

COUNCIL-MANAGER OR "STRONG MAYOR"

The Choice is Clear

Learn the Facts About Council-Manager Government

Everyone wants strong political leadership—neighborhoods, civic leaders, and the business community included. And today's complex communities cannot succeed without the guidance of effective mayors who provide a sense of direction and contribute to the smooth functioning of a local government.

But communities also need thoughtful, dedicated council members, who work with the mayor to establish appropriate policy, and competent, professional managers to carry out those policies. None of the three are mutually exclusive; they can and do work together today in many of the country's successful council-manager communities.

Today council-manager government is the fastest growing form of government in the United States; it frees up the elected body to establish policy, which is carried out by an appointed manager and an administrative staff. The manager is accountable to the entire council for the satisfactory implementation of council policy and the day-to-day administration of municipal affairs.

There are compelling reasons why many of the nation's most successful cities and towns have adopted council-manager government rather than the "strong-mayor" form. Council-manager government encourages neighborhood input into the political process, diffuses the power of special interests, and eliminates partisan politics from municipal hiring, firing, and contracting decisions.

People who take time to learn the facts about council-manager government are likely to join the ranks of those who favor this popular form. Consider the following when deciding which form of government is best for your community:

Neighborhoods Strengthen Their Voice

The council-manager form encourages open communication between citizens and their government. Under this form, each member of the governing body has an equal voice in policy development and administrative oversight. This gives neighborhoods and diverse groups a greater opportunity to influence policy.

Under the "strong mayor" form, political power is concentrated in the mayor, which means that other members of the elected body relinquish at least some of their policy-making power and influence. This loss of decision-making power among council members can have a chilling effect on the voices of neighborhoods and city residents.

The Power of Special Interests is Diffused

Under the council-manager form of government, involvement of the entire elected body ensures a more balanced approach to community decision making, so that all interests can be expressed and heard—not just those that are well funded. Under the “strong mayor” form, however, it’s easier for special interests to use money and political power to influence a single elected official, rather than having to secure a majority of the city council’s support for their agenda.

Merit-Based Decision Making Vs. Partisan Politics

Under council-manager government, qualifications and performance—and not skillful navigation of the political election process—are the criteria the elected body uses to select a professional manager. The professional manager, in turn, uses his or her education, experience, and training to select department heads and other key managers to oversee the efficient delivery of services. In this way, council-manager government maintains critical checks and balances to ensure accountability at city hall.

Functioning much like a business organization's chief executive officer, the appointed professional manager administers the daily operations of the community. Through a professional staff, the manager ensures the effective provision of services and enforces the policies adopted by the elected body. He or she, in turn, uses merit as the leading criterion for making all hiring and personnel decisions.

Appointed local government managers have no guaranteed term of office or tenure. They can be dismissed by the council at any time, for any reason. As a result, they constantly must respond to citizens and be dedicated to the highest ideals of honesty, integrity, and excellence in the management and delivery of public services.

Under the “strong mayor” form of government, the day-to-day management of community operations shifts to the mayor, who often lacks the appropriate training, education, and experience in municipal administration and finance to oversee the delivery of essential community services. Also, under the “strong mayor” form, the temptation is strong to make decisions regarding the hiring and firing of key department head positions—such as the police chief, public works director, and finance director—based on the applicant’s political support rather than his or her professional qualifications.

Many Successful Cities Use Council-Manager Government

Council-manager government works! It balances diverse interests, responds quickly to challenges, and brings the community together to resolve even the toughest issues.

Currently, more than 75.5 million Americans live in council-manager communities, and the system continues to flourish. This form of government is used by thousands of small, medium, and large jurisdictions, including San Antonio, Texas; San Diego, Sacramento, and San Jose, California; and Phoenix, Arizona. Consider these examples:

History Argues for the Council-Manager Form of Government

Approximately 90 years old, the council-manager form of government has proven its adaptability; today it is the most popular choice of structure among U.S. communities with populations of 2,500 or greater. During the past dozen years, for example, an average of 44 U.S. cities annually have adopted the council-manager form, while an average of only two per year have abandoned it.

Council-manager government, however, was not always an option. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, there was widespread corruption, graft, and nepotism among U.S. cities. The stories of New York City's Tammany Hall and Kansas City's Pendergrast machine are only two examples of the misuse of local government power during this time.

By the early 20th century, reformers were looking for ways to return control of municipal government to citizens. Those reformers advocated the council-manager structure of government to eliminate the corruption found in many cities. With its emphasis on professional training and accountability, the council-manager form of government was adopted by a number of cities in the 1920s and 1930s.

It took years to diffuse the power entrenched in turn-of-the-century city political machines and special interests. Today, however, citizens throughout the U.S. have resumed control by adopting or retaining council-manager government in their community and enjoying representative democracy at its best.

Prepared by the California City Management Foundation
1998

More Power More Authority
More Money More Special Interests
Greater Chance For Corruption

City of Davis historically has poor voter turnout. Just recently 10-12% of eligible voter population selected Mayor. Poor Eng. (early units) than a lowest

San Jose, California (pop. 835,500)

Long viewed as the "capital" of Silicon Valley, San Jose uses the council-manager form of government to successfully manage diverse interests in an environment of rapid residential and commercial growth.

Phoenix, Arizona (pop. 983,392)

In 1993, Phoenix captured the international Bartelsmann Award for being one of the two best managed cities in the world. Today, the city continues to maintain its reputation as a model U.S. community.

Boulder, Colorado (pop. 85,127)

One of the nation's most beautiful and environmentally conscious communities, the city of Boulder successfully balances environmental quality with a vibrant business climate.

Dayton, Ohio (182,044)

Dayton enhanced the process of involving citizens in community decision making by creating neighborhood-based priority boards to deal with key funding, service, and neighborhood issues.



NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

Strengthening & promoting cities as centers of opportunity, leadership and governance

November 19, 2005

About Cities : Forms of municipal government

The Constitution of the United States of America does not mention local governments. Local governments are created by and regulated by the states. This means that to speak about cities or other forms of local government in the United States is to speak about fifty different legal and political situations. The states outline the powers of municipal governments in charters.

Historically, there are four forms for municipal government in the United States:

- the mayor-council;
- council-manager;
- commission; and
- town meeting.

A recent survey determined that the predominant forms are:

- Council-Manager form of government with 58%
- Mayor-Council form of government with 38%
- Other form of government with 4% (Including the commission and town meeting)

Recent studies indicate that the distinctions between the mayor-council and the council-manager forms are becoming smaller and smaller. City officials continually change the structure of the municipal government. Those cities with a primarily mayor-council form often adopt features to improve management, while council-manager cities adopt features to increase their political responsiveness, and leadership.

Sources:

DeSantis, Victor S. and Tarl Renner. "City Government Structures: an Attempt at Classification" *State and Local Government Review*, vol. 34, no. 2, (Spring 2002).

Barnes, William R. *Forms and Structure of Municipal Government in the United States*, presentation to the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities on October 24, 1991 in Edinburgh, Scotland.

Frederickson, H. George, Curtis Wood, and Brett Logan. "How American City Governments Have Changed: The Evolution of the Model City Charter" *National Civic Review*, vol. 90, no. 1, (2001).

Frederickson, H. George, and Gary Alan Johnson. "The Adapted American City: A Study in Institutional Dynamics." *Urban Affairs Review* vol. 36, no. 6 (July 2001).

National League of Cities. *Choices of the Citizenry: Forms of Municipal Government*. Washington, DC: National League of Cities, May 1989.

Svara, James H. "The Shifting Boundary Between Elected Officials and City Managers in Large Council-Manager Cities" *Public Administration Review*, vol. 59, no. 1 (January-February 1999).

Svara, James H. *Two Decades of Continuity and Change in American City Councils*. commissioned by the National League of Cities, September, 2003.

National League of Cities

1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Suite 550 · Washington, DC 20004

Phone:(202) 626-3000 · Fax:(202) 626-3043

info@nlc.org · www.nlc.org

Privacy Policy



NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

Strengthening & promoting cities as centers of opportunity, leadership and governance

November 19, 2005

About Cities : The Four Historic Forms of City Government

Mayor-Council

Characteristics include:

- Separation of powers between directly elected mayor and city council
- Mayor has executive powers while council has legislative powers
- Mayor is directly elected to office, often full-time and paid

This form tends to be in older, larger cities, or in very small cities, under 25,000 population. It is most popular in the Mid-Atlantic and Midwestern parts of the US. Depending on the city charter, the mayor could have weak or strong powers. Cities with variations in the mayor-council form of government are:

- Los Angeles, CA;
- Houston, TX;
- Topeka, KS; and
- Minneapolis, MN.

Council-manager

Characteristics include:

- City council oversees the general administration, makes policy, sets budget
- Council hires a city manager to carry out day-to-day administrative operations
- Often the mayor is chosen from among the council on a rotating basis

This form is common in cities of population over 10,000, mainly in the Southeast and Pacific coast areas. Depending on the city charter, the mayor could have weak or strong powers. Some examples are:

- Phoenix, AZ;
- San Diego, CA;
- Salt Lake City, UT; and
- Rockville, MD.

Commission

Characteristics include:

- Voters elect a individual commissioners to a small governing board
- Each commissioner is responsible for one specific aspect, such as fire, police, public works, health, finance
- One commissioner is designated as chairman or mayor, who presides over meetings
- The commission has both a legislative and executive functions

The commission form of city government is the oldest form of government in the US, but exists today in only a few cities, such as:

- Sunrise, FL; and
- Fairview, TN.

Representative Town Meeting

Characteristics include:

- All citizens can attend and participate in town meeting discussion

- Individuals are chosen by the general electorate to represent them in voting
- Each town meeting must be announced with a warrant that provides the date, time, and location of the meeting and specifies the items to be discussed
- The selectmen are responsible for implementing policy

The town meeting is lauded as the purest form of democracy since it allows all voters a say in how the town is run. However, it is quite rare, mainly found in small municipalities in the New England states, such as:

- Bowdoin, ME; and
- Lexington, MA.

Sources:

DeSantis, Victor S. and Tari Renner. "City Government Structures: an Attempt at Classification" *State and Local Government Review*, vol. 34, no. 2, (Spring 2002).

Forms and Structure of Municipal Government in the United States, presentation by William R. Barnes to the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities on October 24, 1991 in Edinburgh, Scotland.

Frederickson, H. George, Curtis Wood, and Brett Logan. "How American City Governments Have Changed: The Evolution of the Model City Charter" *National Civic Review*. vol. 90, no. 1, (2001).

Frederickson, H. George, and Gary Alan Johnson. "The Adapted American City: A Study in Institutional Dynamics." *Urban Affairs Review* vol. 36, no. 6 (July 2001).

National League of Cities. *Choices of the Citizenry: Forms of Municipal Government*. Washington, DC: National League of Cities, May 1989.

Svara, James H. "The Shifting Boundary Between Elected Officials and City Managers in Large Council-Manager Cities" *Public Administration Review*, vol. 59, no. 1 (January-February 1999).

Svara, James H. *Two Decades of Continuity and Change in American City Councils*. commissioned by the National League of Cities, September, 2003.

National League of Cities

1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Suite 550 · Washington, DC 20004
 Phone:(202) 626-3000 · Fax:(202) 626-3043
 info@nlc.org · www.nlc.org
 Privacy Policy

