

<b>C2</b>	Intergovernmental Cooperation	Rydell-Kelly	Article 1, Section 1.20
-----------	-------------------------------	--------------	-------------------------

**Amendment location: Packet Date – Page #**

	<a href="#">2/9-96</a>	<a href="#">2/18-61</a>	<a href="#">2/23-117</a>			
--	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	--	--	--

*\*\* This proposal seeks to inject the Keep Washington Working Act principles of hiding illegal aliens.*

**Sponsor of Proposal**

Commissioner Devin Rydel Kelly, District 4, Position 2

**Brief Summary of Proposal**

This proposed amendment clarifies the nature and scope of Pierce County intergovernmental relations, affirming our government’s commitment to aiding our most vulnerable residents and following the Washington and US Constitutions, and recognizing 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment limitations on local government enforcement of immigration issues.

**Proposed Amendment**

**Section 1.20 Intergovernmental Relations**

(1) The County may, in any manner permitted by law, exercise any of its powers or perform any of its duties, functions, projects, or activities jointly or in cooperation with any one or more governments, governmental agencies, municipal corporations, or any private agency or corporation, and participate in the financing thereof.

(2) It shall be the policy of the County to enhance in every way possible intergovernmental cooperation, particularly when cooperation aids public concerns such as aid, care and support for our poor, needy or most vulnerable residents, except when cooperation risks the County violating rights enumerated in the Washington State or United States Constitutions.

(3) In recognition of the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States Constitution, the County acknowledges that laws relating to immigration and naturalization are the sole responsibility of the federal government, and, therefore, the County will not dedicate its resources (including county funds, law enforcement personnel, facilities, equipment, data, or other resources) to enforcing such laws, or deny any person in the County services solely based on that person’s immigration status.

~~(3)~~(4) The County shall provide professional guidance and coordination for the fire protection agencies within Pierce County and shall support the concept of consolidated emergency services. (Originally Adopted November 4, 1980)

**Rationale For Amendment**

The charter is unclear on how and when Pierce County should prioritize intergovernmental cooperation. Expressly focusing on the poor, needy and vulnerable encourages our legislative and executive branches to approach collaboration with such an orientation. Clarifying restrictions on immigration enforcement also aligns the charter with recent state and county ordinance, reaffirms our values, and helps prioritize our resources.

---

---

## Summary Points

- The Charter is a framework for governance, not a platform for ideological statements.
  - Injecting partisan policy preferences into foundational governing documents weakens neutrality.
  - The Charter should define structure and authority - not political agendas.
  - Intergovernmental coordination must respect federalism and constitutional hierarchy.
  - Would the author propose to set the County Charter at odds with the State Constitution?
  - Amending the Charter for symbolic positioning diminishes its seriousness.
  - Providing county services to illegal aliens violates numerous state and federal statutes.
  - Actions that could stem from this amendment could be charged as aiding and abetting under federal law risking the loss of federal funding or worse.
  - These positions are at odds with Federal law and are moving through the courts. Establishing unresolved legal challenges into the charter is reckless.
- 
- 

## Submit written testimony

By Email: [katey.hobbs@piercecountywa.gov](mailto:katey.hobbs@piercecountywa.gov)

By Web Form: <https://www.piercecountywa.gov/FormCenter/Charter-Review-41/Provide-Written-Public-Comment-893>

---

---

## Submitted public testimony

Names in **RED** = CON

Names in **GREEN** = PRO

As of 4-6-26 = **8 CON** ~ **1 PRO**

---

---

**2-9-26 Packet**

---

---

**From:** [john@thetruthpage.org](mailto:john@thetruthpage.org) <[john@thetruthpage.org](mailto:john@thetruthpage.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, February 9, 2026 3:55 PM

**Subject:** Amendment C2

I oppose Amendment C2 sponsored by Commissioner Devin Rydel Kelly.

Once again, it is a partisan effort to inject personal preferences and values into the charter. This is completely inappropriate and does not benefit anyone if allowed. If a proposal was made to inject partisan values I might agree with, it would still be equally inappropriate. This proposal definitely does not rise to the solemn nature of amending our charter.

Sincerely,

John Leslie

---

---

***\*\*\* Note Mr. Anderson commented on multiple proposed Amendments. The commentary for each will be associated to their specific Amendment \*\*\****

**From:** [jonwayne@comcast.net](mailto:jonwayne@comcast.net) <[jonwayne@comcast.net](mailto:jonwayne@comcast.net)>

**Sent:** Monday, February 9, 2026 11:20 AM

**To:** Mason Fletcher <[mason.fletcher.volunteer@piercecountywa.gov](mailto:mason.fletcher.volunteer@piercecountywa.gov)>

**Subject:** Charter Review Proposed Amendments

Mr. Fletcher,

I am writing as a concerned Pierce County resident to strongly oppose the proposed amendments C-1 through C-5, as outlined in the February 9th packet (particularly the chart on page 93 and detailed proposals on pages 94–104). These changes appear designed to undermine the elected Sheriff's independence, dilute voter authority, inject controversial state policies into our local Charter, and shift power away from democratic processes toward executive or unelected control.

