



An Independent Voice For Responsible Government

## CONSIDERING WORCESTER'S CHARTER

*Report No. 99-2*  
*April 20, 1999*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The issue of changing Worcester's municipal charter has resurfaced for the second time in this decade. A recently formed group called Citizens for a Strong Mayor has urged changing the city's charter from a council-manager form of government to a "strong mayor" form. Since there are a wide variety of forms of local government organization in the United States without any established consensus on which form is best, the Research Bureau will try to contribute to the debate over the structure of local government in Worcester by providing some information about recent trends in local government charters elsewhere in the United States. Among the more significant developments in the organization of local government in the second half of the twentieth century are the increased use of professionals (rather than party appointees) to administer the services provided under mayoral forms of government and the increased powers granted to popularly elected mayors under council-manager government. In other words, many local governments no longer follow either the "pure" council-manager or "strong-mayor" form but rather are a hybrid of the two.

For example, in 1951, the voters of Philadelphia adopted a modified "strong mayor" charter which included the position of "managing director." This individual, who is appointed by the mayor for a four-year term (and can only be removed for cause), appoints the department heads, and oversees the day-to-day operations of the service delivery departments. On the other hand, Kansas City, Missouri, which has a council-manager form of government, recently modified its charter to strengthen the position of the mayor. Kansas City's mayor now nominates the person who will serve as city manager (who is then confirmed by the city council), receives the budget from the manager one month before the rest of the council, and can veto any council actions (which can be overridden by 2/3 of the council). In the final analysis, however, the effectiveness of any local government structure depends on the quality of the elected and appointed officials.

### I. INTRODUCTION

For forms of government let fools contest:  
Whatever is best administered is best.

Alexander Pope, *Essay on Man*

What Pope, the 18th century British poet and satirist, meant was that the historic "great debate" over the character of the best or justest political regime was now settled. All respectable authorities agreed that the proper purpose of government is to secure the equal rights of citizens and otherwise promote the general well-being in ways that respect those rights and secure popular consent. Hence the only remaining issue is to choose a particular form of governmental organization that would achieve this purpose in the most systematic and efficient way. By "administration" Pope meant (in agreement with America's Founding Fathers)<sup>1</sup> not merely the day-to-day details of service delivery, but rather the overall manner in which broad policy decisions are put into effect.

---

<sup>1</sup>See *Federalist* #72, in which Alexander Hamilton offers a broad definition of "administration."

Applying Pope's maxim to local government today, the test of the goodness of a city's system of administration entails considering how best to address such issues as the revitalization of a city's downtown area or the reorganization of the Fire Department, now that structure fires have declined by one-third during the past decade. There are a variety of forms of local governmental organization in the United States that are designed to "administer" urban affairs, without any established consensus on which form is best. In Massachusetts, the citizens of each community are given a wide latitude to choose what they consider to be the best form of government. In Worcester, a recently formed group called the Citizens for a Strong Mayor (CSM) has urged changing the city's charter from a council-manager form of government to a "strong mayor" form.

The Research Bureau's intention in this report is to contribute to an enlightened debate over the structure of our local government by providing the following information:

- Procedures used to adopt or change local charters
- Kinds of charters available to cities and towns in Massachusetts
- Brief history of council-manager government
- Recent trends in the administration of local government

The Research Bureau takes no position for or against charter change.

## **II. ALL ABOUT CHARTERS**

### **A. What is a Local Charter?**

The term "Charter" refers to the basic provisions which set up the form, structure, and organization of government, including the powers and duties of important municipal officials. A charter is the city's "constitution"; it is the fundamental document by which the people of a city govern themselves. Worcester is governed by a charter establishing a council-manager form of government. Any ordinances which are passed by the City Council must be consistent with the charter. However, ordinances cannot be used to change the composition, mode of election or appointment, or terms of office of the City Council, the Mayor, or the City Manager. These arrangements can be changed only by modifying the charter. Recent discussions have focused on changing the form of the chief executive officer; they have not referred to the City Council, the form of which can likewise be altered only through amendments to the charter.

