

# **History of King County Government 1853 – 2002**

*By Kay F. Reinartz, Ph.D.*

This brief summary of the past 150 years of King County government will focus on how the county responded to changing times by providing services, struggling with revenue shortages, and dealing with the problems and solutions that accompanied each era. County government has evolved considerably from its 19th century beginnings. Initially, its role was to serve as the administrative arm of the territorial government. The county's main responsibilities were law enforcement and courts; recording property transactions and vital records; periodically taking the census; assessing property values and collecting taxes; holding elections; licensing; building public works; and providing for the public welfare by supporting the indigents living in the county. The elected county officials were the treasurer, clerk, auditor, assessor, judges, prosecuting attorney, sheriff, coroner, and the county commissioners, who functioned as both the legislative and executive branches of county government.

In reviewing 150 years of King County government history two major themes emerge. The first theme is the diversity and persistence in maintaining local option and local control, including control over the way that state policy is implemented at the county level. The second is the county's evolving relationship of cooperation and interdependence with the municipalities and the special-purpose districts created over the years within its boundaries.

A convenient way to look at county government is in three historical phases: settlement to statehood, 1845-1889; development, reform, and fiscal change, 1890-1945; suburbanization, growth and the struggle to adapt, 1946–present.

## **Prelude: Historical background to the formation of King County**

The formation of King County, Washington, is one part of the chain of events that resulted in the region now known as the Pacific Northwest becoming a part of the United States of America in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In order to understand the historical context from which King County emerged as a political entity, it is useful to briefly review the history of discovery and the exploration of the Pacific Northwest coast.

Explorers and fur traders were in the Pacific Northwest region from the 16th century. However, the first real settlers were Americans who came in the early 1840s looking for land to farm. The fertile Willamette Valley was the first area homesteaded. These people had come to stay and were interested in solidifying their interest and control over the region.<sup>1</sup>

In 1843, the American settlers took the initiative to form a provisional “American” government, which was actually a republic within a republic since the “national” status of the region had not been determined. Keenly interested in drawing settlers to the Oregon Country, the Oregon Provisional Government granted 640 acres to each homesteader. In 1844, the Provisional Assembly met at Oregon City, drafted a code of laws, elected officers to govern and immediately enacted a law defining their boundaries. Up to this time the Hudson Bay Company had functioned as the *de facto* government in the region. Now, the control of the vast region passed from the Hudson Bay Company to the Americans.<sup>2</sup>

Early in 1849, the Oregon Territorial government replaced the Provisional Government through an act of the United States Congress. The great Oregon Territory was divided into six districts. The region that was destined to become Washington Territory lay in the Vancouver district. The Vancouver District encompassed all of the land north and west of the Columbia River, with the eastern boundary being the Rocky Mountains and the western boundary the Pacific Ocean. On December 21, 1845, Lewis County was carved out of the Vancouver District. Lewis County consisted of the area west of the Cowlitz River to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, north of the Columbia River to the 54° 40” parallel, the southern boundary of the region claimed by Russia at that time.<sup>3</sup>

On January 12, 1852 Lewis County was divided, creating Thurston County (named for Samuel R. Thurston, Oregon Territory’s first delegate to Congress). Thurston County included all of the Puget Sound Country, as the land adjacent to Puget Sound was known. In June of 1852 Thurston County citizens elected three county commissioners, including Arthur A. Denny of Seattle. During this same period, before the formation of King County, the Oregon Territorial Legislature appointed Dr. David S. Maynard as Justice of the Peace and Notary Public for the Seattle area. On December 22, 1852, Thurston County was divided into Pierce, King, Island and Jefferson counties.<sup>4</sup>

### **Boundaries of King County as Defined in 1852 and 1867**

The original boundaries of King County were defined in December 22, 1852 as follows: *Commencing at the northeast corner of Pierce County, thence along the Cascade Mountains to a parallel passing through Pilot Cove, then from the point last aforesaid west along the said parallel of latitude to the Pacific Ocean, thence south along the Coast to a point due west of the head of Case's Inlet, beginning.* Pilot Cove, named by Capt. Wilkes in 1841 later came to be known as Point No-Point. Other counties were carved out of the original King County, such as Slaughter County in 1857, later renamed Kitsap County.