1. **Amendment C-1 (Article III, Section 3.70 – Sheriff):** This amendment inserts language mirroring SB 5974, imposing new qualifications on the Sheriff. While professional standards for law enforcement are important, embedding state-level mandates into our County Charter risks overriding voter choice in electing our chief law enforcement officer. Sheriffs are constitutional officers accountable directly to the people through elections—not to state boards or unelected bodies. This change could enable

removal or disqualification based on external criteria, eroding local democratic control. I oppose any effort to limit who voters can choose for this critical role.

2. **Amendment C-2 (Section 1.20 – Intergovernmental Relations):** This proposal seeks to embed principles from the Keep Washington Working Act into the Charter, which limits local cooperation with federal immigration enforcement and has been criticized for prioritizing non-enforcement over public safety and federal law compliance. Our Charter should not be used to lock in one-sided immigration policies that could hinder law enforcement's ability to address serious crimes or coordinate with federal authorities when necessary. Pierce County residents deserve Charter language that supports impartial, safety-focused governance— not ideological restrictions on intergovernmental cooperation.

3. **Amendment C-3 (Article 4, Section 4.7 – Grounds for Removal):** This amendment adds specific grounds for removal from office, seemingly targeted at the Sheriff, while allowing the County Executive to appoint a replacement. Creating tailored removal mechanisms for an elected official circumvents established processes like recall elections or judicial removal. It concentrates too much power in the Executive branch and threatens the separation of powers. Voters, not the Executive, should hold elected officials accountable.

4. **Amendment C-4 (Article 4, Section 4.7 – Vacancies):** By imposing strict timelines and processes for filling vacancies in partisan offices, this change strips political parties of their traditional role in appointments when seats are vacated mid-term. This could disenfranchise voters who elected officials under a party banner and opens the door to manipulation if minor procedural errors occur. Maintaining party input ensures continuity and respects the partisan nature of these offices as chosen by voters.

5. **Amendment C-5 (Article 4, Section 4.7 – Vacancies/Executive Control):** This proposal grants the Executive direct control over the Sheriff upon any accusation— without due process or voter input. This is an alarming power grab that could paralyze the Sheriff's office based on unproven claims, undermining law enforcement stability and independence. Accusations alone should never trigger executive takeover of an elected constitutional office.

These amendments weaken the elected Sheriff's authority, reduce voter influence, import divisive state policies, and shift power to the Executive branch. The Charter should protect democratic accountability, local control, and the separation of powers— not erode them. I urge the Commission to reject C-1 through C-5 in their entirety and preserve the current structure that ensures the Sheriff remains directly accountable to Pierce County voters.

Thank you for considering public input.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Anderson  
9005 19th Ave E Tacoma, WA 98445  
Pierce County Resident

---

**From:** Laurie Layne <laurielayne1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 9, 2026 9:24 AM  
**Subject:** C-2

This encourages protection of illegal aliens, who are here illegally to begin with (already breaking the law). I am not for this either as we should be most concerned with our residents who are here legally and their concerns. Thank you.

---

**From:** nancy anderson <peachyn@live.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 9, 2026 9:34 AM  
**Subject:** 6 proposed amendments to the charter

Since we cannot attend tonight's meeting, we would like to go on record as against all 6 proposed amendments —they are definitely taking our county in the wrong direction and are not properly dealing with the issues of most import. Please reconsider passing any of these. Robert and Nancy Anderson, District 3

---

**\*\*\* Note Lisa commented on multiple proposed Amendments. The commentary for each will be associated to their specific Amendment \*\*\***

**From:** Lisa Sauve <lisa98446@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 17, 2026 7:37 AM  
**To:** Katey Hobbs <katey.hobbs@piercecountywa.gov>  
**Subject:** 6 Amendments up for review at this weeks meeting

Dear Katey,

I would like my position to be registered as noted below on the 6 amendments up for review at this week's Charter Review meeting.

**Amendment C-1**

I oppose this amendment for the following reasons: Voters determine fitness for office - not partisan amendments. Also, singling out the Sheriff undermines equal treatment under the law.

**Amendment C-2**

I oppose this amendment for the following reasons: The Charter is a framework for governance, not a platform for ideological statements. Intergovernmental coordination must respect federalism and constitutional hierarchy.