### **B. How Can a Charter be Changed?**

A charter can be adopted or changed by two methods: The Home Rule Charter method and the Special Act Charter method.

#### **1. Home Rule Charter Method**

Since the Home Rule Amendment to the State Constitution was adopted in 1966, cities and towns have been able to formulate Home Rule Charters by adoption or revision, or by amendment. The adoption or revision procedure may be used either to adopt a new charter or to propose major changes to an existing one (e.g., change in the composition or term of office of the city council, elimination of the manager position, establishing the position of mayor, etc.). The amendment procedure may be used to propose more modest changes in the current charter, such as increasing the membership of a board or commission,

merging two or more departments, or altering the budget preparation timeline. An amendment becomes effective upon passage by a majority of the voters at a municipal election.

#### A. Adoption or Revision Procedure

The Home Rule Charter method permits greater local autonomy than requesting a Special Act of the legislature (which is discussed below). However, the Home Rule Charter method takes about two years to complete. It requires a petition to place the question of charter change on the ballot by collecting signatures from 15% of the City's registered voters. The question that would then appear on the ballot in Worcester is: "Shall a commission be elected to revise the charter of Worcester?" At the same election in which the question is voted on, voters elect a nine-member Charter Commission (to take office only if the question passed), which would then be responsible for preparing a charter revision. The charter it drafted would then be voted on by the local voters at a subsequent election. The final report of the Charter Commission must be submitted to the City Council within 18 months after the Commission's election. (The voters of Worcester elected a Charter Commission in November, 1983, which held hearings and developed a revised charter that was approved by the voters in November, 1985.)

#### B. Amendment Procedure

An amendment to an existing charter must be proposed by a two-thirds vote of the City Council. (Although the amendment must be proposed by the City Council, the law allows it to be suggested to that body by the City Manager, by any City Councilor, or by a petition signed by 200 citizens, the same number required to sign a charter commission nomination paper in Worcester.) The proposed amendment must be filed with the state Department of Housing and Community Development and the Attorney General, who must render an opinion on its legality. If it is approved by the Attorney General, the amendment must be submitted to the voters for their approval.

### 2. **Special Act Charter Method**

A charter may also be adopted or changed by requesting the State legislature to pass a special law. To do so, at least two steps are required:

A. Local approval by the City Council. If the City Council does not approve the request to change the charter, the question may be placed before the voters by the local initiative petition process. If an initiative petition is signed by 15% of the registered voters, the City Council must call a special election in which the proposed change is submitted to the voters. If it is signed by at least 8% of the registered voters, the proposed change is submitted to the voters at the next regular municipal election.

The Massachusetts General Laws do not spell out a procedure for a city to develop a charter through the Special Act process as they do for the Home Rule Charter method. The City Council may determine the procedures for developing the charter as well as its content.

B. State legislative act. Once a proposed charter has received local approval, it can be filed as a bill by a member of the State Legislature. The bill is usually assigned to the Joint Committee on Local Affairs, which studies it and reports its recommendations to the full

legislature. If the bill passes both Houses and is signed by the Governor, it becomes law. While local acceptance is not constitutionally required, the special act sometimes provides that it will not go into effect until local voters have voted to accept it.

## **C. WHAT ARE "PLAN" CITY CHARTERS?**

Before 1966, some cities, including Worcester, accepted one of the "plan" city charters which the state legislature made available under Chapter 43 of the Massachusetts General Laws. (Other cities adopted Special Act charters.) Now these charters may be adopted or changed only by the methods discussed above: local charter commissions or state legislative action. From 1949 to 1985, Worcester was governed by the Plan E Charter. As noted above, in 1983, a Charter Commission was elected which produced a Home Rule Charter that modified the Plan E Charter. The Home Rule Charter was adopted by the voters in November, 1985.

