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ABSTRACT

This research project attempts to set up the foundation upon which a three to four year graduate thesis can be undertaken to specifically study the office of mayor in the City of Riverside. This research project also outlines the broad problems associated with municipal government in California, including problems facing the City of Riverside. As a result of these perceived problems, the newly elected mayor of Riverside, Ronald O. Loveridge, plans to gradually strengthen the mayor's office from a relatively weak, ceremonial office to a strong mayor form of government.

This research project will examine some of the advantages and disadvantages associated with this shift in the mayoral form of government in the City of Riverside. A comparison will also be made with the City of San Bernardino which already has a strong mayor form of government. A detailed description of the various forms of municipal governments and relative powers of the mayor's office will also be included.

This research project will not provide any conclusions or results, but will instead lay the foundations for future research. Survey design along with statistical analysis will provide the necessary tools needed to gather data to test the hypotheses presented in this project. Final conclusions and results, together with samples of the survey designs used will be included in the final thesis which will be
presented to the faculty of the University of California, Riverside, department of political science.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research project is to describe and develop a research design to study the comparative effectiveness of the various structural forms of the office of mayor in small to medium population U.S. cities. The focus is on California. Medium sized cities are defined as less than 300,000 people, and no less than 100,000. Small cities are defined as fewer than 100,000, but at least 15,000. For purposes of this paper, fewer than 15,000 people represents too small a population, and probably a very limited government in terms of size and services delivered.

The final sections of this paper will focus on the present situation within the mayor's office in the City of Riverside. Both the strengths and weaknesses of the present office, as well as which groups seem to benefit from the status quo and which are excluded or viewed negatively will also be examined. Next, these strengths and weaknesses will be examined in each of the various mayor forms introduced in the research phase of this paper. Finally, recommendations as to which form seems most appropriate for Riverside will be chosen, including explanations as to why, and who will likely benefit or be at a disadvantage. Current Mayor Loveridge's views on what the mayor's office should be will be taken into consideration, as well as the literature on the subject of the mayor's office.
The newly elected mayor of Riverside, Ronald O. Loveridge, seeks to expand the powers and scope of the mayor's office. At present, it is unclear in which directions Loveridge will proceed, and what exact changes he has in mind. His intent in general is to strengthen the powers of the office to more closely resemble those of a strong mayor, perhaps similar to those of the mayor of San Bernardino. A strong mayor is defined as one who has final authority in the administrative hierarchy of the bureaucracy, and has the power to fire and hire the chief executive officer. In addition, a strong mayor must be a legal part of the city council, and should have control over agenda setting and officiate council meetings. Further, the limits of this power would include the right to vote as part of the council, the right to veto and the right to introduce new legislation onto the agenda. These are of course rare in most cities throughout California. Most strong mayors do not have the right to vote, but do have some combination of the other powers listed, and even some beyond these.

Given the nature of today's complex intergovernmental system, local city council representatives find themselves increasingly overburdened with requests by the public, as well as by a growing number of complex issues facing local governments. Given the financial and time constraints of most city council members, their ability to deal with these issues in a professional and adequate manner is simply not possible. Many council members argue change is needed. Most see a need for full-time councils, more staff for
support and research, as well as more money; including greater allowances for travel to various meetings. Considering the public's current unfavorable views of spending by politicians and pay increases, these requests are not likely to be approved by voters in the near future.

It may, however, be more realistic and possible to alter the mayor's office to deal with these complex issues facing local government. It is financially cheaper to increase the salary and budget for only one person than to increase the salaries and budgets for a multi-member council. In addition, it is more common to find full-time mayors as opposed to full-time councils. A mayor is also seen as more of a leadership position, and may therefore find it easier to get the public to grant increased powers to the mayor. This is also tied to the fact that there is greater accountability with a single individual than there is with a multi-member council.

Taking into consideration the fact that the residents of Riverside may not entirely agree with Mayor Loveridge's plans for reform of the office, these views must also be accounted for. No solution will be ideal, for any solution will invariably call for some to win and some to lose. When considering change, those who support the status quo usually have the most to lose, and will therefore give the greatest resistance to change. This issue of which groups supports change and which do not will be analyzed, and recommendations will be made on how to implement the new form in the current political context. As is often said of politics, compromise is the key ingredient.
With an understanding of these and other problems, Loveridge instituted a call for reform, and measure J, placed on the November 1994 ballot passed. Measure J called for a charter revision, with an emphasis on strengthening the mayor's office and its powers. The charter review committee will make recommendations to the council, which will then vote on them. If the review committee is successful, and can convince the council to change the charter, then Loveridge will get his first chance to test the hypothesis that a strong mayor in today's complex intergovernmental system can make a positive difference. The following sections will examine this hypothesis, and will also try to determine if a strong mayor is in fact beneficial, and if so, what the benefits and possible negative effects are.
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is three-fold. The first purpose is to attempt to accurately describe the various political structures of local government, as well as examine the role and legislative powers of mayors' offices within each. The second goal is to describe the expected outcomes of increasing mayors' powers within these structural forms of local government. The third purpose is to utilize the City of Riverside as a case study to determine whether a general shift to increase the mayor's power will yield the results anticipated by Riverside's current mayor.
PROBLEM

Introduction

This section examines the perceived problems of government at all levels, with specific attention to California and local municipalities. Over the past several decades, citizens have grown increasingly critical and dissatisfied with the manner in which governments perform their basic functions. Questions of what governments should and should not do is not clear. Yet one thing is clear, people in general perceive problems and an inability by government to solve those problems. Crime, drugs, education, decent and clean cities, have become common complaints of many citizens. The following examination of why government has become dysfunctional begins at state and federal levels, and then focuses specifically on California and local municipalities.

Problems at the State and Federal Level

Since the Great Depression, the size of the federal government has grown dramatically. In addition to this, there are now over 83,000 units of local government alone.(Levine 1) To complicate matters, many new governments developed into new and overlapping layers within state and local governments. The rise of special districts and special agencies were typical of these new local governments. Some of these new agencies developed strong powers
such as the SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District) which is responsible for reducing air pollution in southern California.

The development of the S.C.A.Q.M.D. was a direct result of the passage of new environmental laws at the federal level. Concern about the environment led many groups to lobby the federal government into taking action and cleaning up the environment. The federal government responded, and California met its mandates through the SCAQMD. This approach by the federal government to rely on state and special agencies is becoming typical of the federal government's response to increased demands for new programs and services by voters.

This new maze of governments not only makes it unclear to the public what is going on and who is responsible, but it also confuses government agencies in their relationships. Sometimes it is not clear who is accountable to whom, when, and why. The new maze, it seems, only adds confusion, new rules and regulations, and deprives many traditional governments such as municipalities and counties, of the power and autonomy they once had.

Traditionally, the federal government and the states relied on local governments to provide many basic services and to be the layer of government which people would generally rely on for services and problem solving. Many of these services were administered and financed by local municipalities. During the 1970's and 1980's, this ability of local governments in California to serve the public was greatly reduced. With the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978,
California's local governments lost a great amount of their property tax revenues. This made it hard for local governments to provide the level of services to which citizens had grown accustomed.

