

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

Approved Minutes of the May 5, 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

Commission Staff Present

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

Visitors

Steve Shelow, PSU JASI
Deidre Beiter, Temple University
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

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, May 5, 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.

Major Joanne Reed was introduced as the new Board Member. Major Reed replaced Major George Bivens on the Board as the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) designee. Major Reed

introduced herself as a member of PSP for 20 years and was appointed to this position on April 19, 2022.

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

II. Action Items:

Chair Westover asked Mr. Nicholas Hartman to introduce the first Action Item: Unapproved Draft Minutes of February 10, 2022 Meeting. This can be found on pages 2 through 9 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. Ms. Norwood-Foden made a motion to approve the Unapproved Draft Minutes, with Constable Peitz as the second.

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

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Westover introduced the second Action Item: Unapproved Financial Report for February 2, 2022. This can be found on pages 10 through 15 of the Board packet. Ms. Dorthey Jacobelli provided the balance from the previous year as \$2,478,756.38, reported that from fee collections for July 1, 2020 thru March 31, 2022 as \$921,195.07 which leaves a total funds available as of March 31, 2022 of \$3,399,951.45. Both the financial expenditures and financial commitments totaled \$429,424.89 and \$2,801,216.94 respectfully as of March 31, 2022 for a grand total of \$3,230,641.83 The uncommitted balance as of March 31, 2022 was \$169,309.62. Chair Westover then asked for a motion to approve the Unapproved Fiscal Report for March 31, 2022. Chair Westover wanted to discuss the projected totals of collections. Chair Westover pointed out that it appears that we are not making our financial projections, and asked Mr. Pfau to provide his opinion. Mr. Pfau said Program Staff received the data requested from Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC) regarding Constables Education Training Act (CETA) Fund fee collections, and that the Board can be briefed next meeting. Mr. Pfau also stated that with the opening of courts, Constables are now able to do work that generates income for the Fund. Mr. Pfau said it may take time for the revenue to be generated and reach the fund. Mr. Pfau is expecting an uptick in the next fiscal report. Chair Westover stated he is concerned about the health of the Fund, despite all of the cuts that Program Staff have made and is asking the Board to allow Chair Westover to send a letter to the General Assembly asking to increase the CETA fee surcharge. Chair Westover is asking for help from Program Staff to write the letter. Ms. Norwood-Foden supports the letter, and recognize the impacts of the pandemic, and the loss of certified constables. Ms. Norwood-Foden has concerns about program sustainability, and the impact that that technology is having an impact on CETA due to defendants being able to pay fees online. Ms. Norwood-Foden explained that this is causing a natural reduction to warrants being issued and creating less for work Constables that generates CETA surcharges. Mr. Pfau also explained that there is a lag time when fees are assessed versus when funds are sent to the

Program. Mr. Pfau also stated that it may take time for the Fund to see an impact of a fee increase. Chair Westover voiced another concern over the Fund and explained that the Program does not charge the full amount for the 80-Hour Basic Training Course. Even with the cost of Basic Training, it is still not helping to stabilize the Fund. Chair Westover recognized that the various Constable Associations have also tried to lobby for an increase in the CETA fee surcharges. Chair Westover is asking again for the approval of the Board to send a letter regarding the health of the fund to the General Assembly.

