

EXHIBIT C

February 18th Charter Review Meeting C1 Segment Transcript

0:08**SPEAKER_08**

to talk about that proposal, to give us all some information, to get information from legal about their thoughts and their report, have a very brief discussion that is mostly answering questions, and then a call for sponsorship.

0:24**SPEAKER_08**

So that is our plan for each of these amendment proposals for tonight.

0:29**SPEAKER_08**

Does that make sense to everyone?

0:32**SPEAKER_08**

Great.

0:33**SPEAKER_08**

I ask that because I will probably cut people off if we start straying too far afield.

0:37**SPEAKER_08**

So asking for your consent now, or interruption later.

0:42**SPEAKER_08**

All right.

0:43**SPEAKER_08**

So the first item on our agenda is C1, Appointed Sheriff in Qualifications.

0:49**SPEAKER_08**

Commissioner Hunter, would you like to give us a brief overview?

1:00**SPEAKER_05**

But not like a, why I'm doing it?

1:03**SPEAKER_08**

Well, it's a, tell us about the proposal, but not for like three minutes, not for ten minutes.

1:10**SPEAKER_08**

Does that make sense?

1:11SPEAKER_05

Thank you.

1:12SPEAKER_05

Awesome.

1:14SPEAKER_05

Thank you, Commissioner, Chairman, Chairwoman.

1:19SPEAKER_05

Commissioner Hunter, District 4, Position 3.

1:24SPEAKER_05

The point of this is just simply to appoint the sheriff and to include a little bit of qualifications so we don't wind up with cronyism, and I think this is a very valid question the voters have.

1:39SPEAKER_05

I mean, I ran across a lot while campaigning, and whether we agree with it or not, I think that this is a question that should be put to the voters.

1:50SPEAKER_08

That's great.

1:51SPEAKER_08

I think you can even say a little bit more if you have more you'd like to say, but I think also people can read the proposals.

1:56SPEAKER_08

Okay.

1:57SPEAKER_08

All right.

1:59SPEAKER_08

So, Commissioner Leighton.

2:03SPEAKER_04

Thank you, Commissioner Leighton.

2:04SPEAKER_04

Commissioner Hunter, this is a point where we just ask, like, your thought process.

2:08SPEAKER_04

So, legal report.

2:09SPEAKER_04

What's that?

2:10SPEAKER_04

Oh, legal report.

2:11SPEAKER_04

Great.

2:11SPEAKER_04

Sorry.

2:12SPEAKER_08

All right.

2:15SPEAKER_02

And I hope you can hear me okay.

2:32SPEAKER_02

I don't have much to report.

2:35SPEAKER_02

Obviously, as you know, the sheriff used to be appointed, and it was made into an elected position a few years ago.

2:42SPEAKER_02

So, I believe that a revised version is going out.

2:50SPEAKER_02

I'm not sure if the revised version made it into the packets for today, just regarding the underlying language in the charter.

2:58SPEAKER_02

But there is no legal issue with having the sheriff be appointed.

3:07SPEAKER_08

Well, thank you.

3:08SPEAKER_08

And now it is time for a brief discussion.

3:12SPEAKER_08

So, again, I'm asking specific questions to clarify anything you might be curious about with the proposal, but not to get into any sort of substantive discussion.

3:21SPEAKER_08

That will come if we get the sponsorship.

3:24UNKNOWN

All right.

3:25SPEAKER_08

Commissioner Leighton.

3:26SPEAKER_04

Thank you, Commissioner Leighton here.

3:28SPEAKER_04

Commissioner Hunter, just a quick question.

3:30SPEAKER_04

There's Senate Bill 5974 moving in the legislature that provides quite a bit of qualifications for sheriffs and marshals and whatnot.

3:40SPEAKER_04

Have you checked with that to see if the qualifications in here are at least that or more rather than less than?

3:49SPEAKER_04

Because if that bill passes, we wouldn't want to have any amendment that would be less than that would become null and void, if that makes sense.

3:57SPEAKER_04

And if you haven't, would you be open to when we get to that point, maybe amendments to get at least to that point and more if it passes?

4:06SPEAKER_04

Because I'm just wondering if you've looked at that, those qualifications moving before the legislature now.

4:13SPEAKER_05

I have not compared them, but I don't see why not.

4:17SPEAKER_05

They couldn't align.

4:19SPEAKER_08

Commissioner Leighton.

4:23SPEAKER_03

Use the mic.

4:24SPEAKER_03

Thank you.

4:25SPEAKER_08

There are many mics to be had.

4:27SPEAKER_03

Thank you.

4:29SPEAKER_03

Thank you, Chair.

4:34SPEAKER_03

Commissioner Hunter, just to clarify for me, the language we're looking at right now is the current language that you intend to adopt, right?

4:48**SPEAKER_03**

There are no, like, just because legal says something about the most revised revision.

4:54**SPEAKER_03**

I'm just making sure we're looking at what we would then vote on.

5:17**SPEAKER_08**

Any additional questions?

5:20**SPEAKER_07**

Oh, Commissioner Henry, just to clarify, I've downloaded from the internet and I've been tracking here.

5:28**SPEAKER_07**

I want to make sure that what I'm looking at is what Commissioner Fletcher has.

5:33**SPEAKER_07**

I want to make sure all of us have on the same page if there are two questions out there and how will we identify the details?

5:41**SPEAKER_08**

That is a great question.

5:42**SPEAKER_08**

So I'm going to actually pass it up to our player to make sure, or to Katie, if you have.

5:50**SPEAKER_02**

The version that's in the packet is the revised version.

5:56**SPEAKER_06**

There you go.

5:57**SPEAKER_08**

Chair Lenz?

6:01**SPEAKER_06**

Sorry.

6:01**SPEAKER_06**

Just to clarify, I think there's a little confusion.

6:04SPEAKER_06

Maybe I think what Deputy Prosecutor Blinn was talking about was she had submitted a revised legal review sheet in addition to Commissioner Hunter submitting a revised version of his original C-1 amendment.

6:22SPEAKER_06

In response to the original C-1 amendment, there was a little bit of legal feedback and some questions around it, which Commissioner Hunter has now addressed.

6:31SPEAKER_06

So the one that's in the packets for tonight, it has a blue C-1 on it, and it is in tonight's packet.

6:39SPEAKER_06

That's what we should be using as the basis of this discussion and any subsequent discussion.

6:49SPEAKER_08

All right.

6:50SPEAKER_08

Any additional questions?

6:53SPEAKER_08

Wonderful.

6:54SPEAKER_08

So now I'm going to call for sponsorship of this amendment proposal.

7:00SPEAKER_08

We need four, so I see all, it looks like we have one, two, three, four, five, and six.