The "Plan" City Charters are as follows:

### **1. Plan A**

This is traditionally referred to as "strong mayor" government. Under this Plan, the Mayor is elected by the voters of the city to serve as the chief executive officer and the chairman of the School Committee. All department heads and members of municipal boards, except for the School Committee, the school superintendent, and officials appointed by the Governor, are appointed and removed by the Mayor without confirmation by the City Council. Because a strong mayor does not require council approval for his appointments and removals, he may properly be held accountable by the electorate for the performance of his administration. All orders, ordinances, resolutions, and votes relative to the affairs of the City passed by the City Council must be approved by the Mayor. If he disapproves, the City Council can override his veto only by a two-thirds vote of all its members. Although the current discussion has not focused on the City Council, the powers of the City Council would have to complement those of the strong mayor. (See Appendix A for salaries of mayors in cities with a population comparable to Worcester's.)

### **2. Plan B**

This is traditionally referred to as "weak mayor" government. It consists of an elected Mayor and a City Council elected by districts and at-large. The majority of councilors are elected by district. Cities like Worcester which have more than seven wards would have a fifteen-member council, one from each ward and the rest elected at-large.

The Mayor is elected as the City's chief executive officer with general supervision over all departments. The key difference from the mayoral functions under Plan A is that appointment and removal of subordinate employees are not inherent in the Mayor's power of supervision. Instead, appointments of all department heads and municipal boards (excluding School Committee, school superintendent, and Governor-appointed officials) are subject to Council confirmation. The Mayor may remove department heads with Council majority approval, though a person being removed may contest removal using legal representation before a Council hearing. Because the weak mayor must share appointment and removal authority with the City Council, he cannot be held entirely accountable for the performance of his administration.

### **3. Plan E**

Plan E, which Worcester had until 1985, is Council/Manager government in which the nine-member City Council is elected at-large by proportional representation in non-partisan elections. (The voters of Worcester eliminated proportional representation in 1960 and added five district Councilors in 1985.) Plan E centralizes power and responsibility in the City Council except for authority specified for the City Manager, School Committee, City Clerk, Auditor, and Governor-appointed officials. The Mayor is elected by the Council from its members. His powers include chairing City Council and School Committee meetings with the power to vote, but not to veto. The Mayor also performs ceremonial duties in accordance with the office and those imposed by the City Council.

The City Manager, who need not be a resident of the city, is appointed by the City Council. He is the chief executive and chief administrative officer and is responsible for supervising all departments, commissions, boards and offices of the city, except those of City Clerk, Auditor, and Governor-appointed officials. His compensation is fixed by ordinance. No council member may be appointed City Manager during his term in office, nor elected (during membership on the Council) to any public position in the city or county in which the city is located. The City Manager may be removed at any time by a majority vote of the council membership. The powers and duties of the City Manager include: keeping the City Council fully advised of the city's financial condition and future needs; preparing and submitting budgets; and making appointments to and removals from departments, boards, and commissions under his authority. (It is illegal for councilors to be involved in the appointment process.)

No city operates under Chapter 43 of the Massachusetts General Laws Plan C (Commissioner government), Plan D (Council/Manager government which requires two-thirds of the Council to remove the City Manager), or Plan F (strong mayor government where the Mayor and the City Council are nominated by party primaries and elected in partisan elections). Special act charters adopted before 1966 are usually variations on Plan A, B, and E. While Home Rule Charters may also be based in part on the Plans, they are more apt to contain features which a) more precisely define the mayor's or manager's authority, b) provide more guidance on budget preparation and adoption, and/or c) give the city the authority to implement a department structure most suitable to its needs.

In recent years, the following cities in Massachusetts have replaced the manager form with an elected strong mayor: Methuen (1992), Agawam (1988), and Medford (1986). In 1996, Easthampton and Amesbury, in adopting the city form of government, replaced representative town meetings with mayor-council government. Only Chelsea replaced mayor-council government with a council-manager charter in 1994. Chelsea has no mayor; the individual who presides at City Council meetings is called President of the City Council. Chelsea's mayor charter had been suspended when receivership was put in place in 1991.

Appendix B identifies cities by form of government, noting the size and composition of the city council.

