



## King County

### Charter Review Commission

#### Agenda

January 23, 2019  
5:30-8:30 p.m.

King County Chinook Building  
1st Floor Conference Rooms 121/123  
401 5th Ave. Seattle, WA 98104

- |   |  |            |
|---|--|------------|
| 1. Welcome  | Co-Chairs  | 5 minutes  |
| 2. Public Comment                                       | Co-Chairs  | As needed  |
| 3. Separately Elected Comments:                         |  | 90 minutes |
| • Anita Khandelwal, Director of Public Defense          |  |            |
| • Mitzi Johanknecht, Sheriff                            |  |            |
| • Kathy Lambert, Councilmember                          |  |            |
| • Joe McDermott, Councilmember (possible)               |  |            |
| • John Arthur Wilson, Assessor                          |  |            |
| • Julie Wise, Director of Elections                     |  |            |
| 4. Executive Personnel Proposals                        | Rick Hayes, Sr<br>HR Policy Advisor                | 30 minutes |
|   | Susie Slonecker, Sr<br>Deputy Prosecuting Attorney |            |
| 5. Staff Update:  | County Staff                                       | 15 minutes |
| • Update on Procurement                                 |  |            |
| • Handout for Evening Meetings                          |  |            |
| • Structure of Evening Meetings                         |  |            |
| 6. Review and Discussion:                               | Co Chairs  | 15 minutes |
| • Authorization to hold a second meeting<br>In February | County Staff                                       |            |
| • Possible distribution of white paper(s)               |  |            |
| 7. Other Business                                       | Co-Chairs  | 5 minutes  |
| 8. Adjourn  |  |            |

[Blank Page]

Personnel			Move Forward?			Additional Analysis?	
Charter Section:	Recommended By:	Comments/Additional Information	Yes	Continued	No	Yes	No
<b>Article 2</b>							
220.2	Executive Constantine	1. Clarify Charter's reference to Council's power to set compensation includes all pay items, including medical and leave benefits including Prosecutor's Office and Courts.					
<b>Article 3</b>							
340.4	Executive Constantine	1. Require Council confirmation only for department heads and chief administrative officer only					
350.20.40	Executive Constantine	1. Clarify what employees are classified as career service.					
350.20.60	Executive Constantine	1. Uniform language to clarify which departments are Executive branch departments and subject to career service rules (Sheriff and Department of Public Defense)					
<b>Article 5</b>							
530	Executive Constantine	1. Clarify personnel rules apply to Executive branch employees					
550	Executive Constantine	1. Expand classifications exempt from career to include division and section heads. 2. Allow Council to designate additional career service exemptions.					
<b>Article 8</b>							
NEW SECTION 890.1	Councilmember Lambert	1. Prior to commencing of negotiations with represented employees, the Executive shall work with the Council on more specific and timely general paramets and goals					

[Blank Page]



**King County**

**Metropolitan King County Council  
Charter Review Commission**

**STAFF REPORT**

<b>Agenda Item:</b>		<b>Name:</b>	Brandi Vena
<b>Proposed No.:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	January 9, 2019

**SUBJECT**

Ranked Choice Voting.

**BACKGROUND**

Ranked choice voting (RCV) is a system of voting that allows voters to rank all candidates for a single office in order of preference. If a candidate receives over 50 percent of the first choice preferences, that candidate will be declared the winner. If no one candidate receives over 50 percent of the first choice preferences, the candidate with the fewest first choice preferences is eliminated and voters who liked that candidate the best have their ballots instantly counted for their second choice preference. This process repeats and last-place candidates lose until one candidate reaches a majority and wins<sup>1</sup>.

When RCV is used to elect one candidate (instead of multiple candidates in a multi-member district) the result is similar to traditional runoff elections and, in those cases, the terms RCV and instant run-off voting are used interchangeably<sup>2</sup>. Because the analysis below pertains to elections for which only one candidate ultimately prevails the terms are comprehended interchangeably.

