

Minutes of the Elected v Appointed Committee  
Monday, May 17, 2021, 10:30 - 11:30 am

Present: David Dehlendorf, Richard Grout, Bob O'Connell, Paul Dossett, Maureen See  
Tony Ghazel is absent from today's meeting.

Moved by Bob O'Connell, seconded by Paul Dossett, to approve the minutes of May 10, 2021. All ayes, motion passed

Discussion centered on the revised language provided by Dick Grout on the qualifications of elected officials. Members went through each elected position and agreed on certain changes. After discussion, the following action took place:

Moved by Richard Grout, seconded by Paul Dossett, to adopt the revised language as amended in this meeting for proposed minimum qualifications for elected officials and to move the proposed language forward to the full Charter Review Commission. All ayes, motion passed

Members next reviewed the pro and con comments by Bob O'Connell and David Dehlendorf regarding the issue of whether the Sheriff's position should be elected or appointed. Members agreed to the list which will be sent to the full CRC before the next meeting. A copy is attached to the minutes.

A short discussion followed on the legislative bill recently passed in Washington Section 4, RCW 36.16.030 regarding elected officials. No action was taken.

No public comment was offered.

Members agreed to notify the full CRC that EvA's agenda is completed.

ADJOURNED.

ISSUE	PRO	CON
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SHOULD THE SHERIFF CHANGE FROM ELECTED TO AN APPOINTED POSITION?</b></p> <p><u>Findings:</u> As the most visible elected official, the Sheriff is accountable to voters. As an elected official, the Sheriff can concentrate more efforts on law enforcement priorities. Election also removes the position from Council and Administration intrusion.</p>	<p>1. There have historically been strong candidates locally to run for election. No need to look outside the county for appointees. Moreover, only local candidates will have the necessary immediate knowledge of local conditions, issues, and people to be effective from their first day in office. They will also be better prepared to manage the deputy sheriffs and other staff working for them.</p> <p>2. The local public and press will provide oversight to help assure there is not misconduct by an elected sheriff in the first place. But if there is, a sheriff can be recalled by public vote</p> <p>3) The electorate can prevent this from happening via their ballots. An incumbent is unlikely to do this knowing it would result in his/her defeat when up for re-election. And a recall vote is always an option for the public to take.</p> <p>4) Same issue as #1. See counter counter-point above.</p> <p>5) The benefits of local knowledge and familiarity by local candidates far outweigh the potential downside. Local knowledge and familiarity by local candidates are givens. Potential favoritism is pure speculation. An appointed candidate from elsewhere would be at a disadvantage in beginning their duties effectively.</p>	<p>1. Don't we want to hire the most qualified we can get? Isn't it better to hire from (or more) of very highly qualified people throughout the region or even country? Some of this highly qualified group are unwilling to move here, without the promise of a job to run for office.</p> <p>2. An elected Sheriff is in for four years (and a difficult recall by public vote). This means we have to put up with conduct in office that is intolerable. An appointed Sheriff could be fired in such a way could be fired immediately.</p> <p>3. An elected Sheriff can construct an insulated kingdom. Neither the County Council could tell this person what to do. Citizen input, from an advisory council or oversight committee, could be completely ignored at least until the next election.</p> <p>4. Experience tells us that the odds are against us. Is the Sheriff working for the present Sheriff a good idea? Do we want our practical list of candidates to be politically homogenous?</p> <p>5. Although it is true that an elected Sheriff may know a good percentage of the people in the county, there is a downside to this. Familiarity, a human nature, can lead to favoritism. An appointed Sheriff may have to deal with when the Sheriff has the same familiarity could lead to uncovering a blind eye, etc.</p>

Proposed Minimum Qualifications for Elected Officials  
05-17-21

7. Add clearer language regarding minimum requirements for elected positions.

**Vote:** 6 Ayes for each 5 officials    **Recommend to full CRC**

**Proposals:**

A. Assessor

**Shall be a state-accredited real estate appraiser under RCW 36.21.015 or a state-licensed or state-certified real estate appraiser under RCW 18.140**

B. Auditor

**Proposed qualifications shall be two years as a chief deputy of a Washington county auditor, or three years of other relevant experience in the office of a Washington county auditor, or three years of experience in accounting or financial management.**

C. County Clerk

**Proposed qualifications shall be two years as a chief deputy in the office of a Washington county clerk, or three years of relevant experience in the office of a Washington county clerk, or three years of other relevant experience working in Washington courts.**

D. Sheriff

**Proposed qualifications shall be all the training set out in Washington State law in RCW 36.28.025 (within twelve months of assuming office) and two years of experience as a full-time law enforcement officer.**

***No change***

E. Treasurer

**Proposed qualifications shall be two years of relevant experience in the office of a Washington County Treasurer,**

**Auditor or County Clerk or some combination thereof, or three years of experience in accounting or financial management.**

**Findings:** The Elected v Appointed Committee finds that minimum qualifications for the various elected offices are necessary to ensure that candidates for those offices possess the basic skills and experience necessary to effectively perform the duties of the office.