

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: The incentive is a reduction in expenditures by the combined governmental agency.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And where will the expenditures be reduced? Will they have to pay less for law enforcement? In other words, will the reduce the number of sheriffs and deputies?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Well, Senator, the number of sheriffs would obviously be reduced, whether the number of deputies would be reduced, I don't know. But if you have a merged county or counties, I'm sorry, merged counties, you obviously wind up with just one sheriff.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would you have to only have one sheriff? Is that required under the law right now, that there can only be one sheriff in each county?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: The current... I believe that's correct, although a sheriff can have a number of deputies, but there is only one sheriff.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And under this bill that would not change?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would there be less expenditure for roads repair and upkeep in both of these counties? Since both of them are working together, would there be less in the way of expenditure for roads?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: That would be difficult to say. If you're asking the question, would there be a reduction in the number of miles of road, that is probably not what would occur. You might have some savings with the supervision of the road crews. You might have...you would have only one road superintendent, for example.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So we're talking about if you had two counties, you reduce that...you have one sheriff instead of two, you might have one road supervisor instead of two, that's not enough incentive, in my mind, to combine these counties. I'm saying again I don't believe this is going to result in any property tax relief, and I have yet to hear anybody explain how it can with specificity, anything, other than eliminating a job