**Amendment C-3**

I oppose this amendment for the following reasons: This amendment expands removal authority beyond the constitutional presumption of innocence and it undermines voter sovereignty by bypassing electoral accountability.

**Amendment C-4**

I oppose this amendment for the following reasons: This amendment weakens party authority in offices explicitly chosen through partisan elections. It also disregards the will of voters who selected a candidate aligned with a party.

**Amendment C-5**

I oppose this amendment for the following reasons: This amendment undermines separation of powers within county government and it subverts the will of voters who elected the Sheriff.

**Amendment C-6**

I oppose this amendment for the following reasons: This amendment the Charter derives authority from the electorate - citizens and legal voters and foundational documents must use exact legal language.

Thank you for recording my opposition to these Amendments. Please leave our elected Sheriff alone. He is doing his job and he is doing it well!

Sincerely,

Lisa Sauve

---

---

**\*\*\* Note Mr. Haskins commented on multiple proposed Amendments. The commentary for each will be associated to their specific Amendment \*\*\***

Mark Haskins

[haskinsmark@hotmail.com](mailto:haskinsmark@hotmail.com)

Date: Sunday, February 22, 2026 7:49:07 PM

After attending a District 6 listening forum recently, I have a better understanding of the important work of the Charter Commission, as well as some of the amendments that are being proposed to our County Charter. I am taking the time to make comments because I was dismayed by two apparently popular proposals in particular that reflect a shortsighted and highly partisan response to the current political climate, rather than a thoughtful approach to a charter that facilitates an efficient and effective operation of Pierce County FOR THE NEXT 10 YEARS.

1. First, I strongly opposed a change to the charter that would make the County Sheriff an appointed official versus an elected one. It is actually shocking that we would consider such a change that so obviously erodes the democratic process in the county. The reason that 95% of sheriffs nationwide are elected is so that they are accountable to the people: ALL the people, directly, not through some faceless bureaucracy chosen for their ideological homogeneity. If the people are unhappy with their choice, they can elect someone else during the next cycle. If there are legitimate, LEGAL reasons for removing a sheriff during their term (as opposed to ideological ones), there is a process to do that. Arguably, the fact that our current sheriff was elected by a majority of voters in a county that leans heavily in a different ideological direction is indicative of one thing on which a MAJORITY of Pierce County voters agreed: public safety had been allowed to deteriorate to an unacceptable level. (Even our legislature had to respond, as evidenced by their amending of the "no pursuit" law.). The people should be able to elect a sheriff that serves their priorities, especially public safety, which is perhaps the primary function of government. To remove this voice from the people should be appalling to any American.

2. Similarly, it is shortsighted and dangerous to amend the charter to allow our county to selectively withhold support to federal agencies: I strongly oppose this as well. As a minimum, it limits our insight and ability to influence their activities within the county. At worst, it politicizes the relationship, which could result in federal funding impacts to our county. Considering our proximity to a volcano and major fault line, I want the federal government under any administration to be there for us in the event of a natural disaster. I am unimpressed by the newly minted constitutional

"scholars" who are now waving the 10th Amendment in our faces: It does not apply in matters under federal jurisdiction, such as federal immigration law.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these important matters. I am putting my trust and faith in you to carry out your charter, avoid allowing this process to be hijacked by those looking at the charter through a soda straw of current events, and help us produce a charter that will meet the needs of Pierce County for the next 10 years.

---

---

Walter Hudsick

[walterhudsick@gmail.com](mailto:walterhudsick@gmail.com)

Date: Monday, February 23, 2026 6:32:21 AM

I support Commissioner Kelly's amendment C-2 on Intergovernmental Relations and urge the commission to approve it.

---

---

3-23-26 Packet

---

---

Jason Stielow

[ghoststarkat@gmail.com](mailto:ghoststarkat@gmail.com)

Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 10:59 AM

It is a conflict of interest, security threat, and an insult to have non citizens are police officers and deputies. This cannot be allowed to happen and I stand by my Sheriff when he says he won't hire non citizens in his department.

---

---

4-6-26 Packet

---

---

Colleen Wise

[colleenwise2015@gmail.com](mailto:colleenwise2015@gmail.com)

Monday, March 30, 2026 2:49 PM

After checking this section:Section 1.20 Intergovernmental

## Relations

(1) The County may, in any manner permitted by law, exercise any of its powers or perform any of its duties, functions, projects, or activities jointly or in cooperation with any one or more

governments, governmental agencies, municipal corporations, or any private agency or corporation, and participate in the financing thereof. I am unable to figure out why you need a change. It is clear that any activity required by Local Authorities is handled and then if it is a Federal issue, the correct Federal authorities would handle their part. No further change should be needed

---

---