

Citizen Advisory Committee on Governance

Final Report - November 2, 2020
City of Charlotte, NC

PREFACE

At the direction of Mayor Vi Lyles and Mayor Pro Tem Julie Eiselt, the Citizen Advisory Committee on Governance was established to review the current structure of the Charlotte City Council. Included in the report are recommendations made by the Citizens' Committee to be considered for future Charlotte City Council action.

LETTER FROM THE CO-CHAIR

CACG Co-Chair – Amy Peacock

In January 2020, Mayor Lyles and Mayor Pro Tem Julie Eiselt created an ad-hoc committee called the Citizen Advisory Committee on Governance (CACG). The goal was to consider the following charge from Mayor Lyles and to make recommendations to the Charlotte City Council (CLTCC) based on our research and data from both our peer cities across the United States and our fellow North Carolina cities.

1. "Mayor and City Council terms of office including the length of terms, as well as the method of implementation."
2. "Mayor and City Council full- or part-time positions and related compensation."
3. "Updated policy guidelines and principles for City Council redistricting resulting from the results of the 2020 census."

The committee began meeting virtually in March 2020 and had a total of 10 meetings with City staff that concluded October 2020. We developed the following principles to guide our decision-making process for what is best for Charlotte citizens and our elected officials in light of Charlotte's needs and growth:

Guiding Principles:

- Increase voter participation in our local elections.
- Knowing that well-prepared, thoughtful, and long-term strategic discussion and decision-making by the mayor and council members are optimal for the city; consider the length of terms, compensation, number of terms, implementation, and support staff and function.
- Ensure elected officials are well prepared for long-range decision making.
- Create a way elected officials can serve, communicate with, and represent the citizens most effectively.
- All recommendations should ultimately encourage robust interface with citizens, and adequate compensation and support to allow them to engage at an appropriate level with other CLTCC members, citizens, and other interest groups.

The pages that follow represent the Committee's report to the CLTCC and the culmination of more than six months of research and review by the CACG and City staff.

Our diverse committee of Charlotte Democrats, Republicans, and unaffiliated citizens worked exceedingly well together. The respectful behavior enabled the entire team, including staff and the chairs, to facilitate productive meetings resulting in focused discussions. This was even more impressive, because all our meetings were conducted virtually. The committee did not always agree but thankfully, there was no political drama. We got the job done. It was an honor to serve with Cyndee Patterson as co-chair and to see how we can work together for the greater good.

We are grateful to Mayor Vi Lyles and to Mayor Pro Tem Julie Eiselt for the opportunity to take part in this initiative and to City Attorney Patrick Baker; the Strategy and Budget Department; the Department of Human Resources; and the Department of Planning, Design, and Development for all their support.

Most importantly, we believe we have fulfilled the obligations of the Charge and have made reasonable and fair recommendations. We encourage the City of Charlotte City Council to consider these recommendations as they move forward.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Amy Peacock". The signature is written in a dark ink and is positioned above the typed name.

CACG Co-Chair, Amy Peacock

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter from the Committee Co-Chair.....	i-ii
Executive Summary.....	1-2
Introduction.....	3-4
Membership	5
Discussion and Decision Outline	6-11
Recommendations	12-15
Conclusion	16
Appendix.....	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHARGE

At the direction of Mayor Vi Lyles and Mayor Pro Tem Julie Eiselt, the Citizen Advisory Committee on Governance (CACG) was established to review the current structure of the Charlotte City Council.

The CACG is an ad hoc committee charged with the detailed consideration of, and recommendation for council action on, the following issues:

- Mayor and City Council terms of office, as well as method of implementation,
- Mayor and City Council full- or part-time positions and related compensation, and
- Updated policy guidelines and principles for City Council from the results of the 2020 Census.

MEMBERSHIP

The CACG is a diverse 12-member group of Charlotte residents including: Co-Chair Cyndee Patterson, Co-Chair Amy Peacock, Kristen Conner, Mimi Davis, Christy Long, Brandon Pierce, Cecy Ramirez, Janice Robinson, Rev. Eleanor Norman Shell, Sam Smith Jr., Peter Smolowitz, and Liz Winer.

METHODOLOGY

The CACG had a total of 10 meetings from March through October 2020. To inform their recommendations, the Committee requested information concerning methods of election, compensation, and length of terms for cities comparable to Charlotte and for North Carolina jurisdictions.