**SUMMARY**

***Where is it in use?***

Jurisdictions currently using RCV in primary and general elections include the following:

- Basalt, Colorado: Adopted in 2002 and will be used when three or more candidates run for mayor.
- Berkeley, California: Adopted in 2004 and has been used since 2010 to elect the mayor, city council and city auditor.

<sup>1</sup> URLs: [www.fairvote.org](http://www.fairvote.org); [www.rcvmaine.com](http://www.rcvmaine.com)

<sup>2</sup> URL: <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/alternative-voting-systems.aspx>

- Cambridge, Massachusetts: In use since the 1940s in multi-winner RCV form for the nine seat city council and six seat school board elected citywide. Multi-winner means the voting structure was used in a multi-member district. All nine seats for the city council in Cambridge are at-large positions.
- Carbondale, Colorado: Adopted in 2002 for mayor when there are three or more candidates.
- Minneapolis, Minnesota: Adopted in 2006 and used since 2009 in elections for 22 city offices, including mayor and city council in single winner elections and some multi-winner park board seats.
- Oakland, California: Adopted in 2006 and used since 2010 for a total of 18 city offices, including mayor and city council.
- Portland, Maine: Adopted in 2010 and first used in 2011 and 2015 for electing mayor.
- Maine: Adopted in 2016 and first used in June 2018 for all state and federal primary elections.
- San Francisco, California: Adopted in 2002 and used since 2004 to elect the mayor, city attorney, Board of Supervisors and five additional citywide offices.
- San Leandro, California: Adopted as an option in a 2000 charter amendment and used since 2010 to elect the mayor and city council.
- Santa Fe, New Mexico: Adopted in 2008 and used since March 2018 for mayor, city council, and municipal judge.
- St. Paul, Minnesota: Adopted in 2009 and used since 2011 to elect the mayor and city council.
- Takoma Park, Maryland: Adopted in 2006 and used since 2007 in all elections for mayor and city council.
- Telluride, Colorado: Adopted in 2008 and used since 2011 to elect the mayor when three candidates run, as in 2011 and 2015.

The following jurisdictions have adopted RCV and are awaiting implementation:

- Amherst, Massachusetts: Adopted in charter in 2018 with projected first use in 2021.
- Benton County, Oregon: Adopted by voters in 2016 for elected county offices including sheriff and county commissioner. It will be used in 2020.
- Las Cruces, New Mexico: Adopted by the city council in 2018 for all municipal elections beginning in 2019.
- St. Louis Park, Minnesota: Adopted in 2018 for municipal offices including mayor and city council. It will be used in 2019.
- Memphis, Tennessee: Adopted by voters in 2008 and approved again by voters in 2018. It will be used in 2019.

Jurisdictions using RCV for runoffs include:

- Arkansas: Adopted in 2005, first used 2006, and was extended to all local runoffs in 2007.

- Alabama: By agreement with a federal court, used in special election for U.S. House, 2013; became law for all federal primary runoffs in 2015.
- Louisiana: Adopted and used since the 1990s for state and federal general election runoffs; also includes out of state military voters.
- Mississippi: Adopted in 2014 for use in federal runoffs.
- South Carolina: Adopted and first used in 2006 for state and federal runoffs.
- Springfield, Illinois: Adopted in 2007 and used since 2011.

Finally, the following jurisdictions have adopted the voting structure as options but are awaiting implementation or other contingent measures before its use:

- Davis, California: Adopted in 2006 as an advisory referendum for fair representation form of RCV and awaiting state law change.
- Ferndale, Michigan: Adopted by voters in 2004, awaiting implementation readiness.
- Santa Clara County, California: Approved in charter by voters as option in 1998.
- Sarasota, Florida: Adopted by voters in 2007, awaiting implementation readiness.
- Utah: Several cities in 2018 acted to make RCV an option in 2019.
- Vancouver, Washington: Approved in charter by voters as an option in 1999, but it is not required to be used<sup>3</sup>. It is currently still an option under the city charter.