The situation worsened and by the late 1980's, the federal government was experiencing major problems with deficits and the federal debt. Financial transfers to states and local governments began to dry up. At the same time, effects of the Reagan Presidency also were being felt. Reagan shifted many programs back to the states, and from the states down to local governments. "Unfunded state mandated programs" became a common and disliked term to local governments. California also had deficits to deal with, and began to shift even more program costs down to the local levels. This situation made it extremely hard for local governments to balance their own budgets, while at the same time provide the services demanded of them.
Trends in California

If California were an independent nation, its economy would rank sixth in the world, with an annual gross product of $550 billion. (Gerston and Christensen 7) California has a diverse economy and population. The state varies greatly from its northern half to its southern portions in terms of both climate and geography to population and ethnic diversity. California has 58 counties and some 453 cities as of 1991. (Gerston and Christensen 79) Most big cities, about 80 in California, are charter cities.

California was given statehood in 1850. Since its incorporation into the United States, California has seen tremendous growth, often in cycles. The first wave of people came to California in the late 1840's with the gold rush. More waves, especially immigrants from China followed, mainly utilized as a source of cheap labor. After the turn of the century, California was largely an agricultural state. Large citrus groves dominated the southern California landscape, with more traditional farms located in the north. After the great depression, a new wave of temporary residents came to the state for training and to work in government war plants, producing military equipment to be used in the Second World War.

After returning from the war, many people came back to California to live permanently. This last boom in the population saw southern California transform from citrus crops to new urban cities and suburban sprawl. It was the beginning of the 1950's, and the
beginning of California's urban problems which still plague the state today, and are the source of many current problems.

This tremendous growth of urban areas led to a scattering of small cities throughout the southern California basin. Those cities closely linked to Los Angeles by the new freeway system, which at that time was ever expanding, soon became connected as one urban whole. As the years passed, and freeways allowed people to move farther away from the Los Angeles basin, this sprawl of urban building also expanded. People soon found themselves traveling anywhere from 30 to over 100 miles to work each day. In addition to urban sprawl, air pollution also began to increase and become a serious problem. Efforts to reduce pollution and ease gridlock on the freeways became a priority concern of many municipalities in the region.

As California developed, it did so largely in the absence of public transportation. It was toward the end of the 1930's when California last had an effective and vital public transportation system. The auto manufacturers together with freeway contractors, oil companies, and insurance companies, won the battle over the question of transportation, and California was from that point on going to be a car society. In addition, an excess of open land made it easy for developers to build and expand, adding more roadways and suburbs by the hundreds.

The movement of many middle and upper class residents out of inner cities such as Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Diego, has
contributed in part to the sprawl and growth of suburban neighborhoods. These major metropolitan cities began to be inundated with problems of crime, urban decay, poorly planned and managed growth, inadequate government response and an inability to deal with many problems. There was also a strain on natural resources such as air and water. Second, there has emerged a two tier society comprised of mainly white and Asian, middle class, educated citizens living in suburbia compared with mainly black and Hispanic, poor, less educated citizens living in the inner cities. This trend has caused the inner city to decay, as has happened with Los Angeles, and put new pressures on those governments for a variety of programs, ranging from police protection to welfare and other social programs. In the suburban areas, governments have been pressed with issues related to growth, including expanded government services, more schools, parks, and so forth.

The California lifestyle has been great for some and devastating for others. California now faces the complex and unclear issues of how to resolve these problems. From air pollution to failing educational systems, to infrastructure decay, the problems are as diverse as will be the solutions needed to solve them. At present, there is more competition going on in California among government agencies than there is cooperation and unified leadership to begin the task of addressing these issues. The maze of governments in California has led to gridlock. Getting California and its maze of governments to cooperate will take leadership.
This lack of cooperation and solutions has had direct consequences on many municipalities. The confusion and gridlock has caused many city governments to find solutions on their own, and to compete with neighboring cities for resources like shopping malls, desirable development and federal grant money. Many cities have developed informal policies of protectionism and home rule. Suburban cities do not want to become entangled in the problems of the urban cities, while urban cities try to work together with suburbs to comply with federal and state regulations concerning air quality, infrastructure repairs, and transportation issues, just to name a few. The situation is indeed grave for California cities, and the trends of the nineteenth century will have to be altered in some manner if California cities are to deal effectively with the problems caused by these trends. To gain a full insight into the southern California region, an examination of the city of Riverside, and its situation will serve as a good example of a suburban city fighting to protect its image and keep out crime, while attempting to work more effectively with other governments to address some of the problems outlined above.
Problems Facing the City of Riverside

Before the problems of more government and declining revenues arose, many cities could easily afford to let the bureaucracy at city hall run day-to-day operations. Many had only part-time city councils that primarily served as watchdog groups, and occasionally brought reform or new programs. The atmosphere was one of older council members who really did not do much. All of this changed with the growth of these new problems. Many cities were faced with unprecedented demands that the bureaucracy could not address, at least entirely. It was now up to councils to make the hard choices of how to balance budgets, and in many cases where to cut. The councils were often unprepared and ill-equipped to handle such new tasks. As the years passed, voters increasingly became frustrated with caretaker councils. Action was called for, but rarely delivered.

This frustration was felt in Riverside. For the first time in a long while, younger, active council members were elected to deal with the growing issues of the day. Voters wanted the council to be more responsive, to address the problems, and to be active. In the midst of all this, the mayor was typically overlooked as the key to this activism. In Riverside, the mayor primarily officiated council meetings and performed various ceremonial duties. Yet the mayor was the only elected official who served full-time at city hall. In 1994, Ronald O. Loveridge was elected mayor and moved to
invigorate the mayor's office through his leadership style. Based on the election results, the voters approved.

Loveridge, a political science professor at the University of California, Riverside, planned an aggressive campaign that always centered on what an active mayor could do for Riverside. He constantly campaigned on the situation and complexity of the southern California region. He also promised to better represent Riverside in this maze of confusion and show how executive leadership could make a difference.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The questions this research project addresses are:

1) What effect will increasing the powers of the mayor's office have on local government, especially at the legislative/political level?

2) What are the advantages/disadvantages of a strong mayor in terms of:
   (a) accountability
   (b) effectiveness
   (c) efficiency
   (d) political power
   (e) administrative power
   (f) leadership abilities
   (g) ethics
   (h) possibilities for political corruption
   (i) possibilities of positive change

3) Should municipalities adopt stronger mayoral systems, and if so under what conditions and with how much power?

4) Are stronger mayors more able than weak mayors to ease the problems of gridlock within city hall and lessen the negative perceptions of local government by the public?
5) Can stronger mayors facilitate more positive intergovernmental relations than weak mayors and return lost powers of revenue raising and fiscal responsibility to the city level?
HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1 - Stronger mayors have more political power and influence than do weaker mayors to shape public policy and enhance their legislative role within the city council.

Hypothesis 2 - Stronger mayors exert greater influence and control over a technical city bureaucracy than do weaker mayors with no powers of appointment, through the appointment of the chief executive and potentially department heads.

Hypothesis 3 - An additional source of power and influence for both strong and weak mayors are the size and scope of their agendas. Larger agendas do not necessarily mean additional power and influence will be gained, but in most cases, they provide for more power and influence than was possible before. It also is hypothesized that larger agendas mean more divided government and the creation of new opponents within the government and especially within the city council.

