Richmond City Charter Review Commission Meeting and Public Hearing

May 23, 2023

Advance Documents

1. **May 23, 2023 Meeting Agenda**
2. **Overview of Charter Process**
3. **Summary of Governance Subcommittee Recommendations**
4. **Summary of Electoral Subcommittee Recommendations**
5. **Appendix: Summary of Forms of Government in Virginia Cities and Mid-Sized Southeastern Cities**

Richmond City Council Charter Commission
Richmond Police Academy
May 23, 2023, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Introductions

2. Review and Approval of May 18, 2023 minutes (Mr. Antoine Banks)

3. Overview Remarks (Dr. Thad Williamson)

4. Review of Commission Process (Ms. Rachael Deane)

5. Summary of Governance Committee Preliminary Recommendations (Mr. Kyle Elliott)

6. Summary of Electoral Subcommittee Preliminary Recommendations (Mr. Travis Gunn)

7. Public Hearing (Mr. Antoine Banks, presiding)

8. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Brief Summary of City Charter Review Commission and Subcommittee Process

The 2022 City Charter Review Commission was created by ordinance and has been directed by City Council to undertake a "comprehensive review of the Charter of the City of Richmond" (ORD 2021-347). The Commission held its first meeting and elected officers in November 2022. In December 2022, it approved a preliminary work plan based on the concept of developing multiple Charter reform options for consideration and making a final recommendation informed by public feedback on those options.

Beginning with its January meeting, the Commission has undertaken several steps:

- Conducted a shared public reading and discussion of key provisions of the current charter
- Distributed for review background materials, including materials on the history of Richmond's charter, a review of key charter provisions in other Virginia independent cities and the National Civic League's Model City Charter (9th edition)
- Conducted interviews with key stakeholders (including current and former elected officials) regarding the current city charter
- Established two subcommittees to bring forward specific reform ideas, including a Governance Subcommittee concerned with improvements or adjustments to the existing Mayor-Council form of government, and an Electoral Subcommittee concerned with specifying a model of Council-Manager government, to include a directly elected Mayor, suitable to Richmond, as well as recommended changes to the electoral process
- Requested and received a research review of academic literature on the comparative strengths of Mayor-Council vs. Council-Manager forms of government from the University of Virginia School of Law State and Local Government Policy Clinic
- Worked with City Council staff to develop a survey of local residents regarding the general performance of city government (launched on May 19, 2023)
- Established a Document Optimization Subcommittee to consider additional matters related to the text of the charter itself not directly covered by the other subcommittees, informed by an analysis performed by Virginia municipal law expert Mr. Walter Erwin
- Established a plan for ongoing public engagement and finalization of Commission recommendations for delivery to City Council by July 31, 2023

The documents attached below are working summary documents prepared by the Governance and Electoral Subcommittee, corresponding to the options of a) adjusting the current Mayor-Council form of government to improve its functioning and b) adopting a Council-Manager system, to include an elected Mayor. (These options are not necessarily mutually exclusive: short-term adjustments to the current form of government could be followed by more dramatic changes at a later point in time.) ***It should be noted that none of these ideas represent a final recommendation of the Commission.*** Further, it should be noted that retaining current arrangements in substantially unaltered form is a third available option.

Public feedback on these initial ideas is welcome and of critical importance, and will help inform the Commission's final recommendations. The work of this advisory Commission in turn is just one step in the process of potential changes to the charter; final authority for the charter and approval of proposed changes rests with the Virginia General Assembly.

City Charter Review Commission: Short Summary of Governance Subcommittee Proposals

These proposals represent ideas for improving the functioning of the Mayor-Council system while retaining its basic form. Some of the ideas expand the powers of City Council and some expand the powers of the Mayor. The overall intent is to alleviate the tension between the Charter's statement that the Mayor is the "Chief Executive Officer" of the City (Richmond City Charter, 5:01) and state code's designation of City Council as the City's "governing body" (Virginia State Code, 15.2-102) in ways consistent with a better-functioning, more collaborative government. The Subcommittee envisions a "Partnership Model" of city government that retains the benefits of elected executive leadership and energy while giving Council greater voice and a greater stake in the success of the city administration.

These ideas are to a degree independent of one another; that is, some could be adopted while others rejected. So while the Subcommittee believes these proposals could be adopted as a group, it also seeks feedback on each individual component. At the same time, it encourages the public to consider the impact of each component in light of the overall "package."