### ***Is there an impact on underrepresented populations?***

A 2016 study which analyzed the candidates running for office after the implementation of RCV in the cities of San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, and San Leandro, California found that the voting structure increased “descriptive representation for women, people of color, and women of color<sup>4</sup>.” Descriptive representation is the idea that a body of elected representatives should reflect the outward characteristics, such as such as occupation, race, ethnicity, or gender, of the populations they represent.

The study analyzed races in 11 California cities for various city-wide elected positions between 1995 and 2014, including the four California cities that implemented RCV and seven cities that did not implement the new structure but were similar in population size, racial makeup, and income. The seven non-RCV cities were Alameda, Anaheim, Richmond, San Jose, Santa Ana, Santa Clara, and Stockton, California<sup>5</sup>. The study measured the percentage of candidates who were women, people of color, and women of color as well as the percentage of winners who identified with those categories.

In a section of the study that did not control for differing characteristics of the cities, such as gender and racial demographics, median household income, education levels, partisanship, and others, researchers found the following:

---

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.fairvote.org/rcv#where\\_is\\_ranked\\_choice\\_voting\\_used](https://www.fairvote.org/rcv#where_is_ranked_choice_voting_used)

<sup>4</sup> Sarah John, Haley Smith, and Elizabeth Zack, *The Impact of Ranked Choice Voting on Representation: How Ranked Choice Voting Affects Women and People of Color Candidates in California*, 1 (July 2016), available at <https://fairvote.app.box.com/v/RCV-Representation-BayArea>

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, at 17.

- Although the percentage of female candidates running for election declined slightly after the implementation of RCV in the cities that had adopted it, the overall percentage of female candidates running for election was higher and declined less in those cities versus non-RCV cities;
- The percentage of candidates of color for elective office increased by five percentage points, and the percentage of female candidates of color increased by three percentage points, once RCV was implemented;
- The percentage of elective offices won by women increased slightly after implementation of RCV, while the percentage of elective offices won by women decreased over the same time period in cities that did not implement RCV; and
- The percentage of people of color winning elective office increased more than 18 points after implementation of RCV while the increase was three points over the same time period in cities that did not implement RCV<sup>6</sup>.

These findings were more pronounced for open seat races than in races where an incumbent ran.

In a section of the study that did control for the above-mentioned differing characteristics of the cities researchers found:

- Over time, there was a 26 percent increase in the probability of women being elected to office in cities that had adopted RCV and a 28 percent decrease in probability of the same outcome in non-RCV cities;
- Over time, the predicted probability of a woman of color being elected to office remained at 21 percent in RCV cities but declined from 19 percent to six percent in non-RCV cities; and
- There was a 5 percentage point increase in the percentage of female candidates of color running for office in RCV cities<sup>7</sup>.

### ***Is it legally allowable in Washington State?***

Under the King County charter, “the nominating primaries and elections for the offices of King County executive, King County assessor, King County council and King County prosecuting attorney shall be conducted in accordance with general law governing the election of nonpartisan county officers.<sup>8</sup>”

Washington State law requires that primaries be held prior to a general election for partisan offices. Primaries can also be held for non-partisan offices except where two

---

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, 18-22

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*, 23-24

<sup>8</sup> [Section 610 of the King County Charter](#)



or fewer candidates have filed for the position<sup>9</sup>. In the primary, the names of all candidates that file for office generally will appear on the primary ballot, with the top two candidates advancing to the general election<sup>10</sup>.

State law does not prohibit the implementation of RCV by counties; in 2006 Pierce County voters approved an amendment to the county charter authorizing RCV and the measure was subsequently implemented in the 2008 and 2009 general elections for county officers. The authorization was later repealed by the voters in 2009<sup>11</sup>. Additionally, City of Seattle voters could see a charter amendment on the ballot related to the adoption of RCV in 2019<sup>12</sup>.

Two bills were introduced during the 2018 state legislative session that would have expanded the use of RCV in the state. House Bill 2746 and Senate Bill 6402 would have allowed local jurisdictions to eliminate the primary for any partisan or nonpartisan single or multiple position office and would have allowed the governing body of a local jurisdiction to authorize a proportional voting system for any office with multiple positions<sup>13</sup>. Neither bill ultimately advanced through the legislative process.