Throughout the discussions and the related votes, the group had a polite and engaging exchange of ideas that covered a range of perspectives.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY continued

RECOMMENDATIONS

In presenting our recommendations below, the overarching result we want to have is more representation for Charlotte residents and to help Charlotte's Mayor and City Council to manage their elected office and engage with citizens most efficiently while they are serving in office. We also want to ensure that good, qualified people are able to run for office. We do not want to dissuade the best and brightest from running for office.

Item	Recommendation	CACG Vote Count
Elected officials' terms of office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four-year terms • Staggered elections • Two term limits contingent on four-year terms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8-3 • 10-1 • 10-1
Method of implementation for four-year terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens' Referendum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7-4
Election method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-partisan elections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6-5
Elected officials' compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase Mayor and City Council Compensation • Increase Mayor and City Council Compensation to be comparable to that of the Mecklenburg County Board of County Commissioners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimous • Unanimous
Updated policy guidelines on representation and districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep the number of council members at 12 (11 council members + Mayor) • Add a district representative and remove an at-large representative • The Committee developed factors to consider when redistricting which can be found in the recommendations section 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7-4 • Unanimous

INTRODUCTION

Our Charge

At the direction of Mayor Vi Lyles and Mayor Pro Tem Julie Eiselt, the Citizen Advisory Committee on Governance (CACG) was established to review the current structure of the Charlotte City Council.

The CACG is an ad hoc committee charged with the detailed consideration of, and recommendation for council action on, the following issues:

- Mayor and City Council terms of office, as well as method of implementation,
- Mayor and City Council full- or part-time positions and related compensation, and
- Updated policy guidelines and principles for City Council from the results of the 2020 Census.

Our Methodology

The Committee began regular meetings on June 25, 2020, and requested information concerning methods of election, compensation, and length of terms for cities comparable to Charlotte and for North Carolina jurisdictions. Main sources of data the Committee reviewed included:

- Surveys of Charlotte's 20 peer cities,
- Surveys of U.S. Top 10 Council-Manager cities,
- Surveys of North Carolina cities,
- Data from the Institute of Government on all cities in North Carolina (looking at jurisdictions with populations over 50,000),
- Data from Mecklenburg County's Board of Elections,
- City of Charlotte historical records, and
- A Public Input Survey.

Throughout the discussions and the related votes, the group had a polite and engaging exchange of ideas that covered a range of perspectives.

Our Meetings and Outreach

While the Committee was established in January of 2020, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, we held initial meetings via Zoom and did not meet regularly until June of 2020. There were 10 total meetings from March 19 until October 15, 2020. Regular Committee meetings were advertised to the public through the City of Charlotte's Citywide Calendar and were broadcast on the City's YouTube Channel and the Government Channel.

INTRODUCTION Continued

One of the main objectives in establishing the CACG was to encourage and increase engagement surrounding the issue of Charlotte City Council's current structure, elected officials' compensation, and potential district criteria in light of the 2020 Census.

In addition to meetings, the Committee also had the following available to receive public feedback:

- An e-mail box available for public input cacg@charlottenc.gov
- A public input survey
 - Distributed to solicit public feedback in a virtual meeting environment
 - Distributed from September 21, 2020 - October 2, 2020
 - 681 total survey responses
 - 179 individual comments

Given the anticipated continued level of public interest surrounding these issues, the Committee will have this report posted to the CACG Webpage to allow for ample opportunity for substantial public consideration for a potential voter ballot initiative in 2021.

MEMBERSHIP

Our Committee

The Committee consisted of 12 members and included representatives from each Council District (1-7) and a mix of Democrats, Republicans and unaffiliated voters.

- **Co-Chair Cyndee Patterson**, Lynwood Foundation
- **Co-Chair Amy Peacock**, VirtualAthlete, LLC and Non-profit Board Chair
- **Kristen Conner**, Keller Williams SouthPark
- **Mimi Davis**, Retired Teacher
- **Christy Long**, Wells Fargo
- **Brandon Pierce**, Coca-Cola Consolidated – Culture & Stewardship
- **Cecy Ramirez**, Hispanic Community Leader
- **Janice Robinson**, Cabarrus College
- **Rev. Eleanor Norman Shell**, Presbytery of Charlotte and Non-profit Consultant
- **Sam Smith Jr.**, United Way of Central Carolinas
- **Peter Smolowitz**, Mower
- **Liz Winer**, Winer Family Foundation

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OUTLINE

We used the following “Discussion and Decision Outline” below (also in the appendix) to guide our conversations and related votes. We wanted to provide it as a tool for your future discussion on these key issues.