Hypothesis 4 - Active mayors are perceived more favorably than
inactive mayors in the eyes of: (a) the public, (b) the business community, and (c) the press. This applies to both weak and strong forms, though more so in stronger forms. However, the same situation may exist as in Hypothesis 3: new confrontations may arise, as well as new opponents, due to a more active agenda and personal schedule.

Hypothesis 5 - With an increase in mayoral activism and political and administrative power comes the benefit of a greater public good, and the possible cost of damaging the commonwealth. Dangers in granting more power to a single individual are ever present in politics. The common adage is that, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Absolute power is of course not the aim here, but increasing the power of mayors through greater financial and political resources, may yield positive as well as negative results. This depends on those who are elected and how they discharge their duties, both within the context of the city and beyond to neighboring jurisdictions such as counties, other cities and special districts. Hence, if a stronger mayor is realized, then the risk to the public good
will also increase. The public good is defined here as a broad set of values as well as quantifiable outputs deemed valuable and beneficial by the public.
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

1) The independent variable is increasing the power of the mayor in order to create a strong mayor form of government. Power is defined here as both political and administrative. In terms of political power, strong mayors typically have the right to vote on ordinances, introduce new ordinances, veto, and act in a leadership role within the framework of the council. In terms of administrative powers, strong mayors typically have the powers to oversee the budget process, employ the city chief administrative officer and also department heads, with the approval of the council. In addition, mayors sit atop the city bureaucracy, playing a "chief administrator' role.

2) The dependent variables are:

A) Expected increase in the effectiveness of strong mayors to forward their personal agendas. It is expected that an increase in the powers of mayors enhances their political powers vis-a-vis fellow council members, as well as assume more leadership roles within the councils. This, in turn, should make the mayors' agendas of items more prominent, and therefore more likely to be considered for adoption by city councils.
B) Expected increase in the visibility of mayors in local political events. It is expected that through a more active and involved role, strong mayors will assume more prominence within their communities and at important events. While a ceremonial role will also greatly expose mayors to many events, strong mayors will choose those events deemed worthy and of some importance, rather than just showing up anywhere and everywhere to make an appearance.

C) Expected reduction in legislative gridlock and fragmentation within city councils. Assuming leadership roles within their councils, strong mayors may be able to instill a sense of teamwork, cooperation, and communication. Being full-time leaders, and being involved with the day-to-day management of their governments, strong mayors can use their expertise to guide their councils and act as mediators as well as leaders. In this manner, it is up to mayors to provide the direction in which their city councils should proceed, as well as effectively managing and coordinating the many voices heard in city halls. These interests include: appointed civil service administrators and line personnel; the council; the public; special interest groups and other government agencies.
D) Expected decrease in administrative gridlock and lack of cohesion within city halls. Strong mayors may be more able to assume the role of agenda builders and central leaders within the day-to-day operations of their cities. Strong mayors may also be able to add purpose and goals to the organizations which compose city government. In essence, strong mayors may be more able than weak mayors to act as the unifying forces that hold city halls together and facilitate communication, cooperation, and a unitary sense of purpose.

E) Expected reduction in intergovernmental gridlock and lack of effective communication and working relationships. As a true representative of their cities, strong mayors may be able to expand the influence and protect the rights of their cities through intergovernmental communication and representation. Strong mayors can also act as key negotiators in efforts to protect local economies from capital disinvestment as well as perceived negative projects coming into their cities.
THEORY AND CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE

Major Trends In U.S. Government During The Nineteenth And Twentieth Centuries

Three factors accounted for increased local government responsibility over the last one-hundred years. First, the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed the rapid expansion of technology, which forced many governments to assume the roles of licensing and regulatory services for such public goods as electricity, railroads, telephone, and natural gas. Second, the population itself expanded tremendously as cities began to urbanize and people migrated from farms to urban centers. This also included the huge waves of immigrants into the U.S. during this period. A third factor increasing local government responsibility was the increasing number of people living at or below the poverty level. The poor relied on the government as well as charitable organizations such as churches to provide them with needed welfare and other social programs. (Politics & Policy in States & Communities 2-12)

Another important trend for governments at all levels was the Progressive Movement which occurred in the early Twentieth Century in the U.S., and had a great impact on the nation, especially
California. A high point in the movement in California was the election of a reformer, Earl Warren, as Governor. Reformers believed generally in three broad principles which Banfield and Wilson describe as, "... eliminating corruption, increasing efficiency, and making local government in some sense more democratic."(138)

In addition, reformers were always struggling to capture office and implement their ideals. Their efforts were ridiculed by many status quo politicians, and even when they managed to get into office, they found themselves isolated. Nonetheless their policies made a difference, and provided government with a new direction. Yet the cost was very high, and many of the reformers never saw a second term once elected. They traded their political future for the ideals of the movement.

Even before the Progressive Movement in California, there were some signs at the local level of giving elected individuals more autonomy from legislative bodies which largely controlled most of the resources and political power. Executives were first elected in American cities, independent of the legislature, in the 1820's. (Banfield and Wilson 79) The reason for the sepration of powers was more doctrinaire than political. The unique federal system which was developing at the time had some influence upon this separation of powers. Throughout the Nineteenth Century, most cities which had mayors, gave them only ceremonial duties to perform. The most common form of government was the weak mayor-council. Power still predominately resided with the councils.
In the 1970's, dramatic events began to unfold. Rebellions and protests against excessive government spending and waste shook the country. Big government became the enemy of the American taxpayer. The revolt hit a peak in California in 1978 and Massachusetts in 1981. Voters passed initiatives in California and Massachusetts which sharply limited the amount of property taxes the state governments could collect in a given year.

Faced with limited sources of revenues and ever-increasing demands on government services, local governments were hard pressed to come up with solutions. At the same time, Ronald Reagan became President in 1980, vowing to get government off the backs of the American people. His pledge in many ways did just the opposite. By the end of the 1980's the federal government was running one of the largest trade imbalances in the history of the nation, and the federal debt had reached an all-time high. In order to cut costs, federal officials began to transfer many public service costs such as welfare back to the states.

The states in turn began to feel the effects of ever-shrinking budgets, so they passed many unfunded, state mandated programs on to the local governments. This situation has become grave in many local jurisdictions throughout California. Faced with revenue shortfalls due to Proposition 13, cities can barely meet their previous levels of service, much less pay for these new unfunded mandates from the state and federal governments.
Another important trend in local governments was the emergence of what John J. Harrigan called the emergence of "functional fiefdoms". According to Harrigan, functional fiefdoms result from changes that have occurred in local governments over the past twenty years. Local governments had previously enjoyed a role in which they were the primary administrators of state and federal government policies and programs. Included in that role was the belief that, "The basic function of urban government is service delivery, and urban service delivery is a distinctive function" (Yates 18). According to Harrigan, that distinct role of government may be fading away.