---

<sup>9</sup> [RCW 29A.52](#)

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> Dee Anne Finken, Clark County proponents say 'yea' to ranked-choice voting, The Columbian, December 2, 2018, <https://www.columbian.com/news/2018/dec/02/clark-county-proponents-say-yea-to-ranked-choice-voting/>

<sup>12</sup> Daniel Person, Effort Afoot to Bring Ranked-Choice Voting to Seattle, Seattle Weekly, September 21, 2017, <http://www.seattleweekly.com/news/effort-afoot-to-bring-ranked-choice-voting-to-seattle/>

<sup>13</sup> URL: <http://lawfilesexxt.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2017-18/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/2746%20HBA%20SEIT%2018.pdf>

and URL: <http://lawfilesexxt.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2017-18/Pdf/Digests/Senate/6402.DIG.pdf>

[Blank Page]



**King County**

**Metropolitan King County Council  
Charter Review Commission**

**STAFF REPORT**

<b>Agenda Item:</b>		<b>Name:</b>	Brandi Vena
<b>Proposed No.:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	January 9, 2019

**SUBJECT**

Public Financing of Campaigns.

**BACKGROUND**

In November 2015 Seattle voters approved Initiative 122 which enacted campaign finance reforms and created the Democracy Voucher Program. This program was the first of its kind in the United States<sup>1</sup>. Since that time other municipalities have researched the viability of implementing similar programs in their jurisdictions, however no other municipality has yet done so. There are, however, 27 public financing programs for electoral campaigns currently in use across the country by states, counties, and cities that vary in scope and structure. Types of programs used are tax credits or refunds, grant programs providing lump sums from a public fund, and small-donor matching programs. The City of Seattle’s voucher program is included as a program in the list<sup>2</sup>.

In 2017 two property owners brought a lawsuit against the city claiming the voucher program violated their constitutional rights to free speech by forcing them to support candidates they didn’t like via their tax payments. King County Superior Court initially found against the petitioners but, after they appealed the ruling, the Washington State Court of Appeals sent the issue straight to the Washington State Supreme Court. That court agreed to the review the case and the results are pending<sup>3</sup>.

**SUMMARY**

***Program Structure:***

---

<sup>1</sup> URL: <https://www.seattle.gov/democracymv/about-the-program>

<sup>2</sup> *Public Funding for Electoral Campaigns: How 27 States, Counties, and Municipalities Empower Small Donors and Curb the Power of Big Money in Politics*, 1-2, 2017, available at [https://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/Public\\_Financing\\_Factsheet\\_FA\[5\].pdf](https://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/Public_Financing_Factsheet_FA[5].pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Daniel Beekman, *Washington’s Supreme Court agrees to review case against Seattle’s ‘democracy vouchers,’* The Seattle Times, December 21, 2018, available at <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/politics/washingtons-supreme-court-agrees-to-review-case-against-seattles-democracy-vouchers/>

Under the program instituted by the City of Seattle, the city sends paper vouchers to Seattle voters in odd-numbered years when city candidates appear on the ballot<sup>4</sup>. Seattle residents can assign each voucher, of which there are four and each worth \$25, to any participating City Council candidate, including candidates within or outside their respective council districts. Residents assign vouchers by writing in the eligible candidates' name, the date the voucher was assigned, and signing the voucher<sup>5</sup>. The city automatically mails the vouchers to registered voters, but any City of Seattle resident can use them; if a resident is not registered to vote he or she can apply to receive the vouchers<sup>6</sup>.

Candidates who wish to receive funds through the program must go through a qualifying process which entails collecting at least 150 qualifying contributions of at least \$10 each, as well as signatures from Seattle residents, 75 of which must come from the candidate's district. They must also sign a pledge agreeing to adhere to program rules which include campaign spending limits and a requirement to participate in at least three public debates or similar events, among others<sup>7</sup>.