On January 31, 1867 the boundaries of King County were defined as follows: *Commencing where the fifth standard parallel line strikes the mainland near the head of Commencement Bay, thence east along said parallel line to the middle channel of the White River to the forks of the White River and Greenwater, thence up the main channel of Greenwater to the summit of the Cascade Mountains, thence northerly along said summit to the southeast corner of Township 27 north, Range 11 4 east, thence to Admiralty Inlet, thence southerly along the main channel of Admiralty Inlet, Colvos Passage and Commencement Bay, to the fifth standard parallel and place of beginning.*<sup>5</sup>

### **The Territorial Years, King County 1853-1889**

In the Pacific Northwest, counties are the oldest local government entity. The Oregon Provisional Government, established by the early settlers, created the first counties. The Provisional Government used the Iowa model for structuring county government. The legislatures of both Oregon (1848) and Washington (1853) territories retained the Iowa model as they organized their governments. The Iowa model is unique for its numerous elected officials, who performed specific functions independently such as assessment of property values, law enforcement and tax collection. With numerous regular elections the system provided broad opportunities for citizen participation and influence. It is not surprising that the Iowa county model was selected since Iowa was the home state of a significant proportion of the region's early settlers.<sup>6</sup>

Initially, county government's main role was to serve as the administrative arm of the territorial government. The three county commissioners held the power of local government. The territorial legislature defined their responsibilities to include: approving road and school districts; building and maintaining public buildings; repairing roads; granting licenses; levying and

overseeing the collection of taxes; administering the county's funds; and supporting the indigents living in the county. By statehood in 1889, King County had expanded its responsibilities to include such functions as managing a public health system and approving special use district boundaries.<sup>7</sup>

Early in 1853, the Oregon Territorial Legislature appointed the first officials for King County: Luther M. Collins, Arthur M. Denny and John N. Lowe, county commissioners. Other officials appointed were Henry L. Yesler, probate clerk and Carson D. Boren, sheriff. On January 11, 1853, Seattle was designated the county seat.<sup>8</sup>

Upon the creation of Washington Territory on March 2, 1853, the officials who had been appointed by the Oregon Legislature were replaced by the following men who served until the next annual election: Thomas Mercer, G. W. Loomis and Luther M. Collins, commissioners; C. D. Boren, sheriff; Henry Yesler, auditor; William Smith, treasurer; Dr. Henry A. Smith, superintendent of schools; John Holgate, assessor; William Strickler, probate judge; and S. B. Simons and James Roberts, constables. In 1854, the Legislature created the office of Wreckmaster (abolished in 1915), whose job it was to salvage wrecks in the coastal areas and shorelines. Hilory Butler was the first person to hold this office. In the first years of King County government, the number of county offices were so numerous that a single individual often held more than one office. Because women were not allowed to vote, women could not hold office.<sup>9</sup>

For two decades after its formation, King County was the only local government. Seattle, incorporated in 1869, was the sole municipality until 1890 when Ballard and Kent incorporated, followed by Issaquah and Columbia City in 1892.<sup>10</sup>

### **County government based on local choice and local control**

Two characteristics of county government were shaped and put firmly into place during this early period—local diversity, local option and local control.<sup>11</sup> From the beginning, the county commissioners in King, as well as other territorial counties, took the initiative and used their power to establish numerous ordinances to allow each county to manage its affairs according to local preference. However, in 1863, the Territorial Legislature took steps to limit the implied power of the county commissioners. The amended the statute include a following

provision: “. . . and they shall have no other powers, except such as are or may be given to them by law.”<sup>12</sup>

The individuals that settled King County came at different times and from different places. Their diverse backgrounds fueled the strong opinions that called for local choice, local option and local control. From the 1840s to 1870s, the settlers came largely from New England and the Midwest. Key states included Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, Indiana, Missouri and Illinois. In general, these people were politically liberal and abolitionists. They were usually “tea totalers” and favored prohibition and other controls over the sale and consumption of alcohol, as well as other activities they viewed as socially disruptive.<sup>13</sup> In the 1860s and 70s, many people from the Southeast migrated to the region. These people tended to be politically conservative and often unsympathetic with the abolitionists. The completion of the railroad to King County in 1883 brought the another wave of settlers to the county.<sup>14</sup> These new settlers, including many foreign-born immigrants, came from ethnic and class backgrounds very different from the early pioneers.<sup>15</sup>