Harrigan notes that the traditional government structures -- city councils, mayors, and bureaucracies -- are being largely bypassed. In their place are coming more government agencies which are empowered to operate specific, key governmental functions. In addition, these agencies are receiving the funds and resources from the federal and state governments to carry out these specific objectives. As Harrigan points out, federal and state money is very rarely administered through local city halls anymore. For example, in Oakland, California, only one percent of federal money spent in that city in 19  was administered through city hall. The rest was given to these specialized agencies, the "new political machines" as Harrigan termed them (194).

These new machines -- transit authorities, water districts, and regulatory agencies -- have also made their way into the
government process. They have become very powerful interest
groups that carry official recognition due to their funding sources.
They are also in many cases authoritative government agencies that
have been empowered to deal with specific problems or projects,
such as the construction of the Interstate Highway System or
pollution control. Part of the reason these new agencies have been
successful in gaining access to city halls is that the government has
become fragmented, divided and unclear on goals and objectives. The
net result of these functional fiefdoms has been, "... to create a highly
complex mechanism of government that operates efficiently enough
but it is not very susceptible to unified policy guidance by either the
city council or the mayor" (Political Change in the Metropolis 195)

Yet another example of conflicting pressures being put on local
governments is the situation, "Where a city is made up of distinct
natural areas or sub-communities, its politics often reflect these
attachments and intensifies them" (Banfield And Wilson 51). Ward or
district boundaries are often drawn to reflect ethnic groups, class and
economic divisions. Riverside is a good example of this, having a
university ward, a special ethnic group of mexican heritage known as
the Casa Blanca neighborhood, affluent wards in the southern and
western parts of the city, and poorer groups mainly located on the
east side of the city. Each of these blocks or groups, represents a
special interest and pose special problems for the city council in
making decisions affecting the entire city or even parts of the city.
The diversity of these groups make consensus among ward elected council members almost impossible.

Whether Banfield and Wilson's statement is correct that these divisions are intensified through politics reflecting these divisions is not certain, at least according to my own personal observations as a Riverside mayoral intern. Riverside's city council does in some aspects adhere to home rule and councilpersons from one ward will have certain special interests in mind. However, many times they do act as a unified council, and do represent the city as a unified whole on some issues. There are many explanations for this, but in Riverside's case it seems these divisions are kept to a minimum so that cooperation and consensus among the council can be achieved, at least part of the time. This, however, is only a static picture, for politics and the city council will always change. New members will be elected, and conflict could easily flair up again along some line of ethnicity, political ideology, income, etc.

This system of ward or district elections poses great challenges to city administrators, especially in large cities like New York and Chicago. In general though, these urban political problems can occur in both large and small cities, and almost anywhere within the United States. The implications of these urban politics are also universal.

In urban politics where neighborhood groups are primarily concerned with bureaucratic decision making in regard to the delivery of urban services, the pressure system is focused on urban administrators, beginning with the mayor(Yates 27).
All of these trends and many more have put new and often conflicting pressures on local governments. The responses by these governments have been varied, from shining examples of innovation, to conflict and chaos, to stagnant and unresponsive governments ruled by comfortable elites. These new pressures on governments at all levels, especially at the local level have reinforced the need for better leadership and cooperation.

As noted by Banfield and Wilson, American government affords individuals a right to interact with government, and to try and influence and shape public policy whenever and wherever they can.(1) To speak of "pure" administration in the United States, as is possible in other countries, is not possible in the United States. As Banfield and Wilson stated, "Our government is permeated with politics"(1). And when those politics revolve around disputes or urban politics, the role of a strong mayor becomes increasingly important and necessary, as the arbiter and peacekeeper of the city.
City And State Relationships

Regarding state and city relationships, it has become common to illustrate the relationship as one of parent to child. States hold a superior position in relation to cities. As Justice Pierce Butler wrote in Trenton v. New Jersey, 262 US 182,

The city is a political subdivision of the state, created as a convenient agency for the exercise of such of the governmental powers of the state as may be entrusted to it. . . . The state may withhold, grant, or withdraw powers and privileges as it sees fit. . . . In the absence of state constitutional provisions safeguarding it to them, municipalities have no inherent right to self-government which is beyond the legislative control of the state.(Banfield And Wilson 64)

"The American city can do only what the [state] legislature expressly permits it to do"(Banfield And Wilson 67). This relation seems to only further alienate cities and bolster disagreements and tensions between the state and cities, and even between cities themselves. "Meanwhile politicians on both sides will continue to capitalize on city-state differences as an election issue"(Banfield And Wilson 67). Yet very few will espouse any concrete solutions as to how this dysfunctional system can be reformed in favor of the cities. At present, the state enjoys a more dominant role over cities and
counties. This may be yet another reason why the call for local leadership is growing in popularity among local politicians and citizens.
Various Structural Forms of City Government

There is not one simple hierarchy of authority that governs a city. In fact, cities are composed of many pieces of government. "To make any one of the governments work, it is necessary for someone to gather up the bits and bring them into a working relation with each other"(Banfield And Wilson 76). "All this gathering up and bringing together of authority requires the generation and use of political influence"(Banfield And Wilson 76). Indeed as Banfield and Wilson further illustrated, "The many legally independent bodies—governments of fragments of government - whose collaboration is necessary for the accomplishment of a task must work as one."(101)

A Typology of Middle-Sized Cities

Oliver Williams developed a typology for what citizens and officials in middle-sized cities expect of their government. He noted that local government could serve as: (a) the instrument of community growth, (b) the provider of life's amenities, (c) a "caretaker," or (d) the arbiter of conflicting interests.(Banfield And Wilson 31)

In community growth cities, government is supposed to serve such interests as expansion, industrial development and commercial activities. Supporters of this type of government include: industrialists, business leaders, bankers, city planners, local
merchants, and large property owners. The role of the government will be to enact zoning variations, reduce tax assessments, provide subsidies, develop industrial parks, install utilities and generally favor low labor costs and promote production. (Banfield And Wilson 54)

In municipalities where the predominant view is that government should be concerned with providing for life's amenities, a certain "way of life" will be preserved. Here, outsiders and transients will be excluded, the labor force will be kept low, rigid zoning laws for neighborhoods will be enforced, open space will be protected, and noise and pollution will be kept under control. Such cities will be comprised mainly of upper-middle-class families and the wealthy, retired persons, and young couples seeking the "right type of town" for their family. (Banfield and Wilson 54)

The caretaker government serves a limited role. Its basis for operation are fee for service. This type of government usually undertakes only those services which cannot be easily or more inexpensively provided by other agencies. Keeping government small and cutting costs wherever possible are high priorities. Many programs and services are either privatized or transferred out to other governments and agencies. Similar to this role is that of the arbiter government which acts primarily to manage conflict and resolve disputes. Arbiter governments are typically found in big cities with diverse populations. (Banfield and Wilson 55)
Mayor-Council Form

Currently, just over half of the municipalities in the United States use a mayor-council system, in which there is a separation of powers between the executive and the legislature. The powers and responsibilities of the mayor and council vary according to form. There is a broad range of powers and responsibilities for both councils and mayors, and a large number of combinations is possible within this form.