### ***Use of the program:***

The University of Washington Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology did a study assessing the impact of Seattle's Democracy Voucher Program. The study found that the number of Seattle residents participating campaign contributions increased after implementation of the Democracy Voucher Program, but that historically underrepresented groups were less likely to participate<sup>8</sup>. Specifically, the study found:

- 20,727 Seattle residents used their democracy vouchers to donate to a candidate in 2017;
- Older residents in Seattle were three times more likely to participate than younger residents. More than 6 percent of Seattle residents over the age of 60 returned their vouchers, but only 2 percent of residents between the ages of 18-29 did so;
- More than 4 percent of white Seattle residents returned their vouchers but only 2.4 percent of black residents participated;
- More than 5 percent of individuals with an annual income above \$75,000 participated in the Democracy Voucher program, but only about 2 percent of individuals with an annual income below \$30,000 participated in the program; and

---

<sup>4</sup> *Democracy Voucher Program Biennial Report 2017*, 8, available at [http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/EthicsElections/DemocracyVoucher/Final%20-%20Biennial%20report%20-%202003\\_15\\_2018.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/EthicsElections/DemocracyVoucher/Final%20-%20Biennial%20report%20-%202003_15_2018.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> URL: <http://www.seattle.gov/democracymv/about-the-program>

<sup>6</sup> *Democracy Voucher Program Biennial Report 2017*, 8.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*, 18-19.

<sup>8</sup> Jennifer Heerwig and Brian J. McCabe, *Expanding Participation in Municipal Elections: Assessing the Impact of Seattle's Democracy Voucher Program*, April 2018, available at <https://csde.washington.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Seattle-Voucher-4.03.pdf>

- Citizens who were already engaged in the political system by regularly voting in general elections were much more likely to return their vouchers than those who voted infrequently or not at all<sup>9</sup>.

When comparing voucher users to cash donors, the study found:

- 36 percent of voucher users were 60 years old or older compared to slightly more than 33 percent of cash donors;
- A slightly higher percentage of donors under the age of 30 participated in the voucher program than participated in the pool of cash donors;
- White residents comprise a disproportionate share of both voucher users and cash contributors. While 79 percent of registered voters in Seattle are white, whites comprise 86 percent of participants in the Democracy Voucher program and 87 percent of cash contributors;
- Individuals with an income of \$100,000 or more make up 24 percent of cash donors, but they comprise only 16 percent of voucher users. On the other hand, only 4 percent of voucher users – and 2 percent of cash donors – have an income below \$30,000; and
- Voucher users were slightly more likely to come from poor neighborhoods – and slightly less likely to come from wealthy ones – than cash donors<sup>10</sup>.

***Fiscal range of the program:***

When City of Seattle voters approved the program in 2015 they also approved a property tax of \$3 million per year to fund the program for 10 years. The tax is levied on commercial, business, and residential properties. The average homeowner pays \$8.00 per year<sup>11</sup>. Implementation and administration of the program cost the city approximately \$1.6 million for the following items:

- Translating 21 pages of materials into 15 languages;
- Fielding calls to a Democracy Voucher Hotline;
- Purchasing advertisements on social media to disseminate information to Seattle residents;
- Technology related to voucher tracking;
- Printing and mailing of more than 500,000 voucher packets;
- Office construction for increase in staffing and space needs related to the program; and

---

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> URL: <https://www.seattle.gov/democracyvoucher/about-the-program>

- Two-year staffing costs for the program<sup>12</sup>.

The Charter Review Commission for the City of Austin in Texas, which is considering implementing a similar voucher program, estimates that launching the program there will cost \$400,000 and \$1.55 million annually for voucher and administrative costs<sup>13</sup>.

There are many different ways to estimate the fiscal cost of the program and much of that depends upon the staffing of the program itself and the limits available to each candidate. In the 2015 County Council election cycle the average spent by the 4 winning candidates was \$115k. The most expensive election was the 6<sup>th</sup> Council district where the two candidate campaigns spent a combined \$555k. In the 2017 election cycle, the average spent by the five winning candidates was \$105,000. The most expensive race 1<sup>st</sup> Council district with \$184k spent. The most expensive race with two candidates was the 3<sup>rd</sup> Council district with a combined \$117k spent by the two candidates. These amounts do not include independent expenditures.