Note also that not all details pertaining to the ideas below have been worked out. Specific mechanisms and language will require more research, deliberation, and in some cases professional or legal advice. The document below is intended simply to summarize the key concepts to engender public discussion.

Mayoral Authority and Compensation

1. **Provide the elected Mayor with administrative authority, specifically the ability to appoint or dismiss department heads (or the ability to designate some or all of that authority to the CAO), consistent with the conception of the Mayor as "chief executive officer" of the city.**
2. **Significantly increase compensation for elected Mayor to place it on par or slightly higher than the City's ranking administrative officials**

Goal: give the Mayor more authority to act in ways consistent with the role of "Chief Executive Officer" as well as compensation befitting the Mayor's role in the organization. Note that a Mayor may elect to delegate to the CAO some or all of this authority, some or all the time, as he or she sees fit.

City Attorney Structure

1. **Redefine the current structure of the City Attorney's office by allowing the Mayor and CAO to hire a Lead Attorney (or Law Department Head) to oversee legal work performed on behalf of the administration, while allowing City Council to hire a Council Attorney to oversee the legislative process and other work performed on behalf of City Council. Adoption of this structure would require also identifying a mechanism for resolving potential conflicts on interpretation of municipal law between the Administration and Council's respective attorneys (such as designating an Arbiter specifically to adjudicate such disputes).**

Goal: alleviate issues and conflicts resulting from the City Attorney's current role as representing the City of Richmond and viewing the Mayor, Administration, and City Council as "constituents" of the City.

Chief Administrative Officer Hiring and Dismissal

1. **Creating more specific rules on who can be appointed as Interim CAO, and for how long.**
2. **Requiring the Mayor to conduct a national search for permanent CAOs and to involve City Council in the search process, with the Mayor retaining authority to nominate a candidate; establishing a confirmation hearing process prior to Council confirmation of a Mayor's nomination; requiring six affirmative votes for approval of a candidate.**
3. **Requiring the Mayor in some circumstances to give advance notice to City Council leadership of the involuntary dismissal of a CAO.**

4. **Creating a mechanism by which a super-majority (7 or more) of Council could cause a CAO to be removed. (Such a motion would need to be sponsored by 5 members of Council to be placed on Council agenda, and could only be brought once per calendar year.)**

Goal: Provide Council a substantial but limited role in the selection of the Chief Administrative Officer in recognition that the success of the CAO is of critical importance to the ability of City Council members to successfully represent their constituents, and provide Council a tool to act in the case of extreme administrative negligence or incompetence to protect the interest of city residents.

Budget Process

1. **Amend the annual budget process to give City Council the opportunity for feedback to the Mayor in advance of its introduction, informed by access to agencies' initial budget requests**
2. **Provide Council limited ability (at two designated times a year) to initiate mid-year budget amendments, subject to a line-item Mayoral veto (with six vote override)**

Goal: provide City Council more information and increase its capacity to provide meaningful input into the Budget process, and create a mechanism for Council-initiated amendments

Council Compensation

1. **Significantly increase compensation for members of City Council (to approximately the median household income for the Richmond MSA)**

Goal: increase the capacity of Council to act effectively as the City's governing body by making it more feasible for Council members to devote more hours to the role, and expand the pool of residents who are willing to run for and serve in the office.

Possible permutations

The following chart illustrates five possible ways the main options discussed above might be combined. The status quo option rejects all the changes suggested above; the "balanced" option accepts them all; other options select or reject possible changes depending on whether the goal is to increase the relative power and authority of the Mayor, the CAO, or Council.

This chart is for illustrative purposes only (and does not reflect a subcommittee recommendation).

	Status Quo	Strong Mayor	Strong CAO	Strong Council	Balanced
Increased Mayoral Power re Agencies	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Increased Council Role in CAO Selection/Removal	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Council Budget Amendment Power	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
City Attorney Role Restructured	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Higher Salaries for Elected Officials	No	Yes (M)	No	Yes (C)	Yes

The Governance Subcommittee continues to evaluate additional ideas with potential to contribute to a Partnership Model of urban governance. Continuing with the Mayor-Council form of government would not require major electoral changes, but the Governance Subcommittee believes adoption of staggered terms for Council members is desirable, both to promote stability and to give voters the opportunity to provide feedback on the direction and performance of city government every two years.

City Charter Review Commission Electoral Subcommittee Summary Report (May 19, 2023)

This summary is provided to accompany the Subcommittee's full report.