James Svara says mayor-council forms of government are most common in very large and small cities. Within this system, mayors range from weak to strong. Weaker mayors have limited powers of appointment in terms of administrative staff. In these cities, some of the staff are directly elected, others are appointed by the council, and some are appointed by the mayor with council approval. In addition, mayors have no power to draft city budgets as an executive document. Budgets are usually drafted by a combination of staff, the council, and the mayor. In essence, the traditional roles of the mayor are either shared with or totally controlled by the council. Svara points out that weak mayors can enhance their power through unofficial powers, but this is only a limited approach, and depends heavily upon the personality of individual mayors.

Strong mayors under this system usually have authority over their administrations, and can, without consent of council, employ or
terminate department heads. These mayors typically have the power to draft the budget, and oversee the administrative functions of the government. They also assume a leadership role among the council. The council relies on the mayor for information and new policy proposals. The mayor typically has the veto power, though the council can override. This situation can at times lead to gridlock and confrontation, though it can also result in a vigorous working relationship. Here the mayor assumes both an administrative and legislative role that is absent in the weak mayor form.

Svara states that there are limitations to both weak and strong mayors under the mayor-council form. For weak mayors, frustration results in their inability to force concessions from others in power. Due to their weak standing, many administrators perceive weak mayors as administratively and politically powerless, and hence will not cooperate freely. For strong mayors, there is also resentment from administrators because mayors do have strong powers that may exceed their own. Both cases need not necessarily result in confrontation and resentment, but the possibility exists. In addition, council members may also resent the powers of the mayor, due to the mayor's ambiguous role and limited resources. As Svara said in terms of this form of government, "The mayor-council forms are likely, therefore, to be characterized by a rich variety of conflict manifested by divergent goals, jockeying for advantage, and efforts to block the preferences of others" (Svara 51).
First proposed in 1911 by the National Short Ballot Organization, the council-manager form soon became one of the most widely adopted forms of local government in the U.S.. The council-manager form generally provides a weaker role for mayors than does the strong mayor-council form. In this form, the various responsibilities associated with governance are divided more equitably among the council members, and the mayor. The council and mayor share the political policymaking roles, while the manager holds the administrative power. This form of government is prevalent in cities with populations between 10,000 and 250,000 in population. (Svara 51)

In this form, the council assumes all of the governing functions of the city, and in turn, delegates implementation authority to the city manager. The manager is employed by the council through a simple majority vote, and can be terminated by a simple majority vote. The mayor sometimes presides over council meetings. Mayors in this system are largely weak and ceremonial. They have no formal individual input into policy formulation or implementation. In only 13% of council-manager cities do mayors have the power of the veto. (Svara 51) In this form, there is much less conflict between the administration and the council, for the council is the ultimate authority. As Svara pointed out, "Since the council ultimately wins all battles with the manager, tests of will are self-limiting" (Svara 52).
The city manager in this form occupies a powerful role, which can sometimes become political. The city manager often has a monopoly on technical information. The city manager is usually seen as the center point which all lines of communication and interaction cross. This allows the manager to stay current with the problems and issues at city hall.

In addition to performing a technical and administrative role, the manager also interacts with the council, and hence is made a part of the political side of government. The council can take advantage of this relationship due to the fact that, "... it is normally good politics for councilmen to maneuver the manager into taking, or seeming to take, responsibility for risky or controversial measures." (Banfield and Wilson 175) This allows the council to take credit when things go well, for they instructed the manager to carry out the policy, or deny involvement when things go bad by illustrating the fact that the manager assumed responsibility for the policy. As Banfield and Wilson noted, council members do not want to rock the boat and, "If the boat must be rocked, they want the public to think that the city manager's hand is on the tiller." (175)

There are several other important reasons why council-manager forms experience less political conflict than in mayor-council systems. First, cities which use this form have illustrated a quality of less community conflict than cities with the mayor-council form. Second, these cities are usually smaller than council-mayor cities.
Third, these cities usually have higher incomes in terms of their residents, more growth, and better "quality of life." (Svara 54)

In council-manager cities resentment by the administration toward mayors is also less likely. This is true for both weak and strong forms. Since the city manager is not hired or fired by the mayor, the mayor has no formal authority over the administration. Mayors can use influence, charisma and friendships to bolster their agenda and assume limited authority.

Nonetheless, with the council-manager form, both weak and strong mayors find themselves confined to a relatively weak, ceremonial role. Formal authority limits how far they can go on their own. These mayors are seen primarily as figureheads and guiding forces. Weak mayors are required to do nothing more than simply fulfill the legal duties of day-to-day administration. Strong mayors have a gray area of advancement that depends largely on the relationship with the council, and also with city managers. If managers and councils allow these mayors latitude, they can begin to expand the powers of the office both informally and formally. However, it must always be noted that it is up to the councils to voluntarily yield power to the mayors. Any power the mayors gain formally must be approved by the councils, and usually involves charter amendments.
Various Roles And Powers Of The Mayor's Office

The strong mayor form of government has some similarities to the roles of some governors. As Sarah Morehouse illustrated in the case of strong governors, the formal powers of the governor do make a difference, though formal powers alone will not necessarily make a governor dynamic and forceful, that depends on the personal drive and skill of the individual. Strong formal powers make it easier for a governor to be dynamic and active. (Politics & Policy in States & Communities 254)

Morehouse summarized this view of the importance of a strong executive through an example of the welfare program. She concluded,

"it takes organization to put forward and pass a sustained program on behalf of the needy. Disorganization can obstruct such a program. A fragmented executive may be a holding operation, a bastion of the status quo"(Politics & Policy in States & Communities 253).

And as John J. Harrigan noted in comment on Morehouse's argument, ". . . liberal governors are unlikely to overcome the forces of the status quo unless those governors do have substantial formal powers"(Politics & Policy in States & Communities 254).

"Because mayors were once connected with political machines, the Progressives stripped away their powers, shifting executive
authority to council-appointed city managers who were intended to be neutral, professional administrators"(Gerston and Christensen 83). The trend though, has been shifting back toward more independent mayor forms. Examples of this shift can be seen in San Diego with Pete Wilson (1971-1982), Oakland with Lionel Wilson (1973-1990), and San Jose with Tom McEnery (1982-1990).(Gerston and Christensen 83) As Yates argued, "It is the mayor's job to make an increasingly ungovernable city work"(28).

In San Francisco, the mayor has increased his power through unforeseen tragic events. Mayor Art Agnos was able to make his office the center point for disaster relief after the 1989 earthquake which struck the city. This effort helped illustrate the effectiveness of a single leader to act decisely and quickly in time of need. This trend according to Gerston and Christensen will probably continue: "California mayors will probably continue to grow stronger, partly because of media attention but also because of the genuine need for leadership in the growing tempest of city politics"(Gerston and Christensen 84).

Mayors have generally allowed outside groups to call public attention to new issues. It was believed that the best position for a mayor to take was to wait as long as possible before making a decision. The mayor often could ascertain how many votes the new issue would have with the council. In addition, once a decision is finally made, some will be disadvantaged by the decision, thereby creating new discontent among voters toward the mayor. This does
not mean that the mayor never takes the initiative, though caution in doing so may prove prudent. As Banfield and Wilson said,

But the advantages of being a bold, vigorous leader - if, indeed, they are real and not based on misconceptions - are fleeting; often, after a first wave of mayor-initiated programs, the situation returns to normal and the mayor finds that discretion is the better part of valor(31).