The county’s tolerance of diversity was tested in 1885 when a hostile mob attempted to forcefully expel a group of Chinese workers. These workers came to the United States as contract labor to build the railroads and work in the mines. The King County Sheriff took charge of the situation and with the help from the Seattle Police and the Home Guard (National Guard), sent to the county by the governor, quelled the “Anti-Chinese Riots” and the Chinese were mostly protected from harm.<sup>16</sup>

### **The roots of populism and prohibition**

The roots of populism and prohibition, destined to become major issues in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, are linked with the second wave of immigrants.<sup>17</sup> As the lumber industry rapidly developed, thousands of men, the majority of whom were young and single, poured into the county. As the number of mills increased, so did the number of saloons. Alcohol was an issue in King County from the earliest years. When King County voted to “go dry” in 1856, David “Doc” Maynard, King County’s representative, convinced the Territorial Legislature to split the county in two, forming Kitsap and King Counties. The voters in King immediately voted to go wet while Kitsap remained dry.<sup>18</sup> The saloons often operated 24 hours a day and were packed with drunken mill hands and shingle weavers, whose behavior offended “respectable” people.<sup>19</sup> In

1888, the anti-saloon advocates got a license law passed which gave counties and cities local option to regulate or prohibit the sale of alcohol. In addition, local government was free to set liquor license fees. Often, it was the voters who decided at the polls if saloons were acceptable or not. Local option regarding the sale of alcohol was the preferred solution, since local option avoided the need to get statewide agreement on a standard and, therefore, reflected the values and independence of the local population instead of the population of the entire state. In addition, licensing saloons and liquor sales in unincorporated areas was a potentially lucrative source of revenue for the county and the so-called “roadhouse,” located outside of municipal control, became a common sight in King County, especially in the first two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>20</sup> In addition to issues of alcohol, the second wave of immigrants to the county set the stage for populist politics in regard to “big money.”

Early Washington has been described as a “colony” — a land far away from the “civilized” part of the United States — rich in natural resources available for the taking. For decades, people living outside of Washington (especially in San Francisco and the large Midwestern cities) owned the railroad, timber, mining, and fishing resources. The Midwestern railroad interests facilitated the transportation of people into the Puget Sound region and exploited the immigrants once they were settled, by charging inflated rates to ship goods produced in the region to distant markets. Thus, homesteaders, as well as men who worked in the woods and mines, often felt exploited by these “big money” interests. Resentment against absent owners and big corporations fueled the volatile politics of local choice and control, which, in turn, helped to shape local county government.<sup>21</sup>

In spite of the antagonism between the settlers and the “big money” interests, everyone was interested in development because it increased property values and wealth of the early arrivals. King County, Seattle and other municipalities created “booster pamphlets” that promoted the advantages of the community and county as a place to make one’s home and establish one’s business.<sup>22</sup>

The State Constitution, developed at the Walla Walla Convention in 1888, included several provisions of lasting relevance to county government. For example, county government was to include many elected officials, all serving two-year terms. Perhaps the most significant provision, however, was the statement that “any county, city, town or township may make or

enforce within its limits all such local police, sanitary and other regulations as are not in conflict with general laws.”<sup>23</sup> This provision of so-called “police power” was the source of much controversy over the years. At this point, counties in Washington were regarded merely as administrative arms of the state, responsible for such functions as collecting state taxes and enforcing state regulations. Local governments viewed this constitutional granting of “police powers” as justification for the evolution of the county as a provider of characteristic “urban” services for communities located in unincorporated areas of the county. In spite of the appearance of broad “home rule” authority granted to county government by this provision, it was over 60 years before the courts and the Legislature supported this interpretation.<sup>24</sup> It was not until 1948 that the counties were given unrestricted opportunity to govern their own affairs through home rule. The people of King County it adopted a home rule charter in 1969.<sup>25</sup>