Discussion & Decision Outline:

The outline below seeks to summarize CACG’s meetings, discussions, documents, and articles reviewed, along with a public survey we conducted. The outline served as a framework for debate and discussion for the CACG committee and city staff. Most importantly, CACG believes this framework could be used by the Mayor and Charlotte City Council members to discuss, debate, and eventually decide whether to take any action.

Guiding Principles Summary: Consider what is the best desired outcome for the citizens of Charlotte, how to help elected officials be more prepared to serve the citizens, and how to encourage more voter turnout.

Term of Office; Staggered vs. Non-Staggered; Partisan vs. Non-Partisan; Term Limits; & Methods of Modification

A. Two Year Terms (current model)

1. Advantages
 - a. More responsive to changes/ needs of citizens. More accountability to voters.
 - b. CLTCC members are treated no differently than members of Congress & North Carolina General Assembly
 - c. Term length/ time commitment is seen as less of impediment for those seeking to run for office.
 - d. Voters and previous committees have previously decided they prefer this system.
2. Disadvantages
 - a. Current two-year terms are on an “off year” year cycle occurring on odd years, often resulting in lower voter participation.
 - b. Two-year term lengths are often viewed as reactive and shorter-term in scope.
 - c. Incumbents often express frustration and challenges of running a campaign and serving in the position.

OUTLINE Continued

- d. With the current, non-staggered model, a majority of the council, if not all the members, could change in one election cycle, resulting in a lack of continuity or insufficient experience levels to be effective.

B. Four Year Terms

1. Advantages / Key Facts

- a. Seeks to establish a body with longer-term decision making in mind.
- b. Those in elected office are not “always running,” hopefully feeling less inclined to make decisions with reelection always center of mind.
- c. 80% of Charlotte’s peer cities have four-year terms.
- d. Of the 393 jurisdictions in North Carolina, 351 use staggered terms. That includes eight of the 11 cities whose populations top 50,000.

2. Disadvantages / Key Facts

- a. Could be less responsive to rapidly changing needs / concerns of citizens.
- b. Time commitment for service, particularly for those working full-time, could be an impediment for some seeking to serve in the office.
- c. Non- staggered, four- year terms, could result in a significant loss of experience & continuity in one election cycle.
- d. Voter disapproval: the past results of voter referendums has shown voters are against the move from 2- year to 4-year terms.

Note: Charlotte Mayor and City Council Election Data 1975-2020:

Mayor: Average # of years served: 4.7 years

City Council: Average # of years served all council members: 5.7 years

At-large: Average # of years served: 5.68 years

District: Average # of years served: 5.8 years

86.7% of incumbent mayors have won since 1975

90% of incumbent city council members have won since 1975

Note: Mecklenburg County:

Mecklenburg County Commission has 2-year terms with non-staggered elections

Mecklenburg County School Board has 4-year terms with staggered elections

OUTLINE Continued

C. Maintaining Partisan Elections

1. Advantages
 - a. Party affiliation remains a driving decision factor for voters.
 - b. Party affiliation may help lesser known, non-incumbent, candidates improve chances of winning more often.
 - c. Partisan elections may reduce the financial burden on individual candidates.
 - d. Voter participation seems to be traditionally higher in partisan elections.

2. Disadvantages/ Key Facts
 - a. With over 30% of the Charlotte voters being registered unaffiliated, the process for candidates to run as “unaffiliated” has more hurdles to get on a ballot, and there have been very few unaffiliated candidates for office.

D. Changing to Non- Partisan Election

1. Advantages/ Key Facts
 - a. 93.3% of NC jurisdictions are non-partisan.
 - b. Local issues such a public safety, transit, solid waste, etc. are generally viewed as “non-partisan” by voters.
 - c. Non-partisan offices could be more appealing for registered unaffiliated citizens who might seek to run for these office(s).
 - d. Some believe that elected officials serving in non-partisan positions will result in less partisan rancor or division within the elected body.
 - e. According to the League of Cities, more than 75% of all municipalities nationwide hold nonpartisan elections, including 22 of the country’s 30 largest cities.
 - f. 18 out of 20 peer cities hold non-partisan elections.