"The trouble with the strong-mayor form of government in a big city is that the mayor is administrator, chief political officer and chief ceremonial officer for the entire city; everything flows to him directly"(Yates 27). As Yates also pointed out, trying to handle all of these duties at once could leave the mayor immobilized.(Yates 27) As John V. Lindsay said of the mayor's role, "The things a mayor does or does not do touch on the daily life of people; when his level of government does not work effectively, he feels directly the discontent of his constituency"(Yates 28).

One aspect that is common of all forms of local government is that there is a very close proximaty between city hall and local residents. People can go to meet the mayor. Often, the phone number of the mayor's office is listed in the phone book. The mayor is held directly accountable by the people. When a group becomes dissatisfied, it can more readily lobby the mayor than it can a congressman or the President of the United States. This generally holds true for both weak and strong mayor forms.
The formal powers of the mayor are not entirely within the mayor's reach. The mayor can appoint department heads, members to commissions, etc, but once appointed, keeping control over these people becomes very difficult. In fact, once appointed, removing these appointees becomes almost impossible, unless for clear violations and misconduct. These limits and frustrations of the mayor can be better understood by reading what former Mayor John Lindsay had to say:

The bureaucracy has become so big and insensitive. The way these ninety-nine or so agencies are set up, they're often dealing with fractions of problems, fractions that sometimes transcend what the agencies' jurisdictions should be. The system is so damm divisive that its departments have to deal with each other almost by treaty. Imagine three departments having jurisdiction over paving streets, depending on whether they're in parks or in bridge approaches or in mid-town Manhattan. And does it make any sense to you that sick-baby clinics are under the Department of Hospitals while well-baby clinics are the responsibility of the Department of Health (Yates 31-32).

Mayors will encounter greater difficulty as the number of participants in the decision making process increases. The greater the number of participants, the greater the chance for disagreement and conflict. This is especially true when these participants belong to independent agencies outside the control of city hall. This lack of control exposes the mayor to the media and perhaps unfavorable publicity, depending upon the type of decision that is being made. Therefore, "Mayors have strong incentives to raise the kinds of
symbolic issues that will gain them support, confidence, and goodwill in the media" (Yates 141). It is important for mayors to protect their image, especially after important decisions have been made.

There is another important aspect that differentiates mayoral forms of government. As Yates noted,

Mayors differ along two central dimensions: (1) the amount of political and financial resources that they possess in dealing with their various problems and (2) the degree of activism and innovation that they display in their daily work (146).

This difference applies to both weak and strong mayor forms as discussed previously. How mayors respond to the pressing issues of the day may differ depending upon which type of mayoral form is present, and which of the two dimensions presented above are present. This great diversity in the type of mayoral leadership available to cities makes it difficult to generalize as to the effectiveness of mayors in solving problems of various types.

This does not mean, though, that differing mayoral forms have no common base. As Yates points out, "Mayors of all styles and strategies face a common dilemma: gaining and maintaining political authority" (163). Though the need for strong leadership seems prevalent in the preceding documentation, Yates raises skepticism by noting that:

But today the political makeup of the city is increasingly fragmented; there is a melange of low-income neighborhoods (with their own ethnic and economic divisions), defensive
working-class neighborhoods, growing areas of upwardly mobile homeowners, and pockets of upper-middle-class reformism (Yates 164).

Can strong, urban mayors face these challenges and make cities work again, or are the challenges and obstacles facing them simply overwhelming as John Lindsay believed? It is difficult to answer in general here, but these questions do raise skepticism that Riverside will gain positive results from enhancing the powers of the mayor's office. In addition, there will always be the political question of positive for whom, at what price?
The City of Riverside

The mayor of Riverside wants to change his office from that of a council-manager form of government, into one of a strong mayor. It is not now clear whether the mayor will choose to broaden his powers under the council-manager system of government, or will in fact try to change the system to a mayor-council form of government. In either case, the goal is clear: a ceremonial mayor simply is not able to deal with the complex and divergent problems that face local cities today. In examining the Riverside case, the City of San Bernardino will be used for comparison. The city is similar in population and size of government, with one important exception: the city of San Bernardino has a strong executive mayor.

Riverside currently has a population of about 240,000. It covers an area of about square miles. The government is currently organized as a council-manager form, with the city manager employed by the council. The council consists of seven members and a full-time mayor. The mayor currently has four staff: two full-time secretaries, and two part-time assistants. The city manager is in charge of the administrative functions of the city government. The council has full control over all legislative matters.

Riverside's mayor cannot vote on council items, but can veto proposed legislation. It takes a two-thirds majority to override the mayor's veto. The mayor is seen as the head of the city, and chief dignitary. The mayor attends many conferences and ceremonial
functions. The mayor can only appoint his/her own staff in the mayor's office with approval of the council. In effect, it is a weak position, but has the potential for change.

Ronald Loveridge won the race for mayor in a run-off election in June of 1994. He defeated the incumbent, Teresa Frizzel, on a platform of making the mayor's office more accountable, and expanding the role and powers of the mayor. In November, 1993, during the regular election, the voters approved measure J which will create a review committee to study the city charter and recommend changes. Part of the recommendations will be whether or not the city charter should be amended to provide for a stronger mayor. If this happens, Loveridge could become the first strong mayor in Riverside's history, and more importantly, one of the first weak mayors to begin the move toward stronger roles for mayors in the southern California region.

The approval of the voters for a stronger mayor may seem surprising at first glimpse. It seems that voters want a stronger leadership role for the mayor to address numerous problems facing the city, as well as protect and lead the city into better times and a more prominent role in the Inland Empire region. Riverside voters seem to favor Riverside's leadership role and ability to work with other governmental agencies in the Inland Empire region and beyond. This is though, only an observation, and a general one at that. Nevertheless, the voters made their sentiments for change clear in both the regular and special elections of 1993 and 1994.
Will this change, be all that Riverside and Ron Loveridge think it will be? In order to answer this question, an examination of Riverside's neighbor to the north, San Bernardino, may provide some valuable insight. In comparing Riverside with San Bernardino, a note of caution must be sounded here. While San Bernardino is similar in size, geography and government functions, it has several historical differences, structural differences within its government, and political trends which are quite different from Riverside. Overall, however, for the purposes of this paper, it is a good point for comparison and insight into the advantages and drawbacks of a strong mayor vs. weak mayor form of municipal government.
The City of San Bernardino

The City of San Bernardino is located 59 miles east of Los Angeles. The city covers about 55 square miles. The 1993 population was 231,197. For the Fiscal Year 1993/94, the city employed 1,188 full-time employees (FTE's). The city has a strong mayor-council form of government. The city bureaucracy is administered through a city administrator appointed by the mayor with approval of the council.