The Commission charged the Subcommittee to review and consider various features that the City of Richmond might adopt in a Council-Manager structure of government. The Commission also charged the Subcommittee to review electoral considerations of a Council-Manager structure.

Around 2005, the City moved from a Council-Manager structure to a Mayor-Council structure. Reasons given for the change were to: address inefficiencies, corruption, and a lack of a cohesive vision for City government. Similar complaints are still being raised, i.e., inefficiencies, structural conflict between stakeholders, the inability for stakeholders to deliver constituent services, and failing to deliver on the promise of providing the mechanisms for a cohesive, **City-wide vision to become reality**.

The Subcommittee has sought to identify a Council-Manager structure that embraces the City's desire for a **unifying mayor.** Another important outcome of this proposal would be **to reduce the overall cost of City government,** due to the lessened need for duplication of administrative and overhead costs.

The Subcommittee's recommended structure accomplishes several goals for Richmond:

First, **by bringing the popularly elected Mayor into the City Council,** it removes the structural conflict between City Council and the Mayor that many stakeholders have expressed as a key impediment to good governance.

Second, **by giving the Mayor significant authority** within that policy-making body, it creates the processes by which a unifying vision (embodied by the popularly-elected Mayor's platform) can become the City's reality.

Third, **by delegating administration to the City Manager**, city services will be professionally managed.

Fourth, **by keeping the City Attorney separate from the City Manager**, these two positions will be sufficiently parallel to ensure each is able to exercise their roles to maximize benefit to City Council.

Key Roles

Mayor.

Popularly elected at large Mayor to serve as leader and member of the legislative and policy making body.

Duties. The Subcommittee recommends that the Mayor not only have a vote as a member of City Council, but also have significant authority in leading City Council. Taking the opposite approach, by making the Mayor a non-voting member of City Council, would significantly neuter the role and make it ineffective in serving constituents. Imbuing the Mayor with significant authority within City Council gives the Mayor the ability to effectuate their unifying, City-wide platform—a primary goal Richmond sought to achieve in moving to the Mayor-Council structure.

Compensation. The Subcommittee recommends that the Mayor be a full-time position with pay commensurate with their importance within City government. The pay should be adequate to help attract sufficiently qualified individuals to run for the office. The Subcommittee recommends compensating the Mayor consistent with the recommendation from the Governance Subcommittee, which is to ensure that that the Mayor's compensation is comparable to the highest paid City employees.

Election. The Subcommittee recommends that the Mayor be elected every four years, in an at-large, City-wide election that uses instant run-off voting (also known as ranked choice voting). This proposed way of voting would result in knowing the incoming mayor on election day or close thereafter. The current 5 of 9

districts required to win could possibly result in not knowing until very close to inauguration the winner of a mayoral race. The city came very close to this happening in 2016. Given the significant authority the Mayor retains as head of City Council and the City itself, the most democratically held election possible is appropriate.

The Subcommittee understands that the majority-of-districts requirement (currently 5 of 9) stemmed from a valid concern about diluting the voting power of certain communities of interest. *However, the subcommittee believes that data will show that most districts in 2023, due to demographic changes, no longer reflect singular communities of interest and instead reflect the diversity of Richmond at large. The subcommittee has requested and is awaiting additional information regarding the impact on minority voting power.*

The majority-of-districts requirement can, and has, allowed for candidates to win with significantly less than 50% of the popular vote. Such a scenario does not give an elected Mayor the desired clear electoral mandate to unify the City and to lead the City Council. Note also; the current 5 of 9 districts win system promotes candidate attention to a small number of districts (i.e., the 3rd and 5th districts), The effect would be similar to the electoral college at the national level.

City Council.

Authority. The Subcommittee recommends that City Council should retain all powers vested in the City as defined in the current City Charter. Along with other recommendations City Council will once again become the focal point for City policy.

Size. The Subcommittee recommends that City Council districts be reduced from nine to six, with a total of seven City Council votes including the at-large Mayor.

Reasons for this recommendation include the following:

> Concerns voiced for the seemingly unwieldy nature of nine members.

> Expressed skepticism at the ability of a City Manager to be able to adequately manage expectations from nine different members.

> The reduction in size will more closely align the City with comparable localities in Virginia.

> Reducing the number of districts will enlarge each district, and therefore each district-based member of City Council will have a broader "home base" perspective as their respective districts grow.