### **D. WORCESTER'S CHARTER**

In November, 1947, the voters of Worcester adopted by a two-to-one margin a Plan E Charter giving legislative powers to a nine-member City Council elected at-large in non-partisan elections. The new charter vested extensive power in a city manager appointed

by the City Council. The Plan E Charter went into effect in January, 1949, replacing a charter which had been in operation since Worcester's incorporation as a City in 1848. The impetus for the change was the unwieldy nature of the old charter and the perception of corruption (although no charges were ever proven).

The old charter vested all legislative power - and much administrative authority - in a bicameral city council. The upper chamber, the Board of Aldermen, had 11 members: one elected at-large, and one elected from each of ten wards. The lower chamber, the Common Council, had 30 members, three from each ward. All members of both chambers were elected as Republicans or Democrats. This City Council had the power of appointment over many city positions. The chief executive under the old charter was an elected Mayor. Like the members of the City Council, the Mayor was elected on a partisan basis. The Mayor was considered a "weak" mayor, because many city positions were filled through appointment by the City Council.

Since Plan E was adopted and implemented, there have been several major changes. In 1960, the voters eliminated the proportional representation system of voting. Then in 1983, the voters decided it was time to review the Plan E Charter in its entirety, and elected a charter commission to do so. The Home Rule Charter adopted by the voters of Worcester in 1985 modified the Plan E charter by increasing the size of the City Council from nine to eleven, with five elected from districts. The mayor is elected separately. In order to be elected mayor, however, the candidate must also win an at-large council seat. In addition, all regulatory and advisory boards and commissions consisting of five or fewer persons shall contain no more than one member from any one district.

In 1991, there was a movement to change from council-manager charter to a strong mayor charter. The voters were presented with a non-binding question on whether they favored "strong mayor" form of government. A majority voted in the affirmative. As a result, the Worcester City Council held hearings and developed a charter for a "weak mayor" form of government (one in which the council controlled appointments reserved for the mayor under a strong mayor government). The proposed charter was defeated by the voters in November, 1992.

### **III. HISTORY OF COUNCIL-MANAGER GOVERNMENT**

The local government management profession originated about 100 years ago at a meeting of the predecessor organization to the National Civic League. Those present discussed what they considered to be the deplorable condition of American local government at that time, which was often characterized by corruption, the dominance of party bosses and machines, favoritism, and patronage. The participants at that meeting launched the "reform movement" with its belief in the adoption of the council-manager form as the best means of organizing local government so as to achieve rational and professional city management, and to minimize corruption. Some reformers argued that local government could be run like a business: the city council would act as a board of directors and the city manager would act as the chief executive officer. The popularly elected council would develop policy and the appointed, professional manager would implement it. The reformers contended that the chief functions of local government such as street repair, snow removal, public safety, and public education, were fairly straightforward. Local government needed to be structured in a way to provide these services professionally in the most efficient manner possible, without partisan influence. The principles on which council-manager government was to be based included the following: scrupulous honesty and integrity; open, participatory, representative local government; and professional management.

Over the past 100 years, there have been some changes to the council-manager system, perhaps because decisions about public safety or public education or even sidewalk repair (as we have recently witnessed in Worcester) affect different groups of people differently, and reflect differing views of what is in their interest. And decisions made by public officials in a representative democracy, regardless of the level of government, must take account of and accommodate those competing interests. The resultant policies are generally some sort of compromise which may fall short of being the most efficient solution or the one an "efficient" private corporation might have chosen.

The original council-manager plan called for a small council elected at-large, with a presiding officer selected by members of the council. Elections were to be non-partisan. Elected officials were supposed to be citizen volunteers who received little or no compensation for their public service.<sup>2</sup> All of these features were intended to reduce party influence, and minimize patronage and corruption.