2. Disadvantages / Key Facts
 - a. The two major parties could be less likely to put full support behind candidates in non-partisan races.
 - b. Voter participation is often lower in non-partisan races.
 - c. Without party support, many non-partisan candidates struggle to raise sufficient monies needed to reach voters as effectively as partisan races.

OUTLINE Continued

E. Term Limits

1. Advantages / Key Facts
 - a. Of the Charlotte's national 20 peer cities, 11 have term limits.
2. Disadvantages / Key Facts
 - a. No NC jurisdictions have term limits.
 - b. To impose term limits, NC General Assembly would have to pass special legislation.
 - c. Seeking special legislation is often a matter of timing and has historically not worked in the favor of Charlotte on many issues. We want good relationships with Raleigh and peer cities.
3. Methods of Modification for Changing from 2 to 4 Year Terms and Term Limits
 - a. The North Carolina General Assembly may amend the Charter by local act.
 - b. CLTCC may amend by ordinance; subject to approval by the voters at referendum.
 - c. CLTCC may amend by ordinance without a referendum. However, 5,000 signatures on a petition filed within 30 days may force a referendum.

Decision(s) to consider

1. Remain a 2 year, non-staggered, term? Change to staggered 2-year term?
2. Amend to become a 4-year term? Staggered? Non- Staggered?
3. Remain partisan election?
4. Amend to become non-partisan?
5. Despite not being allow under NC statutes, would you recommend the CLTCC & their legislative team request that the NCGA pass legislation to impose term limits?
6. What is the method of modification? Request General Assembly amend charter? Voter referendum? CLTCC amend ordinance?

Mayor & CLTCC Compensation: Full-Time vs. Part-Time; & Benchmarking

A. Full- vs. Part-Time

1. The NC G.S. do not designate a "full-time" or "part-time" position within local government.

OUTLINE Continued

2. All of the N.C. jurisdictions reviewed have a “part time” mayor and council. Because Charlotte and most cities in NC are established as “Council- Manager” form of governments, board members do not actually run or operate a city / town in NC, they are operated by full-time municipal employees.
3. The terms full- vs. part-time are most often associated with the level of compensation a council member receives for their service and the actual decision-making authority they are granted.

B. Compensation Benchmarking

1. We reviewed information from cities across the nation and throughout North Carolina.
2. A summary of compensation both locally & nationally is as follows (Aside from Charlotte, other jurisdictions may also have allowances when considering total compensation):
 - a. City of Charlotte
 - i. Mayor Total Compensation: \$45,096 (Base Salary: \$27,196; Annual expense allowance: \$10,000; Annual auto allowance \$4,800; Annual technology allowance \$3,100)
 - ii. City Council Total Compensation: \$33,915 (Base Salary: \$21,015; Annual expense allowance: \$5,800; Annual auto allowance: \$4,000; Annual technology allowance \$3,100)
 - b. Mecklenburg County
 - i. Board Chair Total Compensation: \$56,431 (Base Salary: \$37,370; Annual expense allowance: \$9,233; Annual auto allowance: \$4,893; Annual technology allowance: \$4,935)
 - ii. MCBOCC Total Compensation: \$48,563 (Base Salary: \$29,894; Annual expense allowance: \$9,233 Annual auto allowance: \$4,501; Annual technology allowance \$4,935)
 - c. NC Cities & Counties
 - i. Average Mayor Compensation: \$32,756
 - ii. Average City Council Total Compensation: \$25,457
 - d. 20 Charlotte Peer Cities
 - i. Mayor total compensation: \$130,879
 - ii. City Council Total Compensation: \$59,750
 - e. Council- Manager Cities
 - i. Mayor Total Compensation: \$78,717
 - ii. City Council Total Compensation: \$48,336

OUTLINE Continued

3. One correlated element to how much a board member is paid is the elected body's supporting staff and administrative structure.
 - a. In NC, elected officials are most often supported by the City Clerk's office and the City Manager's office.
 - b. Currently, the Mayor is supported by three staff members with an average pay of \$92,983.
 - c. Currently, the CLTCC is supported by seven staff members dedicated to the council. The average salary for those staff members is \$66,549.