> Fewer members of City Council mean less cost, more streamlined government, and less potential for personalities to complicate City governance.

> 2011 Mayor's Redistricting Advisory Committee noted that several benefits can result from "starting over from scratch in drawing the City's electoral map," which would be required when reducing the number of districts (between 5 to 7). The new districts could be drawn to have "both poverty rates close to the city average and substantial internal diversity."

> Districts could be redrawn in a way "encourage the political incorporation of the Hispanic community," which could equally apply to other discrete communities of interest.

Terms. The Subcommittee recommends four-year, staggered terms for district-wide elections. Staggered terms are supported over concurrent terms to avoid dramatic changes in council composition at each election. The Subcommittee recommends that staggering of terms should be implemented with initial implementation according to Model City Charter § 6.03, "Alternative II- Single -Member District System,

Mayor elected separately." Under this approach election of council members would take place every 2 years

Status; Compensation. The Subcommittee recommends that non-mayoral members of City Council be a part-time position with pay commensurate with their importance within City government.

The Subcommittee recommends compensating City Council consistent with the recommendation from the Governance Subcommittee, which is to ensure that that non-Mayor members of City Council are increased to approximate the median household income for the City.

City Manager.

Appointment; Retention. The Subcommittee recommends that the City Manager be selected, appointed, and retained at the pleasure and direction of City Council.

The Subcommittee recommends that City Council, by majority vote of City Council's total members, appoint a City Manager for an indefinite term and fix the City Manager's compensation. The City Council should be able to remove a City Manager by a majority vote of City Council's total members only after adequate and written notice of the reasons for suspension and opportunity to be heard.

Qualifications. The Subcommittee recommends that City Council impose qualification standards for the City Manager, with an industry-approved baseline imposed by the Charter.

The Subcommittee recommends that the Charter direct that City Council to appoint the City Manager based solely on education and experience in the accepted competencies and practices of local government management, with attention to how the City Manager expresses support for and enacts social equity.

The Charter should direct City Council to enact an ordinance that sets the minimum qualifications for any City Manager. The Charter should also specify that any such ordinance must set qualifications that meet a minimum standard.

The Subcommittee recommends that the Charter recognizes City Council's prerogative and duty to establish written standards, but also set a floor for those standards to assure residents that the City Manager will be adequately qualified.

Authority. The Subcommittee recommends that the City Manager be the chief executive officer. This position is continuously responsible to the elected officials and is also responsible for providing professional and effective service delivery.

City Attorney.

General. The Subcommittee recommends the City Attorney to be chief legal counsel for the entire City and all its constituents (officers, employees, departments, boards, commissions and agencies etc.).

This recommendation does not substantively change the current City Charter but should eliminate currently perceived issues with the City Attorney of having conflict between the Council Mayor and City administration.

By bringing the Mayor into City Council, the City Attorney no longer has a "conflict" (whether real or perceived) in representing equal yet independent stakeholders who may take opposing views on issues.

Appointment; Retention. The Subcommittee recommends that the City Attorney be selected, appointed, and retained at the pleasure and direction of City Council.

This recommendation does not change the current City Charter.

This allows the City Manager and City Attorney to have a degree of independence from one another, which for purposes of the City Attorney makes clear that the City Attorney is ultimately responsive to City Council.

The City Attorney therefore has the independence to provide legal counsel to city administration, through the City Manager, while also ensuring that this counsel ultimate reflects City Council's priorities.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Mayor.

Role.

Option 1: Mayor as a member of City Council. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: No Mayor. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option because it takes away a public representative from the City's residents.

Option 3: Ceremonial Mayor. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option

Authority.

Option 1: Mayor with significant City Council powers and duties. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: Mayor with only voting power. The subcommittee does not recommend this option because it reduces the Mayor to simply being a city-wide elected member of City Council.

Reducing the Mayor's authority in such a manner effectively puts the City back in the pre-2005 structure with a very minor change that one member of City Council coming from a city-wide election.

Status; Compensation.

Option 1: A set standard for determining compensation. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: City Council has unfettered discretion to set salary. The Subcommittee supports appropriately compensating the Mayor, and adding guidelines to such compensation reduces the likelihood of any impropriety regarding setting the Mayor's compensation.

Election.

Option 1: At-large, City-wide election with instant run-off. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: At-large, City-wide election with an open primary. The Subcommittee's concern with an open primary is voter fatigue.

Option 3: At-large, City-wide election with a "majority of districts" requirement. The Subcommittee's discussion of this option is addressed earlier in the recommendation section.