#### **IV. RECENT TRENDS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

Today, 62% (1,441) of the 2,322 cities that responded to a 1996 ICMA survey and were identified as operating under council-manager government indicated that they elect the mayor at-large by a vote of the citizens. This is up from 41% in the early 1950's. About 30% elect their councils by district or by a combination of at-large and district (as is the case in Worcester). About 17% of the responding cities indicated they conduct local elections on a partisan basis. And roughly 10% indicated that their councils are larger than the five to seven members suggested by the original reformers. (Worcester has eleven.)

At the beginning of the reform movement, professional management was present almost exclusively in council-manager governments. Today, more than 70% of managers hold a graduate or professional degree. But professionals are also employed in local governments that are organized under a variety of structural arrangements including the "strong mayor" form. In most cities, almost all parts of the service delivery system have been professionalized. Department heads in charge of police, fire, public works, budget and finance, and all functions that require a level of expertise are generally well-educated and trained in their respective fields, and committed to public service.

In brief, it appears that council-manager government has become more "political," with popularly elected mayors and larger councils at least some members of which are elected from districts. In those cities that have modified council-manager government, the proponents of popularly elected mayors have argued that an elected official is more likely to be recognized as the city's leader, and therefore better able to mediate among disparate interests and to promote economic development. Modified council-manager government remains a viable form in many cities. Running parallel to the increased politicization of council-manager government is a trend toward hiring professional administrators under the mayoral form of government to administer municipal services on a day-to-day basis. Some examples of charters under both forms of government will illustrate these trends. However, as the recent dispute in Worcester over the allocation of funds for sidewalk repair indicates, the responsibility for decisions must be clear, whichever form of government exists.

---

<sup>2</sup>This was not the case in Worcester, however. When the charter was adopted, each member of the City Council received a \$4,000 salary per annum. The rationale was that since Council business was conducted during regular business hours, councilors should be compensated for lost income.



## **V. EXAMPLES OF CHARTER CHANGES - MODIFIED CITY MANAGER CITIES**

### **A. *Kansas City, Missouri***

Kansas City, Missouri, one of the stalwarts of council-manager government, recently modified its council-manager charter to strengthen the position of the mayor by giving him closer ties to the city manager, a veto over any council action, enhanced authority over the city budget, and the power of appointment to all municipal authorities, boards, and commissions. Kansas City's mayor now nominates the person who will serve as manager subject to council approval. The manager, however, is still the professional administrator of the city, appointing department heads and implementing policy. The main change is in the conditions for his removal. Six council votes are required to oust a manager if the mayor agrees. But if the mayor supports the manager, it takes nine votes to remove him. The purpose is to give the manager greater political "cover" from the council as long as he retains the confidence of the mayor.

The mayor also has greater authority over the budget. The manager now submits the budget to the mayor one month before it goes to the council. The mayor then has time to analyze the document and come up with his own spending priorities before the council even sees the budget. Within that month, the mayor and the manager may reach an agreement.

The mayor was also given the power to veto council actions other than one imposed by a citizen initiative. Vetoes can be overridden only by a vote of at least eight of the twelve city councilors. The veto's main value, according to advocates, is as a negotiating tool. According to supporters of the changes, now that the mayor is recognized as the city's official "leader," he is better able to promote economic development in Kansas City.

### **B. *San Jose, California***

While San Jose has a council-manager form of government, its charter, like Kansas City's, has been modified to grant additional powers to the mayor. According to the city charter, the mayor is now the political leader of the city "by providing guidance and leadership to the council, by expressing and explaining to the community the city's policies and programs and by assisting the Council in the vigorous and effective exercise of its powers." The mayor has the power to make recommendations to the Council on matters of policy which require council decision. He is required to address the citizens annually on the state of the city and articulate plans he is proposing. He can recommend increases or decreases in the budget to the city council. He nominates candidates for council consideration for appointment to the position of city manager. The city manager remains the chief administrative officer of the city responsible for day-to-day municipal operations.

## **VI. EXAMPLES OF CHARTER CHANGES - MODIFIED STRONG MAYOR CITIES**

Since in all examples described below, there are various limitations on the appointment and removal power of the mayor, these charters may properly be called modified strong mayor government.