All of that being said, if a public financing program were to have a maximum public contribution of \$100,000 per candidate and each position fielded three candidates who took the maximum, the program expenditures to candidate campaigns would be \$2.7 million per four year Council cycle. This does not include administrative costs, but an estimate of \$1 million to \$1.5 million per year for the program does not seem unrealistic. If you were to include countywide races like the Executive, Assessor, Elections Director, Sheriff or Prosecuting Attorney, the costs would likely escalate very quickly as the expensive of a countywide race could be much higher. As a point of reference, the winning candidate in the last two County Executive races spent \$977k and \$1.6m in 2013 and 2017 respectively.

### ***Similar programs in other jurisdictions:***

The City of Austin, Texas charter review commission has recommended implementation of a program based on the City of Seattle program in time for 2022 elections. The city council will take up issue in 2019<sup>14</sup>. Commissioners representing Bernalillo County, New Mexico voted against allowing the question of implementing “democracy dollars” to go on the November general election ballot in 2018<sup>15</sup>.

On the federal level, Congressional Democrats have introduced legislation that would create a pilot voucher program and select up to three states to participate in the pilot. The pilot program would allow a resident of a pilot state to request a \$25 voucher from the state which the resident could then allocate to candidates in \$5 increments<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Democracy Voucher Program Biennial Report 2017*, 9-12.

<sup>13</sup> Emma Feer, *Austin weighs \$1.5 million Democracy Dollars voucher program*, Community Impact Newspaper, October 24, 2018, available at <https://communityimpact.com/austin/central-austin/economic-development/2018/10/24/austin-weighs-1-5-million-democracy-dollars-voucher-program/>

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> Steve Knight, *BernCo again denies Democracy Dollars initiative*, Albuquerque Journal, August 21, 2018, available at <https://www.abqjournal.com/1211663/bernco-commission-denies-democracy-dollars-initiative-for-second-time.html>

<sup>16</sup> H.R. 1, §§ 5001 – 5104, available at [https://democracyreform-sarbanes.house.gov/sites/democracyreformtaskforce.house.gov/files/HR%201\\_TheForthePeopleAct\\_FINAL.pdf](https://democracyreform-sarbanes.house.gov/sites/democracyreformtaskforce.house.gov/files/HR%201_TheForthePeopleAct_FINAL.pdf)



**King County**

**Metropolitan King County Council  
Charter Review Commission**

**STAFF REPORT**

<b>Agenda Item:</b>		<b>Name:</b>	Brandi Vena
<b>Proposed No.:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	January 15, 2019

**SUBJECT**

Government Structure in the 20 Most Populous United States Counties.

**BACKGROUND**

King County Council is currently the thirteenth most populous county in the United States with just over 2.1 million residents<sup>1</sup>. The county has an elected executive and a nine-member council elected from single-member districts. Each district represents approximately 240,000 residents. Councilmembers are elected to four-year terms.

In 1992 voters approved a charter amendment to increase the size of the council from nine to 13. In the 2004 general election voters approved a county charter amendment introduced via citizen initiative to reduce the size of the council from 13 to nine<sup>2</sup> the size at which it remains today.

There are several counties across the United States with larger or similar populations to King County with a wide variety of representative governance structures. Below is a summary of the structures for the top 20 (excluding King County) most populous counties in the United States.

**SUMMARY**

***California:***

All counties in California have five-member boards of supervisors as was set out by the state legislature in 1852. Los Angeles County has a population of 9.8 million. Each supervisor represents more than two million people. There is no executive branch; the board appoints a Chief Executive Officer for the county<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/kingcountywashington,miamidadecountyflorida,US/PST045218>

<sup>2</sup> URL: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/independent/charter-review-commission/about/history.aspx>

<sup>3</sup> URL: <http://www.lacounty.gov/government/supervisors/>

San Diego County has a population of 3.3 million<sup>4</sup>. The county government is composed of the elected five-member Board of Supervisors which operates in a legislative, executive, and quasi-judicial capacity and who each represent approximately 660,000 people. The board appoints a Chief Administrative Officer for the county<sup>5</sup>.