7:07SPEAKER_08

So that will move on to a future agenda where we will have two substantive discussions about that amendment.

7:18SPEAKER_08

Thank you all so much.

7:20**SPEAKER_08**

All right.

7:21**SPEAKER_08**

Same process to talk about C-3 around vacancies.

7:26**SPEAKER_08**

And I'm going to hand it over to Commissioner Stred to talk about C-3.

7:33**SPEAKER_01**

Thank you, Madam Chair.

7:35**SPEAKER_01**

During my campaign for this seat in District 5, I went to over 1,000 homes and met a lot of voters.

7:42**SPEAKER_01**

And frequently in my discussions with voters, in fact, overwhelmingly, it was expressed to me that they wished to retain the right to vote for their elected officials.

7:52**SPEAKER_01**

At the same time, there was also consistent expression that people wanted more accountability from elected officials.

7:59**SPEAKER_01**

And there's a polarity there.

8:00**SPEAKER_01**

There's a tension there that I have to grapple with, that we have to grapple with.

8:04**SPEAKER_01**

And in my review of the charter, it's come to my attention that vacancies, this section, that is the subject of three amendments of mine, is the section that allows us to most effectively ensure accountability.

March 9th Presentation by Swank and Hitchen

18:02SPEAKER_05

meaning none. All in favor of approving the minutes, please say aye. Aye. All opposed, please say nay.

18:09SPEAKER_05

Extensions. All right, so minutes have been approved. Now we are going to move on to our presentations. So just as a reminder for the public and for our presenters, we have 30 minutes allotted to each presenter that includes questions. And for commissioners, when it gets to our time to ask questions, please only ask one at a time. We will loop back around to people for second questions if we have time. But if I hear, and my second question is, I'm just going to cut you off.

18:38SPEAKER_05

So just know that I'm coming. All right. So our first presenter tonight is our Pierce County Sheriff, Keith Swank. And we will get you a microphone. Thank you so much for being here tonight.

18:55SPEAKER_10

Thank you. Good evening. My name is Keith Swank, and I'm the elected Sheriff of Pierce County.

19:01SPEAKER_10

I'm here today to tell you that democracy and the will of voters is under assault in the state of Washington. Last week, the state legislature passed or advanced bills that disenfranchise or overturned the will of voters on sheriff's certification, non-citizens as law enforcement, and income tax. 87% of voters were against the sheriff's certification law and 89% against the

19:32SPEAKER_10

income tax. Both are unconstitutional. Both will likely be short-lived. We do not need to continue that unfortunate trend here today. What do Pierce County voters want? They want an elected sheriff.

19:50SPEAKER_10

18 years ago, 66% of the voters overwhelmingly decided this when they reversed a short experiment in an appointed sheriff and returned to their historical roots with an elected

one. Voters wanted a choice of who protected them and to avoid one-party rule of Pierce County, and the voters have spoken.

20:12SPEAKER_10

It's not just here. Nationwide, almost 99% of all sheriffs in the U.S. are elected. That reflects a longstanding tradition that avoids the corruption and control that one-party systems bring. It's lasted so long because it works, and it's why it should not be called the sheriff's department, but the office of sheriff. People who want to return the sheriff to an appointed position say a sheriff shouldn't be

20:44SPEAKER_10

political, as if an appointed sheriff is not a political position. Being sheriff is extremely political. Pierce County Sheriff Office is the largest elected sheriff office in the state and the 59th largest in America out of over 3,400 counties. That right there makes being sheriff political.

21:07SPEAKER_10

My days are filled with political work such as community engagement, speaking with politicians, both local and federal, and working with our various partners here in the county and our communities.

21:22SPEAKER_10

Several members of this committee want the sheriff to be appointed. Why is that? The sponsor, Jake Hunter, told Peter Talbot of the Tacoma News Tribune that I am an existential threat. That's a lie. He simply doesn't like my direct style of communication. I have served honorably for over 34 years, and having the courage to tell the truth about the takeover is an existential threat to his ability to subvert the will of the

21:57SPEAKER_10

voters. Yet, Mr. Hunter recklessly makes his incendiary comments and disregard for the danger of order he poses to me and my family, all because I say things he disagrees with.

22:12SPEAKER_10

Sheriff Swank, we have a point of order. This move is purely political because my opponents could not.

22:18SPEAKER_09

We have a point of order. Okay. Are we allowed to direct comment towards commissioners specifically, or is it supposed to be towards the commission in its entirety? So, uh, to answer your question,

22:33SPEAKER_05

our rules of reform are about addressing the entire, um, body that was specific. If we don't have anything about specific commissioners, but the comments are meant to the whole body. Hmm. Interesting.

22:46SPEAKER_10

And I'll continue. This move is purely political because my opponents could not meet me at the ballot box. So they want to cancel me. How very undemocratic. They are begging on the hope that Pierce County will continue to be controlled by Democrats. But what if an existential threat like me is elected executive? Would you want me to appoint your sheriff? Or would you want to vote for your sheriff?

23:13SPEAKER_10

If I believe the same way as the sponsors of this proposal, I wouldn't be standing here today.

23:21SPEAKER_10

So I'll dissect the proposal now starting with the qualifications. How many of you in here think that Paul Pastor was a good sheriff? A lot of these qualifications, he wouldn't qualify. He was that old police officer. He was appointed. He didn't go to the academy. He didn't have sworn officer supervisor experience.

23:44SPEAKER_10

Yet many people believe he was a great sheriff and that the sheriff must possess at least 10 years of progressively responsible experience in law enforcement. Let's just say that the chief of Roy Roy wants to be sheriff. There are two full-time officers, officers there, including him.

24:07SPEAKER_10

And that's sort of a prior to being in chief. He worked for Silicon PD, a department of nine. He worked there for five years. He was an officer for three and then a supervisor. This person would qualify to be sheriff. But would he really be qualified? You see, I was a police officer in Seattle for 33 years, and I'm quite sure I had much more experience in one year

than this imaginary person I speak of would have in 10 years. But in this case, I wouldn't qualify for sheriff or a person like me wouldn't

24:39SPEAKER_10

qualify for sheriff. My point is 10 years of progressive experience doesn't mean anything if a person really doesn't have experience and the 10-year requirement is entirely subjective.

24:51SPEAKER_10

10 years sounds like lots of experience unless you work somewhere where nothing happens.

24:58SPEAKER_10

These requirements ultimately do nothing to make the sheriff more qualified or accountable.

25:03SPEAKER_10

There's no additional rationale for making the sheriff an appointed position.

25:08SPEAKER_10

There's something like 50-plus elected positions in Pierce County from county executive, the council, prosecuting attorney, judges, the auditor, the assessor. Are these positions too political?