## **A. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania**

In 1951, Philadelphia adopted a charter in which the city is governed by a mayor, but it also established the position of "managing director." The managing director is chosen by the mayor with the approval of the City Council. He is required to have at least five years of experience as an executive in public service or private industry in order to supervise the service delivery departments. The managing director appoints department heads with the approval of the mayor. He has a four-year term which coincides with the mayor's, and can only be removed for cause. The department heads report to the managing director; he serves as the liaison between the mayor and the departments.

The mayor also appoints a director of finance from persons recommended by a Finance Panel. (The members of the Finance Panel are the President of the Philadelphia Clearing House Association, the Chairman of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and the Dean of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania who chairs the panel.) The reason for this procedure is that, according to the charter, "the major powers and duties vested in the Director of Finance and the extreme importance of his office require that the office be filled by a person of marked competence and experience." The Finance Panel device is intended to help ensure especially qualified appointments to this office. The Director of Finance must have at least five years' experience as an executive or controller of a business, or as an expert in public finance.

## **B. Oakland, California**

An attempt to change the charter from council-manager to modified "strong mayor" failed in 1996 but passed in 1998. Under the new charter, the mayor presides over meetings of the city council, and appoints the city manager subject to confirmation by the city council. The mayor alone gives direction to the city manager. The mayor's term of office is limited to two four-year terms.

The city manager serves as the city's chief administrative officer. He must be a person of demonstrated administrative ability with experience in a responsible important executive capacity. The charter requires him to be chosen by the mayor solely on the basis of his executive and administrative qualifications. He is removable only upon adoption of an ordinance by an affirmative vote of at least five members of an eight-member council.

## **C. St. Petersburg, Florida**

In 1993, St. Petersburg changed its charter from council-manager government to a modified "strong mayor" form. Under the new charter, the mayor, subject to the confirmation of the city council, appoints the city attorney, city clerk, all boards and commissions, and a city administrator who is in charge of the daily operations of the city. The city administrator is required to have had relevant management, executive, or administrative experience in municipal government.

## **VII. CHARTER CHANGE ATTEMPTS THAT FAILED**

During the past decade, seven large cities as well as ten smaller New England municipalities have voted on initiatives to change from council-manager form of government to "strong mayor." All but three attempts have failed. (New charters for Oakland, St. Petersburg, and Amesbury, Massachusetts were approved.) The reasons that some

avored the change seem to be fairly similar: constant feuding among city council members leading to the belief that important decisions were not being made.

### **A. *Cincinnati, Ohio***

Cincinnati, which has had council-manager government since 1925, was generally recognized as being well-governed by competent city managers for many decades. According to knowledgeable observers, that changed in 1987 when councilors were elected who began to "grandstand" and trade insults, to replace city managers frequently (four in five years between 1991-1995), and to abdicate responsibility for important decisions, especially regarding economic development. In spite of the factional disputes on the council, the charter change measure was defeated by voters, reportedly because the initiative was perceived to be supported and financed solely by the business community. (Procter and Gamble alone contributed \$60,000 to the campaign to change the charter.)

### **B. *Hartford, Connecticut***

A 1993 ballot initiative to change the charter to "strong mayor" failed in Hartford as well. Proponents of change argued that the mayor was not providing leadership, even though the mayor under Hartford's city-manager government has considerable power: he is the chief policymaker, has veto power, presides at city council meetings, and appoints and convenes task forces and commissions. Moreover, city councilors were engaged in bickering among themselves. According to newspaper accounts, the voters nonetheless rejected the proposed changes because they believed that giving the mayor the power to appoint the city's chief operating officer and the city attorney (with confirmation from the council) delegated too much power in one person. In addition, voters believed that Hartford is well-managed and fiscally sound compared to more troubled "strong mayor" cities such as Waterbury, Bridgeport, and New Haven. In recent months, however, a new group called Hartford Area Rallies Together (HART) has initiated another discussion about amending the charter to give the mayor more power.