Decision(s) to consider

1. Mayor's total compensation: Remain same? Increase?
2. CLTCC member's total compensation: Remain same? Increase?

Composition of the Elected Body

1. Current
 - a. 7 District (Voted by district).
 - b. 4 At Large (Voted by all).

Decision(s) to consider

1. Balance Districts
2. Increase number of council members from 11 to 12 or more to meet demands of 2020 Census population?
3. Add another district representative or at-large representative? Note: Max of 12 (11 council members plus mayor equals a total of 12).
4. Keep the number of council members at 11 but change composition? Add a district representative for 8 district representatives and reduce at large representation to 3.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In presenting our recommendations below, the overarching result we want to have is more representation for Charlotte residents and to help Charlotte’s Mayor and City Council to manage their elected office and engage with citizens most efficiently while they are serving in office. We also want to ensure that good, qualified people are able to run for office. We also do not want to dissuade the best and brightest from running for office.

Our Recommendations

Item	Recommendation	Vote Count
Elected officials’ terms of office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four-year terms • Staggered elections • Two term limits contingent on four-year terms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8-3 • 10-1 • 10-1
Method of implementation for four-year terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens’ Referendum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7-4
Election method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-partisan elections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6-5
Elected officials’ compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase Mayor and City Council Compensation • Increase Mayor and City Council Compensation to be comparable to that of the Mecklenburg County Board of County Commissioners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimous • Unanimous
Updated policy guidelines on representation and districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep the number of council members at 12 (11 council members + Mayor) • Add a district representative and remove an at-large representative • The Committee developed factors to consider when redistricting which can be found in the recommendations section 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7-4 • Unanimous

RECOMMENDATIONS Continued

- **Switch to four-year terms:** Currently, the mayor and council members serve two-year terms. By an 8-3 vote, we recommend the mayor and council members instead serve four-year terms.

The majority said this would help the CLTCC work collaboratively, have more time to understand the job, and avoid election-year politics. The minority noted this idea has been rejected by Mecklenburg County voters in previous referendums, as well as by a bipartisan panel co-chaired in 2010 by Mayors Harvey Gantt and Richard Vinroot.

If the CLTCC agrees with the switch to four-year terms, then we also recommend the following:

- **Referendum:** By a 7-4 vote, we recommend CLTCC hold a referendum on the move to four-year terms. We think voters should have a say.
 - **Term limits:** By a 10-1 vote, we recommend council members be limited to two terms. If council members serve a longer, 4-year term, we believe the number of terms they serve should be limited.
 - **Staggered elections:** By a 10-1 vote, we recommend that every two years, half the seats on the council will be up for election. This would mean even with council members serving four-year terms, voters would still have a say every two years.
- **Nonpartisan elections:** Currently, the City of Charlotte has partisan elections, where voters see the name of a party listed next to the name of the candidate on the ballot. In this type of election, Republicans must vote in the Republican primary, and Democrats must vote in the Democratic primary. Unaffiliated voters may choose the Democrat, Libertarian, Republican ballot in a primary election. In general elections, voters can choose any candidate regardless of party affiliation. The nonpartisan election method is one in which candidates do not have party affiliations listed on the ballot in either the primary or general election.

By a 6-5 vote, we recommend Charlotte stop listing the party affiliations of candidates for CLTCC. The committee majority said party affiliations matter less at the local level than at the state or national level. Our group also noted that according to the League of Cities, more than 75% of all municipalities nationwide hold nonpartisan elections, including 22 of the country's 30 largest cities. The minority said party affiliations help inform voters about differences among candidates.

RECOMMENDATIONS Continued

- **Higher pay:** We unanimously recommend a pay raise for both the mayor and council members. We looked at 20 peer cities. The pay for Charlotte's Mayor ranked 18 out of 20, making Charlotte's Mayor the third lowest paid mayor. Charlotte City Council members are paid less than 13 of its peer cities. We looked at the 7 peer cities with the Council-Manager form of government including Charlotte - We rank 5 out of 7 on mayor pay, yet for council pay we are the highest. Most of these Council-Manager run cities have populations smaller than Charlotte.
- We noted the lower level of compensation may dissuade some highly qualified candidates from running for office, because it's difficult to both have a full-time job and represent the city as an elected official.
 - **Match the salary of the county commissioners:** We recommend raising the pay for the mayor and council to be comparable to that of the Chair of the Mecklenburg County Commissioners and the rest of the board. We considered that an appropriate benchmark.
- **Add a district representative:** We voted unanimously to recommend adding an eighth district representative and removing one at-large position from the CLTCC. Thus, the CLTCC would consist of eight district representatives, three at-large representatives, and a mayor. Our analysis found that the Charlotte's average district size is 112,546. The average district size of NC State House of Representatives is 79,462. CLTCC therefore has 33,084 more citizens per district. With Charlotte growing exponentially, there should be smaller districts and overall, better balance among those districts, with no outliers. Further, Charlotte voters should have more of a say in what's happening in their parts of the growing city.
- **Remain at 12 council members:** We considered adding an additional council member to the CLTCC, the maximum allowed by state law. This would have added an eighth district seat without removing an at-large seat; however, it would significantly change the relationship between the mayor and the council members. Our committee voted 7-4 against taking this step.