A motion was made by Constable Peitz and seconded by Ms. Patricia Norwood-Foden for the Board to send a letter to the General Assembly. Chair Westover then asked for Public Comment regarding the Financial Report. Constable Scott Davis asked about the cost of training, the letter going to the General Assembly, but then transitioned into talking about the Basic Training scheduling. Constable Davis asked if Basic Training could be amended to be easier for newer Constables to attend. Chair Westover explained that locations (school, and firing ranges) can be difficult to secure, and can be the determining factor of the date of a training. Ms. Leffler added that location was a key factor, as well as Program Staff not being able to predict the loss of certified Constables in the 2020 election. Ms. Leffler explained that there will be more availability in the future for weekend classes. Constable Davis asked if there were additional trainings, and Ms. Leffler explained that all Basic Training classes are full. Constable Herbert Brown spoke about the cost of travel, and lodging for the Basic Training classes, and stated that the cost of Basic Training feels to be cost prohibitive. Chair Westover said he appreciated the concern and explained that many of the costs associated with Basic Training are tax deductible, such as mileage, due to a Constable being an independent contractor, as they are their own business. Chair Westover explained that Program Staff tries its best to have classes in areas with the highest concentration of registered constables, and that the pandemic has limited our locations. Constable Brown stated that warrants appear to be in number in the more rural counties and has concerns that Judges are not wanting to enforce smaller offenses. Chair Westover explained that jail population is a concern regarding Judges, due to the pandemic, and having room in the jails. Chair Westover agreed that there are many warrants available. Ms. Leffler also told Constable Brown that Program Staff is looking to host a Basic Training in both the North East, and North West regions in 2023. Ms. Leffler provided the reason for the cost of Basic Training: that the program trained 506 new constables in 2016, only 353 were certified, and of the 353, none of the certified Constables completed work that generated CETA surcharges. In 2020, the Board made the decision that new Constables would need to pay for the cost of Basic Training. Constable Brown suggested that new Constables must work for the judiciary for a year or two to generate funds. Ms. Leffler explained that the 2018 Workgroup recommended this option, but Program Staff would also need to look at the AOPC data on how to consider this option. Constable Abraham Smith explained that in Westmoreland County the minor judiciary was prohibited from providing warrants to Constables and feels this is a cause of a lack of CETA surcharges being generated in Westmoreland County. Constable Smith explained that in Westmoreland County the number of warrants has grown, and that this is an issue that affects other Constables and the inability for Constables to be assigned warrants by the minor judiciary. Constable Smith asked if the stopping of warrants could be addressed, because this would generate CETA funds. Chair Westover explained that conversations regarding the concerns of Constable Smith are happening. Constable Michael Ludwig asked if Program Staff has had additional information regarding if the Veteran's Administration (VA) can help cover the costs. Mr. Pfau explained that the Sheriffs and Deputy

Sheriffs Training Program (SDSTP) does use the Veteran Program. Mr. Pfau said that the initial feedback was positive from the VA, and that Program Staff is working on the necessary requirements. Mr. Pfau explained it is a long process to receive approval to accept VA funding for the 80-Hour Basic Training costs. Chair Westover explained that the Public Voice should be regarding the Fiscal Report, and that Public Voice for other comments will happen at the end of the meeting. Chair Westover asked for a motion and it was provided by Ms. Norwood-Foden, and seconded by Constable Peitz.

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

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Westover introduced the third Action Item: Instructor Certifications. This can be found on pages 16 through 20 of the Board packet. Ms. Tracy Beaver was asked to introduce the instructors for Board approval: Dominic Caimona (Firearms), Merle Geisey (General, Physical Skills, and Firearms), Marcus Kohan (Law, and Communications – MOAB (Management of Aggressive Behavior)), Timothy Nease (General, Physical Skills, and Firearms), and Sean O’Block (General). 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 asked for a motion, and Constable Peitz made the motion, with Ms. Norwood-Foden seconding the motion.

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

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Westover asked Ms. Leffler to introduce the fourth Action Item: Request for Exception to Board for Ineligible Waiver Applicant. This can be found on page 21 of the Board packet. Ms. Leffler provided that Constable Richard Begenwald applied for a Waiver Exam but had exceeded the two-year submission date as outlined in the Regulations. Program Staff is asking that the Exception be denied. Ms. Leffler explained that the application must be received within two years of employment: in the case of Constable Begenwald, April 1, 2019 through April 1, 2021. The application was received on January 14, 2022, after the eligibility period. Chair Westover agreed with the decision based on the regulations. Ms. Norwood-Foden asked a clarifying question if it has always been two years per regulation, and Ms. Leffler explained the regulation, and answered Ms. Norwood-Foden’s question as yes, it must be within a two-year period. Chair Westover asked for a motion, Constable Peitz made the motion, and Ms. Norwood-Foden seconded the motion. There was no public comment.