### **1890 – 1945: Growth, reform, the Depression and fiscal change**

One of the most significant factors influencing the course of county government after 1900 was a major population surge. The railroad reached Seattle in 1882, and by 1889 the county’s population was 40,788. In 1890, it was 63,989; and by 1900 it had climbed to 110,053. Seattle’s population of 42,837 in 1890 nearly doubled during the next decade. By 1910, the city had 237,194 residents.<sup>26</sup> The Klondike Gold Rush of 1897 brought many people into King County, since Seattle was a major jumping-off point for those rushing to the gold fields. Fortunes were made financing and outfitting the miners. After the rush was over, many people returned to Seattle and the Puget Sound region to stay. The 1909 Alaska-Yukon Pacific Exposition, the ultimate “boosterism” event, gave King County and Seattle high visibility nationwide and brought in business interests and new wave of people seeking opportunities and adventure. Anticipation of the opening of the Panama Canal also spurred development in Seattle.

The rapid increase in population was reflected in the incorporation of 24 new municipalities between 1890 and the 1910s.<sup>27</sup> Interurban passenger rail service from Tacoma to Everett, which became available between the 1890s and the 1910s, stimulated the growth of many communities in the immediate vicinity of the train stations.<sup>28</sup> The era of commuting to Seattle to work, while living in the outlying county, had begun.

A boom economy was enjoyed through World War I and into the 1920s.<sup>29</sup> At this time, King County, like the other Washington counties, continued to function largely as a local agent

of the state attending to record keeping, tax collecting and enforcing laws. The county's involvement with urban life per se was limited to the county commissioners' power to incorporate new municipalities and create special-purpose districts.

However, these were volatile political years with new ideas abounding on how to conduct the public's business. The special-purpose district concept, permitted by the State Constitution – but as yet little implemented (with the exception of school districts which numbered over 100) – began to take form at this time with port districts, road districts, water districts and public utility districts proliferating.<sup>30</sup> However, the county began to take on new responsibilities including public health functions, such as imposing quarantines and hospital construction and maintenance. In 1895, the State Legislature explicitly defined the county's responsibility for the care of the poor. This directive became a significant financial drain on the county as destitute unemployed people and indigent immigrants — largely homeless men — continued to arrive in growing numbers. It was a trend that had begun during the Panic of 1893, and was to reach crisis proportions during the Great Depression of the 1930s.<sup>31</sup>

### **The Great Depression brings major revenue changes**

The Great Depression marked a turning point in the county government's ability to work as an independent entity with local choice. The national financial collapse that was the core of the Depression was responsible for the change. With the onset of the Depression, the county faced the dilemma of how to finance government in a time of plummeting property values, widespread unemployment and spiraling welfare and service needs.<sup>32</sup> Historically, property taxes had been the major source of government revenue. By the 1920s, property owners began to vehemently object to ever-increasing taxes, which had reached three percent of the value of the property. Many property-owners could pay neither property taxes nor mortgages, and lost their property to foreclosure. A series of Depression-era tax cuts between 1931 and 1941 (including property tax rate reduction from three percent to two percent) had the net effect of reducing local tax revenues by 50 percent. An attempt to enact a state income tax failed, although a tax package including sales, business and occupation taxes passed in 1935. However, the county did not benefit from these new taxes and continued to struggle with property tax revenues.<sup>33</sup>

The loss of revenue resulting from the state reduction of property taxes was temporarily replaced during the Depression by state and federal grants, loans and shared revenues. A host of



regulations and requirements accompanied outside funding for services and programs. Next, the state imposed statewide uniform standards in road construction and welfare, further limiting local option and control. Thus, for the first time in Washington State history, state and federal government began to play significant administrative and financial roles in supporting local economies. This type of involvement continued after the Depression, with the long-term effect being the shift from the county functioning as a relatively autonomous entity to the county becoming a partner with state and federal government to provide a wide array of services ranging from road construction to mental health and family services.<sup>34</sup>

### **Post-War growth brings change in government**

Following World War II, the stage was set in the Puget Sound region for massive changes that would lead to radical modification of county government by century's end. The key factors were a huge jump in population, post-war prosperity, widespread automobile ownership, and a new, county and regional road system. During the war years, tens of thousands of people moved into King County, both military personnel and war industry workers. Largely young adults, many settled in the area following the war. Others had passed through on Navy or other military duty and came back to live. The population of King County nearly doubled between 1940 and 1960, from 504,980 to 935,014.<sup>35</sup>