The mayor's office is responsible for overseeing the general government, as well as many community programs and special programs such as affirmative action. While the city administrator is charged with day-to-day operations, oversight and final approval still rest with the mayor's office. The mayor's office staff is comprised of:

5 Administrative staff (clerical)
1 Executive Assistant (Dept. head)
1 Administrative Assistant (day-to-day operations)
1 Project Coordinator (in charge of the mayor's schedule)
1 Affirmative Action Officer (For the entire city)
1 Director of Cultural/International Affairs

Total: 10 Support Staff

The mayor serves a four year term of office, and there are no term limits. The mayor pro-tem is rotated on a monthly among the
councilmembers. The budget for the office for FY 1994 - 1995 is $620,000. The mayor's salary is budgeted for $32,000, and is considered a full-time position. The mayor officiates at council meetings. The common council consists of 7 members. The mayor has no vote, but can veto legislation. The mayor cannot veto if there are at least 5 votes. It also takes 5 votes to override a mayoral veto.

Tom Minor was elected mayor of San Bernardino in 1992. Currently, there is an unofficial voting block consisting of 4 members of the council who usually vote contrary to the directions of the mayor. The mayor can and does introduce ordinances in council meetings. Based on a personal interview with Ray Salvador, administrative assistant to the mayor, up to now, the mayor has been successful about half the time in getting issues he supported passed by council. The mayor is still perceived by the council as new in his role as mayor, and therefore there is still an adjustment taking place in mayor-council relations. Tom Minor had previously served on the council in San Bernardino.

The new mayor is active and has a hands-on role overseeing the city bureaucracy. There is an open door policy for all department heads to see the mayor. The mayor appoints the city administrator as well as all department heads and assistant department heads. The mayor has been active in dealing with city problems. At present, a major problem facing the San Bernardino is crime. The mayor, a former San Bernardino assistant chief of police, has worked hard to put more money into police, as well as seek federal law enforcement
grants. A number of privatization programs have also been initiated to improve services and reduce costs.

In terms of the local press, the mayor has been perceived as less controversial than his predecessor. There is an effort by the mayor's office to keep the press informed about current projects and programs initiated by the mayor. There is no active press agent for the mayor's office at present, though there is some pressure to add a position of this type in the future.
A Comparison of Riverside With San Bernardino

The advantages the Mayor of San Bernardino enjoys compared with his counterpart in Riverside are as follows.

San Bernardino's mayor enjoys the formal powers the mayor of Riverside lacks. Oddly enough, the mayor of San Bernardino has a much lower salary than Riverside's mayor. The San Bernardino mayor has a larger staff, which performs broader functions and has more power within the city government. In addition, the city administrator is directly under the mayor's authority. This gives the mayor the power needed to enforce policies and programs. Currently, according to Ray Salvador, the mayor-administrator relationship is fairly smooth and congenial, which is ideal. In addition, the mayor has the power to prepare the budget. Since the budget is a function of the city administrator's office, the mayor can influence budget requests if he/she chooses. The current mayor is delegating that role to the administrator's office, but formal control rests with the mayor.

The advantages of these differences lead the mayor in San Bernardino to assume a very active role. As chief executive, the mayor can rely on departments to support his/her policies and new programs. A greater degree of coordination and cooperation is achieved. In addition, the mayor has more latitude to pursue his/her own personal, professional and political agenda.
The weaknesses in this system may not be noticeable at first glance. One of them is the fact that the city administrator is appointed by the mayor, and confirmed by the council. This puts the decision on who is hired to this significantly professional and technical post in the hands of political actors. Their criteria for choosing the person may not rest solely on his/her professional qualifications and experience. This can lead to a feeling among city professionals that political appointments may not be the best qualified, or may not be qualified at all. This resentment can have serious consequences in the performance and efficiency of the government in providing public services.

Another major weakness of this system is that it lacks accountability. The council has no real power to question or hold the mayor accountable for his actions. In addition, some council members are also friends of the mayor. The system of checks and balances which so exemplifies our system of government has failed to adequately address these problems in San Bernardino. It is in fact a city ruled more by politics, and less by professional administrators. In addition, the mayor is active in defending policies and goals that were not entirely clear to the public. The chance to do good for the community turned into a chance to do good for those viewed politically favorable. This it seems is true of all politics in general. Too much reliance on political power to solve problems can turn into political abuse of powers and political favoritism.
Success Criteria For Effective Strong Mayors

It is the contention of this paper that, when comparing mayor-council vs. council-manager forms of municipal government, the mayor-council form is more advantageous for successful strong mayors for several reasons. Despite the weaknesses of the San Bernardino model of government, a stronger mayor in Riverside may be able to provide more political and general leadership than previously has been the case. This may however, be due in part to the character of the current mayor, and not hold true for his successors, even if they assume a stronger mayoral role than Loveridge plays.

Harrigan suggested that one of the antidotes to the problems of urban government as outlined previously, including that of functional fiefdoms were strong parties and strong mayors. Current trends of voter dissatisfaction with unresponsive government and little accountability provide mayors with an opportunity to pyramind their powers through contacts and bargaining with bureaucratic and community leaders.

In order to become dynamic, mayors will need to address two important criteria. First, they must be given the legal and political resources to do their jobs. According to Pressman, this entails seven important factors:

1. The mayor needs sufficient funding for new and innovative programs.
2. The mayor needs city jurisdiction in the areas of education, housing, redevelopment, and job training.
3. Jurisdiction within city government over these policy areas
4. A full-time salary.
5. Sufficient support staff to cover areas such as policy planning, speech writing, intergovernmental relations, and political work.
6. Easy access to newspapers and television for publicity.
7. Reliable political groups to help achieve specific goals.
   (Political Change in the Metropolis 195).
Without these powers, the mayor is limited to a frustrated role and serving in a minimum capacity. (Political Change in the Metropolis 199).

The second key factor cited for successful mayors is that they must have clear goals for their cities. Mayors who are active in pursuing these goals can have a lasting impact on cities, long after they have left office. Without these clear goals, mayors can be seen as rudderless ships sailing at full steam. The power is there to make things happen, but the direction and control is gone, thus making the sum total rather pointless. Even weak mayors can make a lasting impression if they only had clear goals and a willingness to pursue them.

As was pointed out earlier, the need for a strong mayor is due in part to the trends over the last twenty or thirty years which have divided many local governments into spheres of influence and
competing agencies. In addition to this trend has been the increasing trend by the federal and state governments to transfer more general government responsibility to the local level. It was noted before that functional fiefdoms inherited many specific project grants, but these shifts are of broad government programs and services that are becoming more and more the responsibility of local governments.

Finally, due to the divisive nature of functional fiefdoms, competing political interests, and the lack of coherent, viable political leadership, mayors may well prove to be the solution at hand to the urban crisis facing so many cities in the United States. Mayors however, might well prove to be just another political player building coalitions that further the interests of themselves and their allies, and not necessarily mean the improvement of cities, or the solutions to their urban problems. In fact, one can only speculate as to what will be the final outcome of stronger mayors. Arguments on both sides are convincing, and as is the case with politics, one may never know, due to the personalities involved and the nature of politics itself.
RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has attempted to outline the various powers of mayors under two general forms of city government: mayor-council and council-manager. In addition, both the positive and negative aspects of each system, as well as those of strong and weak mayors within these systems have also been compared. From the information gathered by this paper, it has become clear that no one system can address all of the problems facing local governments, or please all of the voters within the particular jurisdiction. Ron Loveridge's call for a strong mayor form of government may prove beneficial to Riverside as long as Loveridge is mayor. Based though on what Loveridge has recommended and the fact that measure J did pass in the November election in Riverside, it seems that voters are ready for a change in Riverside's current form of government. It is recommended that the mayor's office should be restructured for the following reasons.