### **C. *Lowell, Massachusetts***

In 1994, there was an attempt to change the charter of Lowell to a "strong mayor" because of a fractious council and its constant pressure on the city manager whose job depends on maintaining a 5-vote majority on the council. The measure was ultimately defeated, according to newspaper accounts, because the economy improved, thereby reducing financial pressures on the council. In addition, a number of economic development projects had been proposed, including a convention center and boxing arena, and a minor league baseball stadium. Also, several major companies announced plans to move into vacant inner-city buildings. Public officials, including the late Senator Paul Tsongas, believed that bringing these projects to fruition required the expertise of a professional manager.

## **VIII. CONCLUSION**

While Worcester's citizens should reflect on the experiences of other communities, they should choose a charter that suits the character and needs of this community. Perhaps the most important criterion for a charter is that its provisions encourage the most qualified and public-spirited individuals to enter public life.

**APPENDIX B**

**CHARTERS OF MASSACHUSETTS CITIES**

<b>CITY</b>	<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>HOW ESTABLISHED</b>	<b>COUNCIL SIZE</b>	<b>DISTRICT/WARD</b>	<b>AT LARGE</b>
Agawam	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	15	12	3
Amesbury	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	9	6	3
Attleboro	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	11	6	5
Barnstable	Council-Manager	Home Rule Charter	11	11	0
Beverly	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	9	6	3
Boston	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	13	9	4
Brockton	Mayor-Council	Plan B			
Cambridge	Council-Manager	Plan E	9	0	9
Chelsea	Council-Manager	Special Act Charter	11	8	3
Chicopee	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	13	9	4
Easthampton	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	9	5	4
Everett	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	25	18	7
Fall River	Mayor-Council	Plan A	9	0	9
Fitchburg	Mayor-Council	Plan B	11		
Franklin	Council-Manager	Home Rule Charter	9	0	9
Gardner	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	11	5	6
Gloucester	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	9	4	5
Haverhill	Mayor-Council	Plan A	9	0	9
Holyoke	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	15	7	8
Lawrence	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	9	6	3
Leominster	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	9	5	4
Lowell	Mayor-Council	Plan E (without PR)	9	0	9
Lynn	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	11	7	4
Malden	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	11	8	3
Marlborough	Mayor-Council	Plan B	11		
Medford	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	7	0	7
Melrose	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	11	7	4
Methuen	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	9	6	3
New Bedford	Mayor-Council	Plan B	11		
Newburyport	Mayor-Council	Plan B	11		
Newton	Mayor-Council	Home Rule Charter	24	8	16
North Adams	Mayor-Council	Plan B	9		
Northampton	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	9	7	2
Peabody	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	11	6	5
Pittsfield	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	11	7	4
Quincy	Mayor-Council	Plan A	9	0	9
Revere	Mayor-Council	Plan B	11		
Salem	Mayor-Council	Plan B	11		
Somerville	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	11	7	4
Southbridge	Council-Manager	Home Rule Charter	13	10	3
Springfield	Mayor-Council	Plan A	9	0	9
Taunton	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	9	0	9
Waltham	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	15	9	6
Watertown	Council-Manager	Home Rule Charter	9	4	5
Westfield	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	11	5	6
Woburn	Mayor-Council	Special Act Charter	9	7	2
Worcester	Council-Manager	Home Rule Charter	11	5	6

Source: Department of Housing and Community Development, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

## APPENDIX A

### Salaries of seven mayors in cities with a population comparable to Worcester's \* (100,000-200,000).

Cities	1990 Population	Mayor's Salary
Chattanooga, TN	152,466	\$105,622
Flint, Michigan	140,761	\$107,565
Fort Wayne, IN	173,072	\$87,418
Providence, RI**	160,728	\$125,000
Springfield, MA	156,983	\$95,000
Syracuse, NY	163,860	\$84,388
Yonkers, NY	183,490	\$115,000

\* Worcester's population was 169,759 according to the 1990 census. The current salary for the mayor is \$18,000. The current salary for the city manager is \$120,821.

\*\* includes \$25,000 expense account

Source: Worcester Municipal Research Bureau