Orange, Riverside, San Bernadino, and Santa Clara counties all have the same structure as San Diego and Los Angeles counties. These four counties have populations of between 1.7 and 3 million with each district representing between 340,000 and 600,000 people.

**Illinois:**

Cook County has a population of 5.2 million<sup>6</sup>. The Cook County Board of Commissioners is the legislative body of county government. The board is comprised of 17 Commissioners, each serving a four-year term and elected from single member districts. Each district represents approximately 300,000 residents<sup>7</sup>. The County Board President is the county's chief executive officer. The president directly supervises county departments. The president is elected to a four-year term by the voters of the entire county<sup>8</sup>.

**Texas:**

Harris County has a population of 4.6 million<sup>9</sup>. Counties in Texas are governed by a commissioners court which has five members: the county judge, who is separately elected and acts as the chief executive officer of the county, and four commissioners elected from single-member precincts. Each commissioner represents over one million people. The commissioners have no term limits<sup>10</sup>.

Dallas County, with a population of 2.6 million, Tarrant County, with an estimated population of 2 million in 2018, and Bexar County, with an estimated population of 1.9 million<sup>11</sup>, all have the same structure as Harris County because it is established in state law. Commissioners in those counties represent between 475,000 and 650,000 people.

**Arizona:**

Maricopa County has an estimated population of 4.3 million<sup>12</sup>. The County Board of Supervisors is comprised of five members who are elected to single member districts. Each district represents approximately 820,000 people. The positions do not have term limits. It has a strong-council governance structure with a county manager handling county administration and who is appointed by the board<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sandiegocountycalifornia,US/PST045218>

<sup>5</sup> URL: <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/home.html>

<sup>6</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/cookcountyillinois,US/PST045218>

<sup>7</sup> URL: <https://www.cookcountyil.gov/content/about-cook-county>

<sup>8</sup> URL: <https://www.cookcountyil.gov/agency/office-president-0>

<sup>9</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/harriscountytexas,US/PST045218>

<sup>10</sup> URL: Katharine Shilcutt, *So, What Exactly Is the Harris County Commissioners Court?*, Houstonia, March 31, 2016, available at <https://www.houstoniamag.com/articles/2016/3/31/peoples-court-harris-country-commissioners-court-april-2016>

<sup>11</sup> URL:

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/bexarcountytexas,tarrantcountytexas,dallascountytexas,US/PST045218>

<sup>12</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/maricopacountyarizona,US/PST045218>

<sup>13</sup> URL: <https://www.maricopa.gov/3598/About-Maricopa-County>



**Florida:**

Miami-Dade County has a population of 2.75 million as of a 2017 census report<sup>14</sup>. The Board of County Commissioners is the legislative body, consisting of 13 members elected from single-member districts. Each district represents just over 200,000 people. The Mayor of Miami-Dade County is elected countywide to serve a four-year term and is considered a "strong mayor"<sup>15</sup>.

Broward County has a 2017 estimated population of 1.9 million<sup>16</sup>. The Board of County Commissioners is composed of nine members elected by district. Each district represents just over 200,000 people. Each year the Commission elects a mayor and vice mayor and appoints the County Administrator, County Attorney, and County Auditor<sup>17</sup>.

**New York:**

Kings County has a population of 2.6 million estimated in 2017<sup>18</sup>. The county is coterminous with the borough of Brooklyn and was consolidated with New York City in 1898. As part of the consolidation, all town and county governments within the city were dissolved, and their powers were given to the city and the boroughs. All five boroughs of New York City are coterminous with their respective counties. Brooklyn has a borough president who generally acts as an advocate for the borough to mayoral agencies and the city council<sup>19</sup>. The borough also has 16 out of 51 of the seats on the New York City Council<sup>20</sup>. Each member from this borough represents approximately 162,000 people.