The mayor's office should be restructured through the process and scope of the charter review committee. It will then be up to the council to approve the changes and subsequently yield some of their formal and informal powers to the mayor. This will be a hard task to accomplish. If the council is truly aware of what a strong mayor will mean vis-a-vis their current powers, they would not likely vote for the changes. Only time will tell how they will vote.
Next, the question of which system will be adopted also needs to be addressed. As mentioned previously in this paper, in Riverside that will be up to the charter review committee and council. The view of this author is that the current system could be returned, with an enlarged role for the mayor, or a mayor-council form could be adopted. For now, both have potential advantages and disadvantages. The general direction suggested here would be to preserve the present system for now, and expand the powers of the mayor under the current system. The council is likely to be reluctant to change the charter and enhance mayor's power at first, due to the fact that they will be yielding some of their powers. Nor is the council likely to develop a new form of government, which may hold even fewer powers for the council.

A final recommendation is a word of caution. First and foremost, everyone should remember that while the excitement of a new administration is good, this administration will not be around forever. Riverside needs to look at the long run and big picture. Ron Loveridge may be popular now, but what will happen once he gets real political and administrative power? Will he change? Will his successors change? Are we simply setting up a system based on his personal character and abilities, or are we truly in need of structural reform? These questions are important and difficult ones to answer. Everyone must be comfortable with the new system set in place, and develop a system that will work beneficially for Riverside's residents no matter who assumes the mayor's office.
These recommendations may seem grave, but the topic being discussed is of importance, and can have either tremendous positive or negative effects. Once a change is made, it is hard to reverse. The decision to change the mayor's office should be done incrementally, rather than all at once. Several major shifts could be accomplished at first, to give the mayor a more active role, but the entire shift should be phased-in after the initial changes are made.
PROPOSED METHODS OF EVALUATING RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to evaluate both the process of changing the mayor's office, as well as the political and administrative results of such a change, a longitudinal survey research design is recommended. The length of time for this study should encompass at least three years, and perhaps extend beyond the tenure of Mayor Loveridge in order to compare Loveridge's performance with how a new mayor utilizes the office.

In addition, the survey design will encompass not only city hall and the council, but also voters in the City of Riverside. It is the intent that three questionnaires be developed: one for city hall, another for council, and a third for registered voters. The purpose of the questionnaires will be to elicit attitudes and opinions of the mayor and his performance under a stronger mayor form of government. In addition, both favorable and unfavorable results produced by the mayor's office will be documented.

Another means of evaluating the mayor's office will be how well the mayor is able to achieve his goals and objectives with the new sources of power and resources. The focus will be to see if given the necessary resources to carry out his goals, can and will he do so? As was stated in Hypothesis 1, stronger mayors have more political power and influence than do weaker mayors to shape public
policy and enhance their legislative role within the city council. In addition, Hypothesis 2 also affirmed through the relevant literature, that stronger mayors exert greater influence and control over a technical city bureaucracy than do weaker mayors with no powers of appointment, through the appointment of the chief executive and potentially department heads. It may just be that even with expanded powers, the mayor will remain frustrated in his efforts. Perhaps the complex intergovernmental system in California itself is to blame, and no mayor, no matter how powerful, simply cannot overcome such a deficient system.

Another means of evaluating whether changing the mayor's office will prove more beneficial to Riverside voters will relate to hypothesis 3 which predicted that stronger mayors would tend to develop larger personal and professional agendas which would likely create new opponents both within the government and within the public as well. However, it is also likely that new supporters will be gained in the government and among the voters. If succesful, the strong mayors will hopefully generate more new supprters than opponenents.

Along these lines, it was hypothesized that active mayors are perceived more favorably than are inactive in the eyes of: (a) the public, (b) the business community, and (c) the press. This applies to both weak and strong forms, though more so in stronger forms. If Ron Loveridge proves to be more active than his predecessors of the last two decades, in terms of (a) new ordinances,
(b) new policies and programs, (c) attending more public functions, and (d) employing more specialized staff to handle greater numbers of issues, complaints and problems, then Ronald Loveridge should be perceived more favorably by the voters and the press.

In terms of the press, the business community and other cities, several methods of evaluation are proposed. First, in order to evaluate the press, a record of news articles relating to the mayor should be reviewed and compiled by a member of the mayor's staff. A statistical breakdown of the views or opinions expressed can be made on a periodic basis. In addition, Loveridge should keep in contact with the press as much as possible to inform them of upcoming events and policies. A good working relationship with the press might produce more favorable opinions on the part of the press toward the mayor. In terms of the business community, both surveys and periodic visits by the mayor to local businesses are crucial. Loveridge has already planned to visit businesses once a week. In order to evaluate his image among the business community, survey questionnaires can be distributed which solicit information important to the business community, and how they perceive the mayor vis-à-vis these views. Last, in terms of other cities, surveys could be conducted, which would elicit the views of community leaders. These community leaders should come from businesses, government, the press, and civic or community groups.
CONCLUSION

First, this paper has provided an overview of the political theory surrounding the structure and composition of American cities, especially those in California. In examining this structure, the question of political organization and powers has been the focus. Two main forms of government were examined: council-manager and mayor-council. The differences and similarities were noted, as well as what role the mayor played in each form was given special attention.

Second, the question of which form seemed to best meet the demands of today's society and problems was examined, including historical trends and developments. In addition, the argument was made for a strong mayor based on the review and critique of literature on city governments and politics. Third, the argument for a strong mayor form was examined in light of the experiences of both the City of San Bernardino, and the City of Riverside. Fourth, a research design was developed to actually test the hypotheses. This will be undertaken as a Ph.D. dissertation in the coming years at the University of California, Riverside.

Finally, there is the unknown which political science cannot answer, but can only speculate upon. When dealing with individual personalities, it is always impossible to predict the future exactly. We cannot tell who will be the mayor of Riverside in the year 2010. Once the mayor's office has been changed to a strong mayor form, it will
be hard to return it to a weak form again. In addition, it will be up to watchdog groups, the council, and official agencies of the government to keep a system of checks and balances in place which will hopefully prevent the abuses of power that might result from strong mayors. It is a risk to give a single individual more administrative and political powers, especially when one cannot determine who will inherit these powers in the years to come. That is something only the voters can determine.

In order that this change be perceived as successful in terms of this paper, three important results must be obtained, though not necessarily all at once. First, the Riverside mayor's office must be transformed from a weak mayor form to a strong mayor form. This includes those powers and responsibilities that were discussed previously in the theory section of this paper as to powers and functions of strong mayors. Second, a majority of voters in Riverside must support the strong mayor form, which will be measured through (a) general elections every four years of a mayor, (b) opinion surveys, discussed in the previous section, and (c) in the quantifiable measure of more ordinances introduced by the mayors office, more policies and programs developed, and in the employment of more specialized staff to handle more city related problems, citizen complaints, and issues of intergovernmental affairs. If each or part of these three criteria are met, then, depending on what percent of the criteria were met, an equal percentage of success will have been attained.
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