The census verifies that the growth was primarily in the suburbs. Between 1950-1960, Seattle's population increased by 3,417 while the number of people living outside the city limits nearly doubled, growing from 208,135 in 1950 to 377,927 in 1960—an increase of 169,792.<sup>36</sup> Improved roads and the construction of the Mercer Island Floating Bridge, which opened in 1940, greatly improved access between Seattle and the east side of Lake Washington. Numerous suburban communities proliferated. New commuter “bedroom communities” sprang up in east, south and north King County.<sup>37</sup> Existing municipalities grew and 15 new communities incorporated. But the major thrust on this new development was in unincorporated King County — a choice made possible by widespread ownership of automobiles.<sup>38</sup>

### **Independence and loss of local control**

In 1948, an amendment to the State Constitution was passed that permitted Washington counties to draw up home rule charters. This gave the citizens of each county the freedom choose the form of government they wanted, providing that the charter was drafted by a commission of elected freeholders and the county retained an elected prosecutor, the existing court system, and

continued to fulfill the traditional state duties. This amendment eventually led to a radical reorganization of King County government.<sup>39</sup> King County was the first county to examine the potential of home rule. A King County citizens' group and the Municipal League took the lead. Both groups were convinced that the county commission form of government was incapable of managing the problems and issues of rapid population growth. These problems were especially acute on the Eastside, where in the absence of an adequate sewage system, the waters of Lake Washington were being polluted.<sup>40</sup> In response to the demand for better rural residential infrastructure (such as sewage and water service), special-use districts – each a little government entity unto itself – were proliferating, often with overlapping jurisdictions. The pro-charter contingent pointed to this proliferation as concrete evidence that the existing form of county government could not meet the needs of its citizens. In 1951, a Charter Review Committee was elected. Using a national model, the committee drafted a charter that many people felt failed to address local concerns. That draft subsequently failed at the polls.<sup>41</sup>

While the effort to pass a Home Rule Charter languished, the Puget Sound region boomed. Both federal and state government programs sought to promote growth in a variety of ways, and encouraged local government planning and protecting the natural environment. Continuing a trend initiated through New Deal programs in the 1930s, the federal government gave substantial financial support in the form of grants. Both state administered and federally funded programs increased the financial resources available to the County. However, there was a cost to local control through the imposition of federal and state standards for local performance, including minimum standards for the courts, jail conditions and environmental health. By the 1980s, the practice of federal and state standards being imposed on the counties was firmly established, with the exception that federally mandated standards were no longer accompanied by the funds to support implementation.<sup>42</sup>

In the 1960s, with financial incentives from the federal government, King County participated in Puget Sound regional planning in the areas of transportation, land use and growth, environmental quality and protection and other issues. The groundwork for regional planning had been laid in 1956, when four counties in the Puget Sound area – King, Snohomish, Pierce and Kitsap – came together to form a regional planning council called the Puget Sound Council of Governments (PSCOG). In the 1960s, regional councils were supported by new federal

legislation and grants for programs such as: the Federal Highways Act (1962); Housing and Federal Development Act (1956); Model Cities Act (1966); and the Intergovernmental Coordinating Act (1968). The latter act required regional coordination of local projects as a condition of the federal grants.<sup>43</sup> In 1968, the Forward Thrust bond issue was passed. Forward Thrust brought the county's residents new parks, 18 community swimming pools and improvements to many public facilities.<sup>44</sup>

After more than a decade of discussion and several unsuccessful attempts to secure voter approval, in 1969 the voters approved changing King County government to a Home Rule Charter system. Under the new charter, county government was reorganized with a county executive and a nine-member county council replacing the three-person county commission. In addition, the county sheriff became an appointed rather than elected position and there were many changes in the organization of the departments. The charter was amended in 1992, after the County merged with Metro, and the council grew to 13 members in 1994. County operations underwent major restructuring under the new Home Rule Charter. These changes allowed the county to better manage the ever more complex array of services demanded by a steadily growing population, who demanded urban amenities.<sup>45</sup>