25:23SPEAKER_10

Are they subject to new qualifications? The exact reason many of you say we should have an appointed sheriff is to get rid of politics, but that's all theater. The sponsors of this amendment want the current executive to pick the sheriff, and they hope that by changing the executive term to three terms, he will be able to pick the sheriff until we revisit this charter again in 2036.

25:49SPEAKER_10

But an independently elected sheriff is necessary for oversight of the county council and the executive.

25:55SPEAKER_10

It's necessary for checks and balances and to avoid single-party rule, to help avoid corruption and authoritarianism. The sheriff keeps the council executive honest, and they in turn keep the sheriff honest. To keep the sheriff independent, answerable to the people,

and a check on and against corruption, you should change section 3.70 to read, there is hereby created the office of sheriff.

26:25SPEAKER_10

The voters have spoken, they want an elected sheriff, and they want the will of the ballot box to be respected.

26:31SPEAKER_10

Making this a position appointed, subjecting it to random and poorly thought out new qualifications, while not doing the same for the dozens of other elected positions in the county is undemocratic.

26:45SPEAKER_10

Let's keep the party positions elected as the voters intended. Thank you for your time, and I'll be glad to answer any of your questions. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for coming today, Sheriff Sling.

27:07SPEAKER_06

What are some of the key important differences between a county sheriff and a chief of police,

27:14SPEAKER_10

a chief of police, for example? Well, they're very purely political. The chief of police is appointed by the executive or the council or the person in charge of the jurisdiction, and they do their bidding.

27:28SPEAKER_10

The sheriff represents the people and doesn't have to worry about being told what to do. They can do what they think is right, and they are answerable to the people who voted for the sheriff and put them in office.

27:44SPEAKER_00

Commissioner Molowski. Thank you, Madam Chair. Sheriff Sling, thank you so much for your presentation. I appreciate that.

27:52SPEAKER_00

I have a little bit of curiosity because the debate is, you know, elected versus appointed position.

27:58SPEAKER_00

Some people look at having an appointed position means that someone has a wonderful resume, so much experience underneath their belt, a lot, a lot, a lot of them. But, you know, through my research, you know, I found a couple of things that kind of contradicts that, and I want to get your opinion in regards to this. So we know with the elected positions, you know, we're hoping that the person has experienced, they have a hope for the job, they have a heart for the job, and they're going to do right for the people because that's what the people's voting for. For the appointed position, that's kind of limited for the people because they don't have a choice. It's somebody within

28:28SPEAKER_00

the departments to hire somebody with a wonderful resume and experience that they bring forth. But regretfully, what I'm seeing here that kind of nullifies that, I heard one sheriff spoke where he says, unless you're a lawmaker that sexually harasses a voter that was in 2018, or a lawmaker that shows up to work during drunk, that was a couple of days ago, I saw that on the news, or a lawmaker that leaves work drunk in crashes, that was 2018, a PUD commissioner engaged in bribery, that was 2025, a coroner, which is one of our constitutional positions that uses

29:00SPEAKER_00

fentanyl found on dead bodies, that was 2025, an assessor that stalks his ex-girlfriend, that's another

29:08SPEAKER_00

constitutional position, stalks his ex-girlfriend, which is in violation of a court order, and that's 2025. So I can go on. So the reason why I brought this up is because I see there's a, to me there's a conflict in regards to what's identified as qualified. Give me, with your opinion, all right, does it really make a difference? Is it the heart of the person that makes the job and the person to respect the position? Now, I want you about this now because I've also did background check on you as well. So I know that you had some little issues when you're in Seattle.

29:40SPEAKER_00

What would be the confidence that you would give the the voters of knowing that you are the exceptional sheriff, and any sheriff that we elected would be an exceptional sheriff to do right

29:49SPEAKER_10

with the community? I'm not really sure if I follow your question, but the people have the right to vote.

29:59SPEAKER_10

In every position in the state, there are no qualifications for them except for prosecuting attorneys and judges. Every other one, the state representatives, state senate, the governor.

30:13SPEAKER_10

Actually, the president of the United States, in order to be qualified for that, you have to be born in America and 35 years old. That's all you have to be. You're qualified. So these qualifications that people are putting on an office such as the sheriff, they need to not happen. For instance,

30:32SPEAKER_10

in 2020, a retired general who was a county councilman before, and he also was a Lakewood

30:44SPEAKER_10

mayor. He was a one-star general retired in the army. He ran for sheriff, and under this bill here, he wouldn't be qualified. But I will tell you that a brigadier general in the military is absolutely qualified to lead an office of 700 people, especially after they led thousands and thousands of men and women. So to say something doesn't have qualifications doesn't mean anything at all. The sheriff of an agency as large as this, the CEO. I don't go out on the street and arrest

31:17SPEAKER_10

anybody. I haven't arrested anybody since 2005. I am the leader of the sheriff's office. I have people that do that. I'm busy all the time dealing with what happens in the sheriff's office itself. So the people should have the right to vote for somebody. And if they vote for somebody who's never been a cop before, and they don't like that person, they can vote them out of office the next time around, just like any other elected position.

31:50SPEAKER_08

Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much for speaking with us. It was very informative. But I did have one question. Mainly, what is the jurisdiction? What areas do you cover, being that there are cities and towns in Pierce County that have their own police department? I live in unincorporated Pierce County. Which has more weight as far as, you know, what your role is and what you can do?

32:19SPEAKER_10

The sheriff's office places all of unincorporated Pierce County, which you said you live in, so that you don't live in an incorporated area. And we also have contracts with Edgewood and University Place. And those are the places that lead police. So that goes the whole way from Mount Rainier to the Key Peninsula, across the pretty spit, way out there to Mason County line.

32:43SPEAKER_10

The county is 1,806 square miles. It's very long from east to west. But lead police is everything that's in the unincorporated area, which is about 500,000 people, give or take.

32:58SPEAKER_05

Mr. Randall Kelly.

33:01SPEAKER_07

Yes, thank you, Sheriff's Blank. I have a couple questions. I'm curious first about if the sheriff's office, first question, I'll come back and add it one later.

33:14UNKNOWN

If a democratically elected sheriff's office is the will of the people, what do you think your explanation is for why there is so much lower vote turnout for sheriff's races than other races throughout the county, and why there are so few competitive sheriff races in Pierce County history, such as Paul Vestori, Wayne Man, twice after getting elected after the committee ran

33:37SPEAKER_07

and put on a post to those times. So if you have thoughts on either of those things, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

33:43SPEAKER_10

Well, I don't know about the previous ones where nobody ran, but I can tell you in 2024, six people ran for sheriff. And in the general election, when it was down to two of us, 400,000 people voted, I would say, or close to it, voted for sheriff, 190,

33:59SPEAKER_10

about 400,000 people voted. I would say that's a pretty good turnout. So I don't, I don't know where you come up with a number saying the turnout wasn't very good. There are fewer people that vote for the sheriff than vote for the executive oftentimes, and that could

be because of positioning on the ballot, but also it could be because people that are bad don't like cops, and they don't vote for cops at all.