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

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously.

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 18 being completed, and 3 canceled. These statistics were as of April 25, 2022. 431 Constables have successfully completed the 8-hour in-person Continuing Education class. For Online Classes: Crisis Intervention is 27% or 220 completions (there were 6 first attempt failures); Legal Updates is 24%, or 193 completions (there were 8 first attempt failures, with 2 second attempt failures, and 1 successful retake); Service of Criminal Warrants is 24%, or 192 completions (there were 2 first attempt failures). 127 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 5pm.

Ms. Leffler introduced statistics regarding Annual Firearms to the Board, of 40 classes scheduled, with 10 being completed, and 4 canceled. 177 Constables have attempted qualification, and of the 177, 170 successfully completed Annual Firearms with their primary weapon, or primary, and secondary weapon. There was a 4% total failure rate of annual qualifications thus far, with 1 failure being a written exam being failed twice, and 6 qualification failures after two attempts for a total of 7 failures.

For Basic Training, Ms. Leffler stated that Program Staff have assisted over 300 plus newly elected constables, and deputy constables. 139 individuals are currently in the CCETS (Constables Continuing Education Training System) system, 46 are awaiting to be approved in CCETS (waiting to receive Term of Office), and 130 paid individuals are enrolled into a Basic Training class. A follow-up email was sent on April 28, 2022 giving a deadline of May 27, 2022 for new Constables to submit their required paperwork or have their CCETS registration rejected.

Ms. Leffler explained that there are currently four Basic Training classes scheduled: one in the East (SE01BT22, with 30 successfully completed Constables, 28 of which are certified), one in the Central Area and two in the West that will run Friday night, Saturday, and Sunday for four weekends. 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 course added to accommodate the number of potential Constables due to Basic Firearms being a smaller class size. The first Basic Firearms Course will be held at Westmoreland County Community College starting on May 13, 2022. Ms. Leffler also reminded that new Constables should enroll into the CCETS system to receive the information regarding the 2023 classes.

Ms. Leffler explained that Basic Training classes, and Basic Firearms classes are occurring, and provided the dates for the classes.

Ms. Leffler informed the Board that Program Staff will be working with the Training Delivery Contractors to start formulating the Basic Trainings, and Basics Firearms for 2023 with a focus on an early Basic Firearms.

Ms. Leffler provided the statistic that five individuals have been approved to take the Law Enforcement Basic Training Waiver exam. Two have passed, and three are currently confirming dates.

Ms. Leffler stated that Program Staff will be mailing 2022 ID Cards each Tuesday, as Program Staff receive Terms of Office, and additional required paperwork.

Ms. Leffler explained, that as of April 2021, there are 883 Constables, and Deputy Constables who are active, and certified, and for 2022 there are 753 certified Constables. 727 of the 883 Constables, and Deputy Constables are Firearms Certified. 4682 Constables have either completed the Basic Training or passed the Waiver Exam through the life of the program since 1996.

Ms. Norwood-Foden asked if the newly elected Constables will have priority for the Basic Training for next year, and Ms. Leffler said yes. Ms. Norwood-Foden explained that Chester County had 41 active Constables and is now down to 12 active Constables. In Chester County, Magisterial Judges are working with Constables on who receives Constables on what days, and are rotating court hearings due to the availability of a Constable. Ms. Norwood-Foden stressed the importance of needing new Constables in Chester County. Ms. Leffler said that in CCETS there are 31 active Constables in Chester County, however not all who are in CCETS may be providing judiciary support. Chair Westover explained that he is commuting to another county to help another judge and said this is an inequity in the state.

Ms. Leffler introduced the second Discussion Item, Board Regulation Revision Discussion. Ms. Leffler presented the Regulations on Microsoft Teams. Ms. Leffler explained that there is language Program Staff is recommending be removed, and additional language to be added into the Regulations. Program Staff is following the style issued for additions/subtraction by the Independent Regulatory Review Committee (IRRC). Ms. Leffler asked if the Board has had a chance to review the changes. Ms. Leffler said rather than go through all changes individually, we would like to focus on specific recommendations.