### **1970-2002: Issues, problems and solutions**

From the 1970s to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the key issues for King County government revolved around refining governmental structure under the Home Rule Charter, establishing a dynamic role for itself in regional planning, dealing with urban sprawl, increasing revenue shortfalls, and developing environmental policies. Regional planning was further advanced when the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) passed in 1971. Patterned after the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, SEPA and the Shorelines Management Act of 1971 were among the most important pieces of state environmental legislation to affect King County. The Public Water Systems Coordination Act of 1977 addressed the provision of water services for new developments in unincorporated areas.<sup>46</sup> A second significant new factor in this period, with far-reaching effects, focused on preserving environmental quality. The state and federal governments imposed drastic new environmental-quality standards that would affect almost every area of county activity. Occasionally, mitigating financial aid accompanied these mandated

changes. Generally, however, neither the state nor the federal government provided funds, leaving the county responsible for funding the programs necessary to meet the new standards.<sup>47</sup>

In 1989, county voters approved a major open space bond issue that funded purchase of recreation and resource lands around the county. Precedent for county involvement in land preservation had been established in 1979, when voters approved the King County Farmlands Preservation Bond issue. Beginning in 1984, the county purchased over \$50 million in farmland development rights under this program. Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, additional appropriations added to the growing public ownership of open space, parklands, wildlife habitat and other resource lands.<sup>48</sup>

In response to the pressures on local government that had resulted from the rapid population growth, the Washington State Association of Counties and the Association of Washington Cities presented an initiative to the State Legislature in April of 1985 that stimulated the creation of the Local Governance Study Commission. The commission's charge was to study local government and current problems and to identify what part of the problems might be the result of public policy. The commission identified the following key problems/issues:

- Citizens expect urban levels of services in certain [densely populated] unincorporated areas;
- Problems and /or services needs extend across governmental boundaries; and
- Local government revenues are not adequate to their service responsibilities.<sup>49</sup>

The commission found that local residents looked to King County government to assume responsibility for a vast array of new governmental services such as parks and recreation, land use planning and zoning, social services, environmental health, housing, libraries, mass transit, emergency medical services, and economic development.<sup>50</sup> The long-term implications of these findings were to be significant for all county government.

One response to the demand for services in unincorporated areas came in 1990, with the State Legislature's passage of growth management legislation, RCW 36.70. In response to a citizen's initiative demanding containment of urban sprawl, the legislation urged communities located in unincorporated areas to either incorporate, or annex to nearby cities. This legislation resulted in a third wave of incorporations in King County with 11 communities incorporating between 1989 and 2000. Growth management also spurred the revision of county and municipal comprehensive land-use plans.<sup>51</sup>

In 1992, the Home Rule Charter was amended and King County and the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro), a special use district government dealing with transit and sewage, consolidated. This was a critical move for the county that coincided with major restructuring of King County government. It also marked the addition of regional responsibilities, even though property tax revenues were dwindling with each incorporation. The merged government became fully operational in January 1996. The reorganization had been triggered by the loss of county jurisdiction over those parts of the county that either incorporated or annexed to nearby cities. By the mid-1990s, King County had become the largest government agency in the region, surpassing the city of Seattle for the first time.

At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, King County continues to be deeply involved with an array of ongoing issues that stimulate considerable public debate. These include the funding and location of water systems, freeways, public transit, airports, sport stadiums, parks, solid waste, and impacts on the natural environmental and quality of life.<sup>52</sup> As it has been from its earliest days, the history of King County is interwoven with the local cities, the Puget Sound region, and the state.

**Dr. Kay Reinartz is a Seattle-based historian who specializes in the history of the Pacific Northwest and its communities. Her published works include *Passport to Ballard*; *Queen Anne: Community on the Hill*; and *Tukwila, Community at the Crossroads*.**