34:28SPEAKER_10

It could be that. I don't really know what the reasoning is behind it. But all in all, Pierce County sheriff race in 2024 was very competitive, and the turnout was very good.

34:41SPEAKER_05

Commissioner O'Leary, and I'm sure it's like if we could show the mic, but Commissioner O'Leary,

34:45SPEAKER_02

that would be great. This will be short. Commissioner O'Leary, District 1, thanks for the presentation. Going back to qualifications, are there any qualifications, Chief Swank, that you would recommend be included,

35:08SPEAKER_02

for any person that would be eligible to run for office, having gone through an election, having served in the office now, and looking forward?

35:24SPEAKER_10

I think that if somebody runs for sheriff, they shouldn't be a convicted felon. They shouldn't be precluded from being able to carry a firearm, especially if they're going to do or take any police action. But as far as qualifications, I believe that the voters make good choices, and we should allow the voters to vote for it. If the voters want to vote in somebody who's never been a cop before, which happened in Pacific County four years ago, a person was elected sheriff, he'd never been

35:56SPEAKER_10

sheriff before, and the people are pleased with that sheriff. So the people can make that decision.

36:02SPEAKER_10

If they want to vote for somebody who's not a cop, that should be their prerogative. The other thing is, most times, people that aren't cops don't get voted in to be sheriff. As the example, in 2020, when the retired regular general ran, you didn't make it through the primary. The people said they wanted to vote for cops. So they wrote it through two people, and the primary, that were cops.

36:30SPEAKER_05

Mr. Strickland. Thank you.

36:35SPEAKER_15

Hi, Swank. Thank you for showing up to our district meeting yesterday, I believe, for a listening session.

36:41SPEAKER_15

There's one thing that you brought up there that I would like to bring up again. It's around the retiring of police officers when they've done something wrong, like say Dickerson when he hit the family of four. Do you think that it's great for people to just retire and not face any consequences? Should police officers have different rules than regular citizens? I'm just curious about

37:07SPEAKER_10

that. Well, police officers have different rules than citizens. As soon as that incident happened, Major Dickerson was released from remote duty, put on administrative leave, wasn't allowed to come back into any buildings. All his computer equipment and phone and key card was taken from him, and we got a hold of the Washington State Crime Lab and asked them to expedite the blood draw test, because oftentimes it

37:39SPEAKER_10

goes well over a year before it comes in. So he was treated differently. And some people said to me, well, why didn't you just fire him when you found out about what happened? So I would like to explain that. Thank you for bringing this up, because we talked about it yesterday. We have labor law out there.

37:59SPEAKER_10

We have a thing called due process. If I were to fire somebody, and then later on they were found not guilty in a court of law, the county would have to pay millions and millions of dollars. And I am very conscientious about the taxpayers' dollars. I am also very conscientious about people's rights.

38:20SPEAKER_10

So we shouldn't violate people's rights, whether they're a police officer, or whether they're a citizen, or whether they're a non-citizen in cases like crime. So I follow the process. And when the

38:36SPEAKER_10

blood alcohol came back, the prosecuting attorney charged Major Dickerson with a crime,

38:44SPEAKER_10

we went through the process. And if he had stayed on, I would have fired him. However, he retired, which is his right. If you were at Boeing and you got arrested for a DUI, you probably wouldn't even lose your job. But anyhow, even if you did, you would be able to retire. There's not a provision there that says if you commit a crime and before you convict it, you lose your pension that you paid in for 25 or 30 years. So everything was followed by the book. Lastly, I gave a press conference about

39:17SPEAKER_10

it right away. I went out and talked about how terrible it was, how embarrassing for the agency it was, how terrible it was for people to get harmed, and all of that. And we did that right away.

39:30SPEAKER_10

This is the most transparent sheriff's office it's ever been. We are so transparent that the prosecuting attorney's advice sometimes for me is to not say the things that I do say. But I try to be transparent with the community to the best of my ability. Thanks for bringing that up. I set the record straight on that.

39:51SPEAKER_01

Commissioner Heimlich. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Sheriff Swank for being here. Last week, we heard testimony that sheriff's elections, and this is reading from the slide, have been uncompetitive in Pierce County. Would you describe your 2024 election as uncompetitive?

40:09SPEAKER_10

It was the most competitive election in a long time. My understanding is between the two that made the general election, it was the most money raised and spent ever. Also, and I will tell you this, this is just me for my position here. I had a lot of politicians that were against me the whole time.

40:30SPEAKER_10

So in my opinion, it was very, very competitive. And my opponent had people that were helping her out. So it was very competitive from the beginning to the end. And I'm quite sure that it'll continue to be competitive, because I'm sure there's somebody that will, if I decide

to run again, will want to step up and run against me. And I support that. Even if they're not a cop, I support that.

40:54SPEAKER_10

Vice Chair Lance.

40:57SPEAKER_04

Hello, Sheriff Swank. My name is Michael Lance. I'm from District 7. Thank you for speaking to us.

41:02SPEAKER_04

I just have a question. You've spoken quite a lot about qualifications in the Senate bill and just in general. And as you know, the task of this commission is not to reach

41:15SPEAKER_05

the final decision on anything, but simply to make recommendations on matters that should go to the

41:20SPEAKER_04

voters. So I'm wondering if you have any thoughts about an amendment proposed to voters that was very simple, elect or appoint, no, nothing, nothing else in it. And just let the people choose, as you're saying.

41:34SPEAKER_10

Well, if that's what you come to, that's fine. I think it's a waste of time when there's things in the charter that you really should be addressing, such as for future, not for me, for the future sheriffs, the independence of the office, it's written in there that the sheriff is an executive department. And that was written in 1980 in the original charter. And whenever the sheriff was in appointed position, so you should work on that so that when the sheriff is there, if the people decide that to, uh, that they should be independent then so they can work independently and not be said,

42:07SPEAKER_10

or have these fights in the court about the independence of the office of sheriff, which is written in our constitution. So no, I, I don't, if, if the body here decides that they want to put forward to the people of Pierce County appointed or elected, then that's, that's the way this process works. I'm just here telling you that, um, we're spending a lot of time talking about this sheriff thing because people don't like me, but I won't be the sheriff forever. There

might be the sheriff that you really, really like, and then they'll end up being appointed by somebody else and just say,

42:39SPEAKER_10

darn it. I really like that sheriff, whoever it was, we voted for. So I just think they should be left to the vote of the people, but this is a vote of the people. If the people say that, then that's fine to make it appointed. But all of this time we're spending on it, we could really be diving into the charter and making it, uh, making it better and actually holding all politicians accountable. I'm good with doing background checks and everybody wants to run for office.