Mr. Pfau said this is a first look at proposed changes, and that voting would not occur today but, rather to review the content, and begin the discussion regarding edits. Ms. Leffler said it may take multiple meetings to finalize the language. Ms. Leffler said the first item to be discussed was not in the regulations, but rather discovered by Program Staff.

Program Staff had discovered that under Basic Training regarding failures, it is stated that if a failure occurs after the second written exam, that that individual would need to complete a full Basic Training again. When comparing this failure policy to the Continuing Education policy, the discrepancy is the Constable would need to retake the subject, and not the entire Continuing Education Course. Ms. Leffler is asking the Board to discuss a possible motion that if an individual fails a subject at Basic Training, that they do not need to retake the entire 80-Hour Basic Training Course again, but rather retake the subject that they have failed. Mr. Pfau

explained that this change would be consistent with the SDSTP. Chair Westover supports the suggestion and made the recommendation of the Constable having to pay for the individual class failure rather than the entire cost of Basic Training. Chair Westover liked that the suggestion mirrors the Sheriff's Program and is consistent with existing Regulation. Ms. Norwood-Foden also recognized that this helps to keep spots available for a new Constable to attend the 80-Hour Basic Training Course. The Constable who failed a subject is not taking up a seat in the Basic Training but would rather be viewed as a retake. Constable Peitz, and Major Reed both provided their support. Ms. Leffler also said that sub-section D would need to be removed from the Regulation to make this policy consistent with the Continuing Education policy. Mr. Pfau also explained that early in the Program, that there were consistent failures in the Basic Training, but total failures have not occurred recently.

Ms. Leffler introduced the next recommendation regarding demonstration of proficiency in Defensive Tactics, and other skills related subjects such as Mechanics of Arrest. The Board and Program Staff has struggled with the total waiving of participation in physical skills. Ms. Leffler stated that the numbers of physical skills waivers has decreased, however, Program Staff are asking how does the Board enforce this regulation for mandatory participation. Mr. Pfau explained that other training academies are an employer who can require full participation of their employees. In the SDSTP Academy, a physical sign off is required from a medical practitioner, for a student to participate in physical skills. With Constables being independent contractors, there is no doctor available to validate that they are physically fit to engage in the physical skills. The fear is, Constables are concerned with being hurt at training, and not being able to work. The question that Mr. Pfau is asking is how does Program Staff require Constables to demonstrate skills in a fair manner to pass the physical skills training. Chair Westover tells Constables that their training records are permanent, and that their training records could be looked at, and subpoenaed. Chair Westover follows-up with saying that the constable would then need to explain to the Courts why they did not participate in the training if their training record were to be subpoenaed. Chair Westover has said when he provides the aforementioned explanation, he sees Constables participating in the physical skills subject material. Chair Westover also mentioned those who say if they are hurt at training, they are not eligible for Workmen's Compensation at their primary job, and that they should be mindful the waiver is on their training record. Mr. Pfau explained that the average age of Constables is 5657, and some may have underlying medical issues. Mr. Pfau added that it is recorded if a Constable can participate in any part of the physical skills subject, and if part of a skill is waived. For example, a Constable can participate in four out of the five physical skills being taught but needs to waive out of the fifth skill due to a surgery. Instructors do document what a Constable does and does not participate in when it comes to physical skills. Mr. Pfau stated that in the past training records have been subpoenaed. Mr. Pfau told the story of one Constable who did not participate in physical skill, and it was presented in a civil case against the Constable.

Ms. Leffler introduced the next proposed change to Continuing Education concerning eligibility for subject waiver. Ms. Leffler explained that if a Constable was employed by a municipal police department or sheriff's office they could waive (receive credit) for a subject that was being taught at their academy. The last time this was approved was in 2009 and Program Staff are asking for this section of the Regulations to be removed. Mr. Pfau explained

that the number of subject waivers we received in the past was minimal. and that the subject materials may be very different between a police officer, and a Constable.