Queens County has a population of 2.3 million in 2017<sup>21</sup>. It has the same structure as Kings County, but is coterminous with the borough of Queens and has 12 out of 51 seats on the New York City Council<sup>22</sup>. New York County is coterminous with the borough of Manhattan and has a population of 1.67 million; it has 10 out of 51 seats on the New York City Council<sup>23</sup>. The councilmembers for these boroughs each represent between 167,000 and 191,000 people.

**Nevada:**

Clark County has an estimated population of 2.2 million<sup>24</sup>. The county is run by the Clark County Commission which consists of seven members who are elected to serve staggered four-year terms. A county manager hired by the commission handles day-to-day operations<sup>25</sup>. Commissioners each represent approximately 314,000 people.

---

<sup>14</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/miamidadecountyflorida,US/PST045218>

<sup>15</sup> URL: <https://www8.miamidade.gov/global/disclaimer/about-miami-dade-county.page>

<sup>16</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/browardcountyflorida>

<sup>17</sup> URL: <https://www.broward.org/Commission/Pages/default.aspx>

<sup>18</sup> URL: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/kingscountybrooklynboroughnewyork,US/PST045218>

<sup>19</sup> URL: <https://council.nyc.gov/about/>

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> URL: <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/planning/data-maps/nyc-population/current-future-populations.page>

<sup>22</sup> URL: <https://council.nyc.gov/about/>

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

<sup>24</sup> URL: <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>

<sup>25</sup> URL: <https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/county-commissioners/Pages/default.aspx>

**Michigan:**

Wayne County, with an estimated population of 1.7 million, and has an elected county executive as well as a 15-member county commission elected from single-member districts. Commissioners are elected every two years in even-year elections<sup>26</sup>. They each represent approximately 113,000 people.

**Summary Tables:**

County	Population (millions)	No. of Representatives (From most to fewest)
Cook County, IL	5.2	17
Kings County, NY	2.6	16
Wayne County, MI	1.7	15
Miami-Dade County, FL	2.75	13
Queens County, NY	2.3	12
New York County, NY	1.67	10
Broward County, FL	1.9	9
King County, WA	2.1	
Clark County, NV	2.2	7
Los Angeles County, CA	9.8	
San Diego County, CA	3.3	
Orange County, CA	3.0	
Riverside County, CA	2.2	5
San Bernadino County, CA	2.0	
Santa Clara County, CA	1.7	
Maricopa County, AZ	4.3	
Harris County, TX	4.6	
Dallas County, TX	2.6	4
Tarrant County, TX	2.0	
Bexar County, TX	1.9	

<sup>26</sup> URL: <https://www.waynecounty.com/elected/commission/home.aspx>

<b>County</b>	<b>No. of Representatives</b>	<b>Population (millions)</b>	<b>Population Represented by Each Representative (Ranked from most to fewest)</b>
Los Angeles County, CA	5	9.8	2 million
Harris County, TX	4	4.6	1 million +
Maricopa County, AZ	5	4.3	820,000
San Diego County, CA	5	3.3	660,000
Dallas County, TX	4	2.6	650,000
Orange County, CA	5	3.0	600,000
Tarrant County TX	4	2.0	500,000
Bexar County, TX	4	1.9	475,000
Riverside County, CA	5	2.2	440,000
San Bernadino County, CA	5	2.0	400,000
Santa Clara County, CA	5	1.7	340,000
Clark County, NV	7	2.2	314,000
Cook County, IL	17	5.2	300,000
King County, WA	9	2.1	240,000
Miami-Dade County, FL	13	2.8	211,000
Broward County, FL	9	1.9	211,000
Queens County, NY	12	2.3	191,000
New York County, NY	10	1.7	167,000
Kings County, NY	16	2.6	162,000
Wayne County, MI	15	1.7	113,000

[Blank Page]