43:07SPEAKER_10

I think that would be great. That's things we should do in there. We do a polygraph, do a psychological test. It's not the same thing that police officers are subjected to. I'm good with that because the politicians write the laws. So let's hold them to the same standards as those of us who they want to enforce it. But I don't think that will come out of this body. I don't think that will happen, but if you can surprise me, it'd be great. I support that.

43:33SPEAKER_05

So, uh, Commissioner Boyden, we have about five more minutes. Just let everyone know.

43:40SPEAKER_14

Thank you. And thank you, Sharon Swine, for being here. I just have, we had most of our public comments have been on this topic, as you probably know. And we are, you know, on the other side is the big part that you were just discussing, building trust and accountability, right, for the position. And what are your thoughts about that as you're serving all of the constituents of where you, um, preside over? Right. And so how do we, what is the,

44:17SPEAKER_14

I guess my question is really, how do you see that building public trust for, uh, your position?

44:26SPEAKER_10

Well, one thing that I do that I don't think any sheriff has done before is I have community meetings every month and not just in one area, but throughout the whole county. And I even have community meetings. They go to community meetings in places that we, the sheriff's office, don't police. So I do that. Um, and you all, it's a third Saturday of the month

that every Saturday this year, I'll be at a various library. And before that, I went out and I still do it once in a while for a breakfast with the sheriff and local communities. So people can come by and meet with

44:57SPEAKER_10

me. But that's been difficult to get together this year because, uh, people protested it and threatened the businesses saying that they'd break the windows out. So some of the businesses don't want to do that again, but that's where people, it's an intimate relationship. There were people can meet me one-on-one and talk to me and ask me questions and learn about who I am. I don't know if it gets much better than that because most other politicians go out and just speak at a crowd of people and say their peace and lead, but not me. I meet with people. I even went to the, uh,

45:29SPEAKER_10

listening session yesterday at summit library, uh, and went in there and to, and to listen, even to listen. And I am going to be here tonight for people to say bad things about me. Not very many people do that, but I'm doing that and I'm getting on three step. And last thing is if there are any problems with the deputies out there on the street, they're doing something wrong and people can file complaints. But the only thing that's going on and wrong with Keith Swank is people don't like what I say, but I'm here to support your first amendment rights, your second amendment

46:04SPEAKER_10

rights on all of the rights that are given to you that are, that are your rights here. So I expect the same thing to be able to exercise my rights. Also, if you don't agree with me, if I run for re-election, run against me or have somebody run against me and beat me at the ballot. That's, that's what this is all about. And that's what I support. Win or lose for me. I support that.

46:27SPEAKER_05

All right. So, um, Commissioner Herrera has not asked a question yet, so we'll go to her.

46:35SPEAKER_06

Hello. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Swank. Um, I wanted to ask, um, several weeks ago when this amendment was first put out, uh, we heard from, um, deputy Guajardo and I apologize. I don't remember her first name. Um, she called and spoke in favor of, um, the position staying elected. Uh, so, uh, that being said, um, you mentioned you had, uh,

several hundred deputies, um, working for you. And I was wondering if you could confirm the amount and, uh, of deputies and also if you are, um, if you have

47:12SPEAKER_06

overwhelmingly heard from them in support of the election elected sheriff position as well.

47:19SPEAKER_10

The person who spoke is, uh, Cindy Fajardo, my undersheriff. And I just, as a, just for a little bit of information here, she ran against me for sheriff because you all didn't know that. But then, um, we had met beforehand and we got along quite swimmingly. And I said, if you win, I sit in the primary, I support you. And, and if I win, she said she supports me. And, and because of her, our sheriff's office is very, very successful because of all of her skills. And I just want you all to know that you don't get to see her out there, but behind the scenes, she's running the

47:52SPEAKER_10

sheriff's office day-to-day operations. As far as support, people are scared to say about support because they don't want people to see it. So sometimes people get ahold of me, deputies, when you see them, they say things to me like that. Like we support you, sheriff. Thank you for speaking up. I also have people who are signing up to become a sheriff deputy because of what I say and do. And even if they don't agree with me, they just like that I stand up and say that everybody's

48:24SPEAKER_10

right. So we have a lot of that going on. I'm quite sure there's people on the sheriff's office who don't like what I say, but that's just the way it is. I'm the person from the outside. It's never happened before. I never worked for the sheriff's office. I got elected and I came in there and I upset the apple cart, but in a positive way, we've made very good changes there, very positive changes. And I will continue to do so under the leadership of my under-sheriff.

48:57SPEAKER_12

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Sheriff Swink. Nice to see you again. Commissioner Surratt, District 5. So while the sheriff is elected and oversees their department, that department operates obviously within the larger executive branch of the county. Could you describe the ways in which the sheriff's office might rely on other executive branch departments like finance or HR potentially

49:21SPEAKER_10

facilities and so on? Well, unfortunately, the sheriff's office depends upon all of those counties.

49:31SPEAKER_10

We call it big county. So we have to go to HR. We have to go to finance, do all kinds of things that I actually think should be changed. I really believe that the budget should be issued to the sheriff's office. The sheriff should be responsible for the budget. And if the sheriff doesn't do the right thing with the budget, then the people can vote the sheriff out or whatever mechanism that is. But anyhow, everything's set up for us. We have to go back and get permission, authority and approval to hire people, although we don't have any problem doing that with deputies. But anything else, we have to

50:04SPEAKER_10

talk about that. We work together at facilities, oversee all of our, basically all of our facilities, all of our buildings and everything. By the way, we have a lot of old dilapidated buildings that we're housing deputies in. And so it's all intertwined there. But I would say that the other part is, and you just said it, the sheriff, you said department, I say office, is an executive department, which therefore people believe that it's run by the executive and that the executive is the boss of

50:35SPEAKER_10

the sheriff's office, but the executive is not because the sheriff's independently elected.

50:40SPEAKER_10

Or if that was the case, then the executive could fire a sheriff. But that can't happen. So it's independent, but with the charter, the way it's written is intertwined. And there should be some things in that also, that should be clarified. Thank you. Thank you so much, Sheriff Swank. We

50:58SPEAKER_05

really appreciate your time tonight. Thank you.