## King County Government Historical Context References

- Bagley, Charles B. *History of Washington, vol. 1*. Seattle, WA: SJ Clarke Publishing Co., 1929.
- Bender, Charles W. "A Report on Politics in Seattle." Cambridge, MA: Edward C. Banfield Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, 1961. (Typewritten.)
- Brewster, David R. and David M. Buerge. *Washingtonians, A Biographical Portrait of the State*. Seattle, WA: Sasquach Books, 1988.
- Bureau of Governmental Research. "Structure of King County Government." Report No. 49, Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Washington, Seattle, WA: August 1, 1941. (Typewritten.)
- Dodds, Gordon B. *The American Northwest, A History of Oregon and Washington*. Arlington Heights, Ill: The Forum Press, Inc. 1986.
- King County Freeholder Commission. "The Proposed Charter for King County." Seattle, WA: 1952. (Typewritten.) Located in the King County Archives, Charter Documents
- "King County Regional Governance Summit- Report To The Public." King County Suburban Cities Association, Seattle, WA: March 27, 1991. (Typewritten.) Located in the Seattle Public Library.
- King County Suburban Cities Association. "King County Regional Governance Summit- Report to the Public." King County Suburban Cities Association, Seattle, WA: August 1992. (Typewritten.) Located in the Seattle Public Library.
- Laufer, Harold, comp. *Fifth Annual Report of the County Road Engineer*. King County, State of Washington. Seattle, WA: American Printing & Lithographing Co., 1939.
- League of Women Voters of King County. "King County Governance . . . Under the 1993 Charter (Amendments)" Seattle, WA, December 1996. (Typewritten.)
- Municipal League of King County, King County Governance Reform: A Report." Municipal League of King County, Seattle, WA: 1991. (Typewritten.) Located in the Seattle Public Library.
- Landmarks and Heritage Program, King County Office of Cultural Resources. "Real Estate Promotion and Developers." Draft copy. (Typewritten.) n.d.
- Payton, Charles. "Overview of King County History." Historical Paper No. 3. Seattle, WA: Landmarks and Heritage Program, King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.

- Payton, Charles. "Incorporations in King County." Historical Paper No. 2. Seattle, WA: Landmarks and Heritage Program, King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.
- Payton, Charles. Telephone conversation with K. Reinartz, April 29, 2002.
- Puget Sound Council of Governments. "Congestion Management System: Baseline System Performance Report," May 1998. (Typewritten.) Located in the Seattle Public Library.
- Pollard, Lancaster. "The Pacific Northwest," In *Regionalism in America*, ed. Merrill Jensen. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1954.
- Reinartz, Kay F. *Passport to Ballard*, Seattle, WA: Ballard News Tribune, 1988.
- Reinartz, Kay F. *Queen Anne: Community of the Hill*, Seattle, WA: Queen Anne Historical Society, 1993.
- Reinartz, Kay F. *Tukwila, Community the Crossroads*, Tukwila, WA: City of Tukwila, 1991.
- Ritter, John. Seattle Police Department, Seattle, Washington. Interview, April 16, 2002.
- "The Proposed Charter for King County." Seattle Post Intelligencer, May 27, 1976.
- Seattle Times, March 15, 1981.
- U.S. Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, Census of Population: 1950, Census Tract Statistics Seattle Washington and Adjacent Area Bulletin P-D51. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1952.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940. Population, vol. I: Number of Inhabitants. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1942.
- US Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, Census of Population: 1960, vol. 1 Characteristics of the Population Part 49 Washington. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- Washington State Association of Counties Yearbook, 1953
- Washington State Local Governance Study Commission. "A History of Washington's Local Governments" Vol.1. Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission. Institute for Public Policy. Olympia, WA: January 1988.
- Washington State Local Governance Study Commission. "The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington" Vol. II Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission. Institute for Public Policy. Olympia, WA: January 1988