Chair Westover praised the suggested changes to the Regulations and agreed that Regulations need to be updated. Chair Westover recognized the changes are using clarifying language to help strengthen the Regulations. Mr. Pfau added that some suggestions also came from Program Staff as they worked daily with the training population. Mr. Pfau has also addressed that training has changed over the years.

Ms. Leffler introduced the last recommendation regarding the Law Enforcement Waiver for Basic Training. Program Staff has presented the current process of the waiver application and exam processes. Ms. Leffler explained that the Waiver Exam is 100 questions that covers all of the Basic Training subjects except for less than lethal option certifications such as expandable baton, etc. If a Constable passes the waiver exam, they must obtain professional liability insurance to become certified by the Program.

Mr. Pfau also provided that Act 49, does not require the Board to provide a Waiver Exam. When Act 49 was passed, established Constables (Constables who were certified prior to the passing of Act 49) were allowed to take a one-time Waiver Exam to receive certification under the new Statute. (This was a grandfathering process.) If an established Constable failed the exam, then they were required to take the 80-Hour Basic Training Course. An established Constable was given the choice to take the exam, or to go to Basic Training. Mr. Pfau said close to 750 established Constables took the Waiver Exam, and approximately 600 Constables had passed the initial waiver exam. Those who failed went to 80-Hour Basic Training Course or resigned as a Constable. Mr. Pfau wanted to establish that there was no statutory requirement. Mr. Pfau explained that the Board adopted the Waiver Exam as a courtesy to our law enforcement partners who become elected or appointed but there is no requirement in the Statute to allow a waiver of training.

Mr. Pfau explained the first Course of Action being recommend would be to eliminate the waiver. Program Staff receives less than 12 waiver applications a year. Since offering waivers since 1996, there have been close to 160 Waiver Exam applications. Mr. Pfau explained the positive of bringing in professionals into the Constable program whom have received training that meets the requirement of the exam.

Mr. Pfau explained the second Course of Action being recommended would be to eliminate the waiver exam but allow certain subject waivers. If a Constable meets the requirements, they would only attend specific sections of the Basic Training directly related to constable judicial work. For example, Civil Law would be a required topic due to the focus of civil process at the minor court level, another would be Role of the Constable, or Court Security. Mr. Pfau provided explanation as to the limitations of non-Constable training regarding these topics, because the information provide in those subjects is more applicable to Constables.

Mr. Pfau also reminded everyone that these are only staff recommendations and the Board could develop a totally different Course of Action.

Mr. Pfau provided the third Course of Action being recommended as maintain status quo. Chair Westover is open to discussion on all three options, provided by Program Staff. Mr. Pfau explained that Program Staff has statistics regarding those who apply, and statistics for each step of the process if a Constable passes versus failing the waiver exam and then needs to take the 80-Hour Basic Training Course.

Ms. Norwood-Foden asked what the passing grade is for the waiver exam and Mr. Pfau explained that the score needed to pass is 70. Mr. Pfau explained that the test is proportionate to the hours associated with a subject in Basic Training. This means that Civil Law has the most questions on the waiver exam. Mr. Pfau explained that the Civil Law section tends to have a lower score. Ms. Norwood-Foden agrees with Chair Westover that this needs more discussion to make a determination as to how the Board should proceed with the waiver exam. Ms. Norwood-Foden also drew the conclusion between the work that Constables do and needing to understand Civil Law since the work of Constables happens at the magistrate level. Ms. Leffler said that more information can be available for the Board at the August meeting. Ms. Leffler also said that upon review, the Board may have a different idea on the Waiver Exam, such as taking elements from two suggestions, and creating a new Course of Action. This will be brought up as a discussion item in August. Ms. Leffler will bring the changes to the previous discussed items to the next Board Meeting regarding Continuing Education.

Ms. Leffler provided the next Discussion Item: 2021 Act 49 Constable Training Grievance Update. Two training grievances were filed regarding the denial of Waiver Exams, due to not meeting the requirements of the Waiver Exam. No new information was provided, so the grievances were closed. The third grievance was filed for a lapse in certification. The individual had numerous “No Shows,” and did not provide information to the Board in a timely manner. Ms. Leffler had sent communication to the individual on how they could maintain certification, however when presented with needing to pay for the “No Shows” the constable filed a grievance. Mr. Pfau stated that the regulations allow for extenuating circumstances, but no information was provided, and the Constables’ story kept changing.