51:03SPEAKER_05

So our second speaker for tonight is going to be our Pierce County Council Chair, Jenny Andrewsley.

51:13SPEAKER_03

Thank you. Good evening, Commission and Chair Varnes. It's a little weird being on this side.

51:19SPEAKER_03

So I really appreciate the time. And I promise not to be 30 minutes unless you send me a lot of questions, but I'm very responsive. I email if that's easier. But I was asked by the chair to listen to what Councilmember Morrell presented last week and provide a counter or concurrence that I agree. So I'm just going to do this in bullet points because that's how my brain works. So he talked about reducing the number of meetings, and I do agree. We really struggle to do 50 meetings out

51:51SPEAKER_03

of 52 weeks. It means that my staff have two weeks of vacation, or we are trying to run our meetings and do our work without our total staff contingency. So it's not about the council members. We know what we sign up for, but we don't do this a lot. So I think he said 49. I would say 48.

52:11SPEAKER_03

Split hairs. Because we also do in-district meetings. And most of us, not all of us, but most of us tend to do that on top of the 50 weeks that we have meetings. So now we're at almost 60 meetings in a week, in a year for 52 weeks. I also agree with Councilmember Morrell that three terms is the sweet spot. I will add that I also think that if it's three terms or non-partisan, three terms for partisan, so it should be the same. So if two terms is what it is,

52:44SPEAKER_03

then all Pierce County electives are two terms, or all three terms is another way to look at it.

52:50SPEAKER_03

Here's where I disagree. I disagree that there should be an additional required in-district meeting.

52:57SPEAKER_03

At any time, if any of the colleagues wanted to do an additional in-district meeting, we could work as a body to schedule that and figure it out with our staff. But mandating it really does create a workload issue for the staff and the council to get up out into the community. Potentially, you could talk about doing, requiring us to do listening sessions in our districts or town hall meetings. That's not there. Some of us do them, some of us don't. But I don't think having 14 additional out in the

53:28SPEAKER_03

community meetings required is really going to help, especially with Zoom as an option these days.

53:35SPEAKER_03

I do disagree with the change of the supermajority or asking there be five votes for every single action. I just feel like it's ineffective and really creates some complications with some of the checks and balances that we do have. And this is the same kinds of checks and balances we have in lots of places across the county where you have an executive or you have a president that can veto, and then there's ways to challenge the veto. If we go to a supermajority, I don't know how that would work. So if it is something of interest, there is some thinking that needs to go into that.

54:08SPEAKER_03

And the other thing that I disagree that he did mention was about the budget.

54:14SPEAKER_03

We changed to a biannual budget, but left the timing predominantly the same. My request would be to think about the executive delivering the budget to us 120 days. That gives us well over three months as a council to really think about how to do the work and get through everything. It is a \$3.5 billion, as of this last time, biannual budget, several thousand employees. And it's just, it's a lot to unpack,

54:44SPEAKER_03

understand, have the feedback from all the different electeds, the separately electeds, and the different departments across the county. And to do it thoughtfully and transparently, public and public engagement takes time. And so I would ask that it come back like two weeks, just give us two additional weeks out of them. A couple other things. So elected versus appointed sheriff, uh, commissioner Lance, I'm where you are. I think that we have, I've heard out of

55:17SPEAKER_03

community of elected appointed. I've listened to several of these meetings. There's a huge debate.

55:22SPEAKER_03

If there's a debate, I think we send it to the people and leave it there. Um, the charter does not really contemplate what happens if the council does not pass a balanced budget or the

executive vetoes the budget. We literally over the last two budget cycles have had those questions and just hoped that everything went well. Would love to hear some clarification on that. I'm hoping we can always stay on the same page and kind of going in the same direction, even when we don't agree.

55:50**SPEAKER_03**

But some guidance in this founding document for our county would be really helpful. I don't have an answer for you, but I'm just throwing it to you because that's why y'all ran for office.

55:59**SPEAKER_03**

Um, and then, um, I did have a wonder, um, about zoom or hybrid being required versus at the will of the council. Right now we choose to put that in our, our rules and procedures. Um, is that something that we think is important? Nope. I don't know that it's rates the level of charter review and going out because I will also bring voter fatigue with charter events is a real thing. Um, but I know

56:29**SPEAKER_03**

that even for your process right now, lots of people that are participating because we are offering zoom as an option. So, um, I don't think we would change that, but if you wanted to make sure putting it in the charter, make sure don't use the word zoom bell. Um, and then I had heard people talking about moving to nine council members versus seven. We are eventually going to hit a million people. I don't know if this is the year to look at it, but it is something that I think this county will have to face at some point. Um, but it is something to think about. And then we're really

57:04**SPEAKER_03**

going to be policy. Um, such a 9.20 talks about franchise agreements and says 25 years, a quarter of a century is really a long time to have a contract with the county again. It's a little bit of a long difference. So happy to answer any questions. Thank you so much. Any questions?

57:39**SPEAKER_13**

Thank you. As for franchise agreements, would you suggest just leaving it up to ordinance to set,

57:47**SPEAKER_03**

set that standard? 25 is too long. I think we've been doing 15 years as a standard practice, but the charter says 25. So yeah, I don't know. And you might look to Ms. Glenn and Ms.

Long to see if it's necessary. I could just be making something. Yeah, but if you had your wish list, I'd say 15

58:08SPEAKER_00

years. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you so much for the presentation. I appreciate that very much.

58:18SPEAKER_00

I have a concern because many people has buzzed my ears on this is how does the county really look at the charter because I have been receiving feedback that some of the administration in within the county doesn't really use the charter. And so with some of the complaints that we receive from the public. All right, it kind of confirms that and I'm kind of concerned. How does the county really look at us as a charter and what would make us be more beneficial if we're weak in some point that

58:49SPEAKER_00

we can be able to help the administration as well as help the public at the same time?

58:56SPEAKER_03

Really good question. Thank you. I think one of the things that's often misunderstood is just how our government works. And so I know that Ms. Long is our chief counsel when we're holding two games and we will often look to her and she goes right directly to the charter and provides feedback or answers questions to make sure that we are meeting the expectations of what our county's constitution, our charter is. And if we start to go arrive, she calls us on it right away to make sure.

59:28SPEAKER_03

And when we have questions, is this allowable under the charter? We are expected to ask. And if we can't come to a decision or if we're having an interpretation issue, then we go to the prosecuting attorney. And that is kind of the setup of our county structure is that we lean into our elected prosecutor and the staff that he or she hired to provide the guidance.

59:55SPEAKER_13

It's okay. I've already spoken. I can wait my turn.