RECOMMENDATIONS Continued

- **District Criteria:** In light of the 2020 US Census, the City will draw new Council Districts. We would recommend that the City seek ways for each district to be balanced in a manner that includes an equal number of residents, a goal outlined during the previous Census count. We also recommend that neighborhoods and precincts should not be divided and that, if possible, there would be equal number of districts with either left-or right-leaning voters. **Recommended District Criteria includes the following:**
 - Importance of the First Order (Highest)
 - Districts must have substantially equal population (Required).
 - Districts should be reasonably compact (Strongly recommend).
 - District boundaries may follow neighborhood boundaries or the boundaries of areas containing residents sharing similar interests.
 - Importance of the Second Order
 - When possible, districts should have relatively even partisan balance. District boundaries may be drawn to create/maintain balance between major political parties.
 - District boundaries may follow precinct boundaries.
 - District boundaries may be drawn considering the race of district residents as long as race is not the predominant motivating factor.
 - District(s) most likely to be impacted by future annexations may be smaller to minimize impact of future annexations on future re-districting
 - District boundaries may be drawn to avoid contests between incumbents.

CONCLUSION

The charge we had from Mayor Lyles was very important, something she emphasized during a call with our committee. We took her advice to not look at issues separately, but rather consider how the issues and options inter-relate.

As a committee, we took our job seriously, researching and comparing the peer city data and legal advice brought to us by staff for each of our meetings. We talked to our associates and neighbors, and debated different viewpoints in a respectful manner, so we could come to a conclusion in a positive and productive way. We realize these matters are passionate to many in Charlotte as we grow and the key decisions made on recommendations impact not only the Mayor and Charlotte City Council in the future, but in a way, the future of all of Charlotte.

According to the US Census, Charlotte has grown approximately 20% every ten years since 2000. The Comprehensive Plan also indicates that from 2020-2040 Charlotte is expected to grow by over 212,000 jobs and 385,000 people.

In this light, we as a committee recommend the council put these items on their agenda for discussion *and* action. And, further, to have a rigorous and respectful debate amongst elected officials and the Charlotte community.

Thank you to Mayor Lyles and Mayor Pro Tem Julie Eiselt for spearheading this important mission. We on the CACG look forward to seeing CLTCC work together on our recommendations. Please reach out to cacg@charlottenc.gov or your CLTCC representative(s), if you would like to provide additional feedback.

APPENDIX

All appendix files may be found included in the final report posted to the CACG Webpage.

1. Letter from Mayor Vi Lyles
2. CACG Discussion and Decision Outline
3. Procedures for Modification of Form of Government and Election Methods
4. Executive Summary of Data Collection
5. Mayor and City Council Compensation Overview
6. General Information: Charlotte “Benchmark” Cities
7. Charlotte Benchmark Cities: Mayor Base Pay and Total Compensation
8. Charlotte Benchmark Cities: City Council Base Pay and Total Compensation
9. Charlotte Benchmark Cities: District Size
10. General Information: North Carolina Cities
11. North Carolina Cities: Mayor Base Pay and Total Compensation
12. North Carolina Cities: City Council Base Pay and Total Compensation
13. Charlotte Benchmark Cities and North Carolina Cities: Council - Manager Comparison
14. City of Charlotte Mayor and City Council Compensation Historical Data
15. Mayor and Council Support Staff Compensation Survey
16. UNC SOG Nonpartisan versus Partisan Election Method
17. Forms of Government and Methods of Election in North Carolina
18. History of local elections in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County
19. City of Charlotte Mayor and Council Election Stats 1975-2019
20. 2000 and 2010 Factors that may be Considered in Redistricting
21. CACG Survey Results
22. CACG Survey Demographic Information
23. CACG Survey Comments