City Council.

Authority.

The Subcommittee did not consider any discrete alternatives for the general authority of the City Council, finding that the current structure (when coupled with other changes) was appropriate.

Size.

Option 1: 6 members elected from districts, 1 Mayor. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: 8 members elected from districts, 1 Mayor. The Subcommittee strongly considered this alternative as one way to achieve an odd number of voting members of the City Council.

Option 3: 7 members elected from districts, no Mayor. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option because it abolishes the position of Mayor.

Option 4: 6 members elected from districts, 2 members elected at-large, 1 Mayor. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option. The benefit of an at-large, non-mayoral position may be already realized due to other features recommended by the Subcommittee**.**

Option 5: 7 members elected from districts, 1 member elected at-large (a "Vice Mayor"), 1 Mayor. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option for essentially the same reasons why it does not recommend Option 4.

Option 6: 9 members elected from districts, 1 Mayor. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option because it creates an even-number of votes on City Council

Option 7: 9 members elected from districts, 1 Mayor without voting power. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option because it significantly nullifies the purpose and authority of a Mayor, as discussed in greater detail in the Subcommittee's recommendations about the Mayor.

Option 8: 9 members elected from district, no Mayor. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option, as it simply returns the City's structure of government to its pre-2005 form.

Terms.

Option 1: Staggered terms. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: No staggered terms. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option, which is the status quo.

Status; Compensation.

Option 1: Increasing compensation. The Subcommittee recommends this option for

the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: No increase in compensation. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option because while public service is an honor and there is an understanding that pay need not be excessive, the Subcommittee believes that the level of compensation should not be punitive.

<u>**City Manager**</u>**.**

Appointment; Retention

The Subcommittee did not consider any discrete alternatives for how the City Manager was appointed and retained, finding that the Model City Charter provided an appropriate structure.

Qualifications.

Option 1: Express Qualifications. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: No Express Qualifications. This alternative would essentially be the status quo. The Subcommittee declined this option for the reasons why it recommends the Charter providing express qualifications.

Authority.

Option 1: City Manager as the chief executive officer. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: Mayor retains some administrative functions. The Subcommittee considered whether the Mayor should retain some administrative/executive functions that are performed by the City manager. The Subcommittee does not recommend this option because it confuses the role of Mayor within the Council-Manager structure.

<u>**City Attorney**</u>**.**

General.

The Subcommittee did not consider any discrete alternatives for the general authority of the City Attorney, finding that the current structure (when coupled with other changes) was appropriate.

Appointment; Retention.

Option 1: City Council have full authority. The Subcommittee recommends this option for the reasons discussed above.

Option 2: City Manager has some role in the process. The Subcommittee does not recommend the City Manager to have any role in the appointment or retention process for the City Attorney.

Appendix 1. Summary of Council Composition and Method of Election for Council and Mayor for Virginia Independent Cities

City Approx. 2021 population	Council Composition and Method of Election for Council & Mayor
Richmond City (1) 227,000	9 Council members elected by ward, 1 Mayor elected at large (5 of 9 wards). Terms not staggered (4 years).
Select Comparison Cities	
Norfolk (2) 235,000	5 Council members elected by ward, 2 by super-ward, 1 Mayor elected at large. Term staggered (4 years), with election for 5 ward members alternating with elections for super-ward members and Mayor.
Virginia Beach (3) 458,000	10 Council members elected by ward, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years). (Current system recently adopted under federal guidance.)
Chesapeake (4) 251,000	8 Council members and 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Other Virginia Cities	
Alexandria (5) 155,000	6 Council members and 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms not staggered (3 years).
Bristol (6) 17,000	5 Council members elected at large, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Buena Vista (7) 7,000	6 Council members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years for Council, 2 years for Mayor).
Charlottesville (8) 46,000	5 Council members elected at large, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years)
Colonial Heights (9) 18,000	7 Council members elected at large, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Covington (10) 6,000	5 Council members elected by ward, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Danville (11) 42,000	9 Council members elected at large, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Emporia (12) 6,000	7 Council members elected by ward, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Fairfax (13) 24,000	6 Council members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms not staggered (2 years).
Falls Church (14) 14,000	7 Council members elected at large, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Franklin (15) 8,000	6 Council members elected by ward, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years for Council, 2 for Mayor).
Fredericksburg (16) 28,000	4 Council members elected by ward, 2 Council members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years, alternating between ward and at-large elections).
Galax (17) 7,000	7 Council members elected at large, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Hampton (18) 138,000	6 Council members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).