59:59SPEAKER_07

Thank you, Chair Hitch and Commissioner Wright L. Kelly. I'm excited to hear that you're open to the idea of expanding the county council. I think that that huge population fluxes

here over the last number of decades and hasn't changed since the charter was established. I'm wondering if you have any more thoughts on what an ideal process for that might look like or any opinions on how redistricting

1:00:25SPEAKER_03

might work. I have a lot of thoughts about it myself. I think first is establishing whether the voters think we should move to nine would be the first step. I think that there's a lot of strong feelings.

1:00:38SPEAKER_03

There is a cost increase to the public to doing that. I will mention when we move to our new chambers early on, I said, please make sure that we have a dais that's big enough for nine because we will get there and it also allows us to do co-located meetings like if we invite other county government other county governments or other city governments to come and meet with us so that we have a good space. As far as the process after that, my suggestion would be to follow our normal district once we know we're at nine as outlined by our state rules.

1:01:20SPEAKER_02

So just a quick question. Commissioner O'Leary, District 1, kind of a puzzling part for me was I'm not trying to trip you up here, but 6.15, the presentation of a six-year plan.

1:01:36SPEAKER_02

Does any executive really present that? And when they do, what happens with it? How

1:01:45SPEAKER_02

how is it followed or is it followed? How many times have you seen it even referenced?

1:01:53SPEAKER_03

Really good question. When I first got elected, I sent that as an ask to executive Dan Meyer at the time. And what I was told was, as opposed to a six-year plan, it was basically what were the priorities and they tried to update them every two years. So it was kind of ongoing. And then in addition, we have a six-year transportation improvement plan, a six-year TIF, the SWIFT, all of those. And a lot of them have a six-year. And I think those plans help lay out the kind of

1:02:24SPEAKER_03

the biggest investments that the executive oversees. And I think that is how it has been historically interpreted. If you don't think that's meeting what you imagined, then I think some more clarity around the language. Because I asked for a six-year plan, I'm thinking I would get something really laid out. And that's what I've gotten. And from our current executive, very similar, where he has put out here is his thinking going forward, but he hasn't done really something long-term six years reaching out formally that I've seen.

1:03:02SPEAKER_02

Thank you, Chair Hitchin. Commissioner Heather Hitchin District 2, throw you a little curveball here. But so since the last time the charter met in 2016, it's of my opinion that politics has become

1:03:13UNKNOWN

very, very partisan, right? Through the national media, through everything. And there are seven county charters that are out throughout the state. I believe three of them have nonpartisan

1:03:24SPEAKER_02

county council members. Do you have any thoughts to a nonpartisan council?

1:03:32SPEAKER_03

I think at this point, with the data and the research tools that we have available, it's really hard even when people are nonpartisan to really be nonpartisan. And so I haven't seen,

1:03:49SPEAKER_03

when I've looked at the commissions and the councils that are nonpartisan, I have not seen anything that is different other than a little bit of, for some people, some voter confusion as far as how they educate themselves on voters to figure out who they elect. But as far as how they operate, is very similar to what we're seeing these days. It's so easy to find the data on people along with the ways to kind of engage. Commissioner Fletcher?

1:04:27SPEAKER_11

Thank you, Commissioner Fletcher, District 5. You mentioned a potential issue if council doesn't pass a budget in your council meetings or in your own spare time. What possible knock-on affects your consequences? Have you or the council contemplated regarding a potential outcome such as not being

1:04:51SPEAKER_03

able to pass a budget? So because the charter doesn't contemplate it, it just assumes that we will pass a budget and that the executive will sign it in the set deadline. And so my questions were, well, what if? What if we can't finish? What if there is something that we are deadlocked on? And if we were to consider one of the things that concerned me was the potential of wanting a supermajority to pass something of that consequence, if we did change that rule, the potential of that happening really does increase. Or if the executive vetoed a budget, what would happen? Because we are mandated

1:05:30**SPEAKER_03**

in the charter to do a certain amount of work. I want to say by the beginning of December, if we haven't passed a balanced budget, then we don't know. It literally stops. So I don't know what happens, which is why I suggested as a potential policy question or charter amendment, because I would love to know what you think we should do. Commissioner Leighton, back to you.

1:06:01**SPEAKER_13**

Yeah. Yeah. RCW and state law and budgets, I believe you have to do one. I don't know how, however you make that sausage, you make it. But by state law, you have to have one done.

1:06:11**SPEAKER_13**

But my question for you, and maybe this is probably more pertinent with the executive arm of the county, but our charter is moved on the courts and the prosecutors, which are assigned down by the state constitution state law to a point. But after that, their budgets, their personnel, their hiring practices need to follow county rules. How have, from your kind of side of the

1:06:42**SPEAKER_13**

dais, if you will, as chair and as a council member, how have you seen that interaction been with the courts and the prosecuting side? They are a function of our county, but there is nothing mentioning any sort of relationship about that and how that's been working. And it's been on my mind here as part of this and why that's the case. You know, what beyond state law, is there maybe a problem or

1:07:10**SPEAKER_03**

issues that we might need to address? So if I start going off and not answering your question, just with me, but one of the things with all of our separately elected, so that includes our courts, and our sheriff, prosecutor, and assessor treasurer, and the auditor, we have really a

1:07:34**SPEAKER_03**

process where they come and present their budget. It starts with going to the executive because of all the different services that the executive's budget does cover. So facilities, IT, risk management, HR, who buys your sticky notes, like all of that is underneath the process of the executive to determine, because it is cheaper in bulk. I mean, literally sticky notes in bulk is cheaper, but also maintaining facilities if we all are signing leases all over the place. It increases our risk.

1:08:08**SPEAKER_03**

And so one of the things we do is we kind of consolidate those rope services, and then a budget is presented to the executive. The executive, and I'm not exactly sure how executive Dan Meyer dealt with this, but the current executive met with each of the separately elected, ran through their budgets. The judges ran through their budgets, discussed what they were asking for, and then they presented the agreed upon budget. And I'm very sure every department and every separately selected office didn't get everything they wanted, but they presented a budget, came to the council, then we debated,

1:08:42**SPEAKER_03**

and could amend. And so the sheriff's office came and gave us some things that potentially they were interested in. The auditor's office asked some things. And so it's one of those things where they can come and we can then amend as the council budget of the power of the first, power of the next.

1:09:05**SPEAKER_05**

Hello there. Thank you for your presentation. So I have a question. So last week, you and your

1:09:16**SPEAKER_06**

colleagues on the council overwhelmingly passed another tax on Pierce County residents. And that being the taxes that were also passed in the state are going to burden, well, all of us in the state and especially Chris County with even more taxes and money taken out of our pockets. Have you received any feedback from that or, you know, I guess I'm just asking for your thoughts and because it was also spoken that,

1:09:55**SPEAKER_06**

um, you know, there might be another county seat added, um, which, um, I'm sure you know better than I do. That would be super expensive. Um, I know our residents have

increased, um, as well, but, um, and you said not maybe this year, but maybe in the future. Um, how does that all tie together?

