Vice-Chair Bruno explained incompatible offices, and said a specific statute addresses a person holding positions that conflict. Chair Westover mentioned the court case *Commonwealth versus LeGree* that addresses being elected to more than one office of public trust. Ms. Sandifer reiterated the purpose of the Board is for training, and certification, and that the Board does not possess any other type of authority, and that the training provided is regarding judiciary support. Ms. Sandifer explained that if a Constable, who is an independent contractor, would need to refer to the rules and regulations of the entity in which they are working when outside the realm of education for judiciary support. Ms. Sandifer reiterated the limit and focus of the Board.

Constable Kevin Herrick said that he spoke with his county about helping with the cost of training, and the county said by law, that they are unable to help him with the cost of his Basic Training costs. Constable Herrick was asking for clarification and Chair Westover explained the separation of the Constable from government and reiterated the independent contractor status of the Constable. Chair Westover explained that the Internal Revenue System (IRS) monitors how Constables work with government, and that if the government were paying the Constable's training, or equipment, they are then employed by the government entity. Constable Westover explained that the government would need to review the independent contractor definition. Chair Westover asked Ms. Sandifer for additional comment, and Ms. Sandifer reiterated the independent contractor status of being a Constable. Constable Herrick then asked if he were to observe a person using drugs, would he be allowed to make an arrest. Chair Westover explained that the Constable would want to refer to their local rules regarding breach of the peace, and Chair Westover explained that the Board cannot make a statement regarding the question. Vice-Chair Bruno explained there was a training on being a good witness, and that the module addressed the question at hand, and what a Constable can, and cannot do. Ms. Leffler explained that she could look for it, but there is not a resource account for old curriculum available for Constables and would need to be revisited for curriculum review. Chair Westover said it also best to refer to your local authorities such as your County District Attorney.

Constable Troy Hay supported the comments made by Chair Westover, and Vice-Chair Bruno regarding the drug use question that Constable Herrick asked. Constable Hay asked a fee bill question regarding bringing a person in for violations (such as a traffic, and non-traffic violations at the same time). Chair Westover explained that local rules, and different judges have interpretation of the fee bill. During the Basic Training, the fee bill is reviewed, but it is also explained that each county may have their own interpretation on what they will and will not pay. Chair Westover explained it is up to the Judge on what will and will not be paid. Constable Hay

said from his experience holds to what Chair Westover explained. Chair Westover asked Ms. Norwood-Foden for her comment, and Ms. Norwood-Foden asked Constable Hay if their county had created a Constable Review Board. Ms. Norwood-Foden suggested that if Constable Hay's county has a review board to present the question to them, or to run the question by the county's payment authority, or to review a county handbook on how payment policies are made. Chair Westover explained that Venango County has a review board, and questions such as Constable Hay's would go there.

Constable Abraham Smith said that dog law mentioned Constables under the term Police Officer in their definition. Constable Smith believes *Commonwealth versus LeGree* is no longer good law due to shepardization. Constable Smith says that the law is based on a version of the statute that is repealed. Constable Smith asked if the media platform for having the Board Meetings will be changed. Ms. Leffler explained that Program Staff must use the products provided through the state.

#### **VI. Adjournment:**

Chair Westover asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:26 a.m. A motion was made by Vice-Chair Bruno to adjourn the meeting and the motion was second by Constable Peitz.

VOTING AYE: Westover, Norwood-Foden, Reed, Peitz, Bruno

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously. The next Board meeting will be held on November 3, 2022 at 9 a.m. via Teams, and in-person at PCCD.