Harrisonburg (19) 51,000	5 Council members elected at large, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Hopewell (20) 23,000	7 members elected by ward, 1 of which serves as Mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Lexington (21) 7,000	6 members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Lynchburg (22) 79,000	7 members; 4 elected by ward, 3 at large, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years, alternating between ward and at-large elections).
Manassas (23) 43,000	6 Council members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Term staggered (4 years).
Manassas Park (24) 17,000	6 Council members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Term staggered (4 years).
Martinsville (25) 14,000	5 members elected at large, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Newport News (26) 185,000	6 members elected from 3 wards, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Norton (27) 4,000	5 members elected at large, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Petersburg (28) 33,000	7 members elected by ward, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Poquoson (29) 13,000	6 members elected from 3 wards, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Portsmouth (30) 98,000	6 members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Radford (31) 16,000	4 members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Roanoke (32) 99,000	6 members elected at large, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Salem (33) 25,000	5 members elected at large, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Staunton (34) 26,000	7 members elected at large, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Suffolk (35) 96,000	7 members elected by ward, 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).
Waynesboro (36) 23,000	4 members elected by ward, 1 at large, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Williamsburg (37) 16,000	5 members elected at large, 1 of which serves as mayor. Terms staggered (4 years).
Winchester (38) 28,000	8 members elected from 4 wards (2 per ward). 1 Mayor elected at large. Terms staggered (4 years).

Notes: 21 Virginia cities have an elected Mayor, 17 have a Mayor elected from among Council members. 35 of 38 cities have staggered terms for Council. Richmond is the only city with 4 year City Council terms, not staggered.

In Richmond, the elected Mayor appoints a Chief Administrative Officer with consent of Council, who serves at pleasure of the Mayor. In all other Virginia cities, Council appoints a City Manager, who serves at pleasure of Council.

In Richmond, the Mayor is not a member of City Council. In the vast majority of Virginia cities, the Mayor is a full voting member of City Council and also presides over City Council; in a small number of cases, the Mayor presides over Council, but does not vote except to break ties.

Appendix 2. Summary of Form of Government for Southeastern Cities, Population 180,000 to 300,000

City (population)	Form of Government	Members of Council	At-Large/Ward	Role of Mayor
Birmingham, AL (198k)	Mayor-Council	9	Ward	CEO
Huntsville, AL (217k)	Mayor-Council	5	Ward	CEO
Mobile, AL (185k)	Mayor-Council	7	Ward	CEO
Montgomery, AL (199k)	Mayor-Council	9	Ward	CEO
Little Rock, AR (202k)	Council-Manager	10	7 Ward/3 at-large	Various*
Augusta, GA (201k)	Mayor-Commission	10	Ward	Leads Commission
Columbus, GA (206k)	Mayor-Council	10	8 Ward/2 at-large	Various*
Baton Rouge, LA (222k)	Mayor-Council	12	Ward	CEO
Shreveport, LA (184k)	Mayor-Council	7	Ward	CEO
Durham, NC (286k)	Council-Manager	7	3 Ward/4 at-large	Leads Council
Fayetteville, NC (209k)	Council-Manager	10	9 Ward/1 at-large	Leads Council
Greensboro, NC (298k)	Council-Manager	9	5 Ward/4 at-large	Leads Council
Winston-Salem, NC (250k)	Council-Manager	9	8 Ward/1 at-large	Leads Council
Chattanooga, TN (182k)	Mayor-Council	9	Ward	CEO
Knoxville, TN (193k)	Mayor-Council	9	6 Ward/3 at-large	CEO
Chesapeake, VA (251k)	Council-Manager	9	8 Ward/1 at-large	Leads Council
Newport News, VA (185k)	Council-Manager	7	6 Ward/1 at-large	Leads Council
Norfolk, VA (235k)	Council-Manager	7	5 Ward/2 super ward	Leads Council
Richmond, VA (227k)	**Mayor-Council**	**9**	**Ward**	**CEO**

- In Columbus, Georgia, the Mayor nominates key administrative officers, can initiate their dismissal, presides over the Council, and has a tie-breaking vote on Council
- In Little Rock, Arkansas, the Mayor presides over the council and nominates the city manager
- This list includes mid-sized cities from the states of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia.
- Each of these cities have directly elected Mayors.