## Endnotes

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Gordon B. Dodds, *The American Northwest, A History of Oregon and Washington*, (Arlington Heights, Ill: The Forum Press, 1986), 89-92.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>3</sup> Harold Laufer, comp. *Fifth Annual Report of the County Road Engineer*. King County, State of Washington. (Seattle, WA: American Printing & Lithographing Co., 1939), 18.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>5</sup> Harold Laufer, comp. *Fifth Annual Report of the County Road Engineer*. King County, State of Washington. (Seattle, WA: American Printing & Lithographing Co., 1939), 52.
- <sup>6</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 12; Lancaster, Pollard, “*The Pacific Northwest*” In *Regionalism in America*, ed. Merrill Jensen. (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1954) 26-38.
- <sup>7</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 12
- <sup>8</sup> Harold Laufer, comp. *Fifth Annual Report of the County Road Engineer*. King County, State of Washington. (Seattle, WA: American Printing & Lithographing Co., 1939), p. 18, 19.
- <sup>9</sup> Harold Laufer, comp. *Fifth Annual Report of the County Road Engineer*. King County, State of Washington. (Seattle, WA: American Printing & Lithographing Co., 1939), p. 19.
- <sup>10</sup> Charles, Payton, “*Incorporations in King County*,” Historical Paper No. 2, Seattle, WA, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.), 6)
- <sup>11</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 1.
- <sup>12</sup> Washington State Association of Counties Yearbook, 1953, 92.
- <sup>13</sup> Kay F. Reinartz, *Queen Anne*, (Seattle, WA: Queen Anne Historical Society, 1993) 41, 86-87; Kay F. Reinartz, *Passport to Ballard* (Seattle, WA: Ballard News Tribune, 1988), 45-55
- <sup>14</sup> Kay F. Reinartz, *Passport to Ballard* (Seattle, WA: Ballard News Tribune, 1988), 53-55.
- <sup>15</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 10.
- <sup>16</sup> Clarence B. Bagley, *History of Washington, vol. 1* (Seattle, WA: SJ Clarke Publishing Co., 1929), 341-350.
- <sup>17</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 7, 10.
- <sup>18</sup> Seattle Times, March 15, 1981. F-10
- <sup>19</sup> Kay F. Reinartz, *Passport to Ballard* (Seattle, WA: Ballard News Tribune, 1988), 132-147.
- <sup>20</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 10, 11.
- <sup>21</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 7.
- <sup>22</sup> “*Real Estate Promotion and Developers*,” Draft Paper, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.)
- <sup>23</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, “*The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington*” Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 12-13.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid.

- <sup>26</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 16.
- <sup>27</sup> Charles, Payton, “Incorporations in King County,” Historical Paper No. 2, Seattle, WA, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.), 1-2)
- <sup>28</sup> Kay F. Reinartz, *Tukwila, Community the Crossroads* (Tukwila, WA: City of Tukwila, 1991), 89-96.
- <sup>29</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 3.
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20)
- <sup>32</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988).
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24
- <sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p.24-46
- <sup>35</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940. Population, vol. I: Number of Inhabitants (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1942), 1126-1127; U.S. Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, Census of Population: 1950, Census Tract Statistics Seattle Washington and Adjacent Area Bulletin P-D51 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1952), 13, 15; US Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, Census of Population: 1960, vol. 1 Characteristics of the Population Part 49 Washington (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), 49-10, 49-11, 49-16, 49-17
- <sup>36</sup> Charles W. Bender, *“A Report on Politics in Seattle,”* (Cambridge, MA: Edward C. Banfield Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, 1961) (Typewritten.) I-1-2
- <sup>37</sup> Charles, Payton, "Incorporations in King County," Historical Paper No. 2, Seattle, WA, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.) 2-3.
- <sup>38</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 22-25
- <sup>39</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 29-31
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>41</sup> . (PI, 1976)
- <sup>42</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 25-33.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 32-35
- <sup>44</sup> Charles, Payton, “Overview of King County History,” Historical Paper No. 3, Seattle, WA, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.). p. 19)
- <sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*: “King County Governance . . . Under the 1993 Charter (Amendments), S-3-16)
- <sup>46</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. I Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 35-37.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4
- <sup>48</sup> Charles, Payton, *“Overview of King County History,”* Historical Paper No. 3, Seattle, WA, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.), 20-22.
- <sup>49</sup> Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, *“The Quiet Crisis of Local Governance in Washington”* Vol. II Final Report of the Washington State Local Governance Study Commission, Institute for Public Policy. (Olympia, WA: January 1988), 2.
- <sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>51</sup> Charles, Payton, "*Incorporations in King County*," Historical Paper No. 2, Seattle, WA, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.) 4.

<sup>52</sup> Charles, Payton, "*Overview of King County History*," Historical Paper No. 3, Seattle, WA, King County Office of Cultural Resources (Seattle, WA: King County Office of Cultural Resources, N.D.) 21-22.