IV. Other Business:

Chair Westover asked the Training Providers if training locations would be more favorable to the Program in the upcoming year. Ms. Beiter said that they facilities that Temple is using will be available for next year. Ms. Beiter is working on securing another range in the North East region. Mr. Mucha stated that all facilities will be available next year, and that he is also looking to secure additional locations as well.

Ms. Norwood-Foden asked if there are trainings available for Constables when working election polls, and provide this information to Constables, and Election Offices. Mr. Pfau was not sure of a training, but County Board of Elections have had policies over the years on what they can and cannot do at the polls, how they should be equipped, etc. Mr. Pfau was unsure who to reach out to because each county may have their own policy. Chair Westover explained that in Venango County that Constables were to attend a pre-election meeting. Chair Westover also explained that at the recent Basic Training he advised the Constables to contact the County entities that are involved in elections.

Chair Westover asked Mr. Pfau for an update for the Workgroup meetings. Mr. Pfau explained that both groups have identified similar topics for discussion. Mr. Pfau said that he is going to take the top three items and present the items to the Board to take some type of action on the items soon. Mr. Pfau will also be working on setting a date for the last Work Group later this summer/early fall.

Chair Westover asked about the status of future meetings and how they would be delivered, hybrid (in-person and virtual) or virtual only. Mr. Pfau explained that the recording equipment at PCCD Offices has been updated and Program Staff will need to ensure everything works correctly before attempting additional in person meetings.

V. Public Voice:

Constable Abraham Smith asked if the Board has had any communication with PSP regarding the use of their training locations. Mr. Pfau answered that we have not recently, but Program Staff can reach out to PSP to see if this could be a possibility.

Constable Herbert Brown stated that he served on the Elections Board in his county. Constable Brown recommended that Constables know their community, and know who the trouble makers are in the community. Chair Westover recognized that each county Board of Elections does things differently. Chair Westover explained that the topic of election day duties does come up at Basic Training, but due to the differences in each county, it is recommended that they reach out to their County Election Board. Constable Brown also mentioned that volunteers are usually present when working election polls and may not be fully educated on election day duties.

Constable Kevin Herrick asked if there is a problem at the election polls what should they do. Mr. Pfau reiterated that they contact their County Elections Boards on how to handle a situation.

Constable Davis asked if Vo-Tech locations could also be used for Basic Training. Constable Davis asked if other trainings could be completed while waiting to attend Basic Training. Constable Davis provided that asking to speak to the Judge of Elections and provide a means to contact you.

Constable Michael Ludwig asked regarding currently enrolled Constables whom have not completed Basic Training, are they able to enroll into Basic Firearms. Ms. Leffler explained that a Constable must secure their base certification prior to applying for Basic Firearms.

Constable John Emerick asked for clarification regarding election day duties versus certified being not certified. Mr. Pfau explained there is no qualification for a Constable to be at their polling place, however this is a duty that is derived from the elected -appointed office. There is no certification for working the polls.

Constable Joseph McElhane asked if no fees would be collected in Westmoreland County if it is not a Constable who is providing the work. Mr. Pfau answered yes, that a Constable must complete the work for a CETA fee to be assessed. Mr. Pfau explains that if a Sheriff completes the warrant that the money goes to the Sheriff's Training Fund.

Constable Rick Salazon asked how soon a Constable needs to take Basic Firearms after completing Basic Training. Mr. Pfau explained the process for certification, and when a Constable can enroll and attend Basic Firearms.

VI. Adjournment:

Chair Westover asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 a.m. A motion was made by Ms. Norwood-Foden to adjourn the meeting and the motion was second by Major Reed.

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

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion passed unanimously. The next Board meeting will be held on August 11, 2022 at 9 a.m. via Teams, and in-person at PCCD.