1:10:13**SPEAKER_06**

What was the reason for the extra tax? If you could explain that, um, in terms that we understand.

1:10:22**SPEAKER_05**

So can I share a question? Um, how does that connect to the charter process?

1:10:27**SPEAKER_05**

I mean, because the question is, um, for Charity Jim's about the charter review.

1:10:34**SPEAKER_06**

Okay. Um, she's here answering any questions. So

1:10:41**SPEAKER_11**

The council member just said that they enjoy the power of the curse, including the ability to maintain or repeal taxes. This question is clearly within the purview of her job.

1:11:00**SPEAKER_03**

So, um, I'll start with the part related to the charter. Um, absolutely agree that when we are raising taxes, a supermajority is necessary and we vehemently argue against it. There has to be, um, a larger body than just a supermajority who is leveraging a new tax. And I won't say I'll fight you on this, but I will argue against that, um, if that were to come up. I think it's necessary to your point, Commissioner. Um, related to why we chose to do that and why we had a supermajority that said yes

1:11:34**SPEAKER_03**

to that. Um, we have significant deficiencies when it comes to the infrastructure to our public safety services. Uh, we are long overdue. We call it our new jail, uh, but it's well over 30 years old.

1:11:51**SPEAKER_03**

It is not new and it is not usable because it is designed for low level offenders who are not a risk to themselves or others. They're just serving their time. And we have very few of those that we are detaining these days. So we are using predominantly the old jail and it is an old jail, but it is really only our, um, medium and maximum security placement that we have for

adult offenders. We also need to rebuild our Raymond Hall, um, whatever our juvenile detention center is going to be. Uh, that is long

1:12:23**SPEAKER_03**

overdue. We have entire sections that we cannot use. Last year, we actually had to move, um, young adult offenders to the large jail, um, to the adult jail because we ran out of room, uh, when the state decided to send some young offenders back to us, uh, without a lot of warning. Um, and the sheriff's office did a really nice job communicating with us and we were able to get them in place and they get to move back, but we are not able to meet the needs. And as a growing county, we need more services, not less

1:12:56**SPEAKER_03**

services when it comes to children. The second larger part beyond that part is that people are the number one expensive thing that the county does. The majority of our budget is the people that do the work that the people that are driving the streets in our jails, driving the Sasquatch, which is our vacuum truck. And whatever the service is, they're doing that work on behalf of the community members that call Pierce County home and the visitors that come here. And so, um, we need

1:13:27**SPEAKER_03**

to be able to pay them, uh, the salaries that they are or the hourly wages that they are into whatever contract they have, whether they're part of a bargaining unit or not. And, um, it's getting more and more expensive. Benefits are getting more and more expensive. Anybody who's in private sector, if you're trying to figure out how to deal with payroll for healthcare, it is astronomical. It's happening to us too. Um, and anything you can do to reduce the risk and make sure we're hiring the

1:14:01**SPEAKER_03**

best people for Pierce County, having a consistent, um, flexible source of funds, specifically earmarked for public safety will allow us to make sure we're hiring the best attorneys, make sure that we are bringing the best deputies online, providing the best facilities that are our residents.

1:14:20**SPEAKER_03**

Yeah.

1:14:22**SPEAKER_05**

Mr. Rendell Kelly.

1:14:24**SPEAKER_07**

Mr. Rendell Kelly.

1:14:29**SPEAKER_07**

Thank you again, Chair Hinton, uh, Commissioner Rendell Kelly, District 4. Um, uh, Sheriff Swank,

1:14:35**UNKNOWN**

in his presentation, spoke about, uh, you would be open to or interested in an amendment to the charter

1:14:41**SPEAKER_07**

that gave more, um, independence to the Sheriff's department and made a separate office, um, and then, uh, mentioned that it would avoid some litigation that is ongoing or pregnant issues right now, um, around the independence of the Sheriff's office. I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on that type of amendment or any of the ongoing litigation that's happening. Thank you.

1:15:05**SPEAKER_03**

So I, I think at the end of the day, for me, it's about liability. Um, right now, will we manage services and how we invest in risk management and work with our prosecuting attorneys to manage that risk is incredibly important? Um, if we were to shift all of that ability to the Sheriff's office under what I was hearing, um, the costs and the number of employees that we needed to be able to do that and the management of their own risk pool and all of that would be a significant increase.

1:15:43**SPEAKER_05**

Great. So just for a time track, we have five more minutes. Uh, Commissioner O'Leary.

1:15:48**SPEAKER_02**

Thank you. Thanks. Commissioner O'Leary, District 1. Um, thanks again for answering all the questions.

1:15:57**SPEAKER_02**

It's brilliant. Um, if you, there's currently a, um, amendment that is in our hopper, so it's gone to the last stage that talks about intergovernmental, um, involvement and specifically about federal government and how we can or act or will not interact with it. The council

have passed a resolution that basically has very, very similar language on what this amendment has. In governing,

1:16:32**SPEAKER_02**

in your position, I would assume there's a lot of items that flexibility is important. Is there anything in general that you could mention in the charter that in your opinion should not tie your hands as a council person as far as if we get too defined could be a detriment to the

1:16:56**UNKNOWN**

way that you have to, that anyone in your position would have to serve and allow enough flexibility for

1:17:03**SPEAKER_02**

you to do what is necessary?

1:17:10**SPEAKER_03**

So flexibility is always welcome. However, when we start getting twisted into a pretzel, sometimes we're trying to be, I guess, too flexible, which is why we have a charter, but charter kind of gives us the background. And then we have beyond the charter, the state constitution, and then we have the federal law. Um, I would want to read the exact amendment that you're talking

1:17:35**SPEAKER_02**

about and I can send my comments to the chair. It's just an example. Okay. You don't have to relate to that. Okay. I'm just saying, is there anything you would say? Hey, look, keep your hands

1:17:43**SPEAKER_05**

off the desk because it ties on. And Terrence, if you don't mind, uh, repeating what Commissioner O'Leary said just so that we can have it. Um, he asked me to just generalize it and I guess I just

1:17:54**SPEAKER_03**

I just, I, I, I don't know. I mean, I, I, I, I, I don't know.

1:17:56**SPEAKER_03**

I, I, I, I, I, I, I, I, and I, I, I, I, I. U, and like, I, I, I, I, I, I, I, I,

1:17:56**UNKNOWN**

Thank you.