

431-04

BOARD OF ALDERMEN

*City of Newton
Massachusetts*

Inter-Office Correspondence

To: The Board of Aldermen
From: Rick Lipof and Verne Vance
Date: February 2, 2006
Re: Docket Item to Reduce the Size of the Board

To Our Colleagues:

Attached, for your consideration, you will find a document that sets forth our reasons for reducing the size of our Board from 24 to 16 members (1 Ward and 1 At-Large). If you have questions or would like to discuss, please contact Rick (617-332-8909, ext. 24) or Verne (617-232-5494) within the next week.

Below you will find the Docket Item which will be submitted by February 14th. We invite any Alderman who would like to sign on as a co-docketor to contact Rick no later than Friday, February 10th. Thank you for your consideration.

Docket Item:

Aldermen (to be determined) proposing that the Board submit Home Rule Petition to the Legislature asking that the composition of the Board of Aldermen be changed from one Ward and two At-Large Aldermen to one Ward and one At-Large Alderman from each Ward.

Rick: rlipof@lipofres.com

Verne: vvance@rcn.com

431-04

BOARD OF ALDERMEN

*City of Newton
Massachusetts*

Inter-Office Correspondence

To: Board of Aldermen
From: Ald. Rick Lipof and Ald. Verne Vance
Re: Reduction in the Size of the Board of Aldermen
Date: February 2, 2006

We respectfully submit to our colleagues for their thoughtful consideration this memorandum setting forth our case for reducing the size of the Board of Aldermen from 8 ward aldermen and 16 aldermen-at-large (2 from each ward) to 8 ward aldermen and 8 aldermen-at-large (1 from each ward), a reduction from a total of 24 to 16.¹ Our basic thesis is that a single-chamber legislative body of 24 members for a city of some 84,000 residents is unnecessarily large and costly to carry out effectively its role under the charter of the City of Newton and dilutes the accountability of the Board of Aldermen in a political system that calls upon the city's electorate to become familiar with too many aldermanic candidates and that precludes the opportunity for direct one-on-one contests in races for the alderman-at-large seats in the various wards. As shown in the attached Exhibit A, the size of single-chamber legislative bodies in Massachusetts cities other than Newton ranges from 7 (Medford) to 9 (in many cities) to 15 (in 2 cities). (Everett has a bicameral legislature totaling 25 representatives composed of an 18-member city council and a 7-member board of aldermen).

¹ It is interesting to note that in 1978 the size of the Massachusetts House of Representatives was reduced from 240 to 160, the precise ratio by which we suggest that the Newton Board of Aldermen be reduced. Since that reduction in 1978 there has been no claim, and no evidence to support any such claim, that the caliber of the performance of the House has declined and no call from anyone that the size of the House be increased.

Newton's 24 aldermen represent an average of 3,513 residents per alderman. In the other cities with single-chamber legislative bodies, this ratio of representation ranges from 2,435 in Melrose (11 legislators) to 47,740 in Boston (13 legislators). Typical ratios in other cities of comparable size to Newton are 11,287 in Cambridge; 11,594 in Lowell; 16,906 in Springfield; 15,973 in Worcester; 9,895 in Quincy; 10,307 in Fall River; and 8,556 in New Bedford. Reducing Newton's Board of Aldermen to 16 would result in a ratio of 5,270 residents per alderman, a ratio of representation that would still be well below the ratios in cities of comparable size to Newton, although a number of the smaller cities with city councils ranging in size from 9 to 11 have representation ratios ranging from 2,500 to 5,000. So even at a size of 16 Newton's Board of Aldermen would continue to give its residents one of the most favorable ratios of representation of any city council/board of aldermen in the commonwealth.

It is our understanding that the present structure of 1 ward and 2 at-large aldermen from each ward was established to ensure that the bulk of aldermanic power would be held by those aldermen who are elected citywide and thus are presumed to hold a citywide perspective on the issues rather than being influenced by the particular and possibly parochial concerns of particular wards. Newton's ratio of ward and at-large aldermen is quite different from the ratios in all other Massachusetts cities that have a legislative body composed of ward or district representatives and at-large representatives. See attached Exhibit A. Those other cities typically have fewer at-large representatives than ward or district representatives (e.g., Boston, Brockton, Somerville, Waltham) or, in a few cases, one more at-large representative than ward or district representatives (e.g., Gardner, Holyoke, Worcester). We know of no evidence that these ratios of ward and at-large councilors have resulted in a body of legislative decisions that do not reasonably reflect the interests of the particular city as a whole. In Newton the records of votes

on disputed items show no consistent pattern of aldermen-at-large voting as a bloc against ward aldermen as a bloc. In sum, we are convinced that the original decision in the Newton charter to have 16 aldermen at large and 8 ward aldermen was based on a myth that is not borne out by experience in Newton or in any other Massachusetts city. In any event, our proposal would still retain an equal balance of ward aldermen and at-large aldermen – a balance that would still provide relatively more at-large aldermen than in the legislative bodies in most other Massachusetts cities that are composed of ward and at-large representatives.

Increasingly since the advent of Proposition 2 and ½ in 1981, Newton, along with all other Massachusetts communities, has felt the need to reexamine how many people it requires to carry out effectively each of the functions of city government, including the public schools. As a result, over the past 25 years Newton has reduced the number of city personnel used to carry out those functions, from teachers to firefighters to police officers and so on. But over those 25 years Newton has made no reduction in its unusually large number of aldermen. This seems anomalous, since the number of positions such as teachers and police officers plays a critical role in the quality of services that are provided, whereas the number of legislators, above a certain minimum number, does not. There is no evidence that a larger number of municipal legislators beyond a minimum of 9 to 13 produces better legislative decisions than bodies in the 9 to 13 range. Last year the Board demonstrated its concern over the costs of the operation of the Board when it rejected a proposal to increase the aldermanic stipend from \$9,750 a year to \$12,500 a year to adjust for inflation since the last increase in the stipend. The rejection of that proposed \$2,750 increase saved a total of \$66,000 a year in the costs of operating the Board. But the elimination of 8 aldermen, at a current stipend cost of \$9,750 a year, would save the city \$78,000 a year in stipends, plus the cost of health insurance and retirement benefits for whatever

431-04

aldermen out of the 8 would opt to participate in those city programs. The savings from the elimination of those stipends and other benefits, which could be as much as \$100,000 to \$200,000 or more a year, while not huge in an overall city budget of some \$250 million, dwarf the \$66,000 in savings about which the aldermen were concerned in last year's vote. Reducing the size of the Board by 8 aldermen would effect other minor savings and efficiencies, such as reducing copying costs of materials distributed to aldermen and savings of the time of the staff in the Clerk's office, which must support all aldermen, and the auxiliary police, who deliver the weekly packets.

That raises the question of what added value the city is receiving for the \$100,000 to \$200,000 in additional costs it is paying for the eight aldermen-at-large we propose to eliminate. We submit that it is very little.² The necessary work of the Board could still be done, in our view, by a Board of 16 members who continue to serve part-time, as at present, as is done in other cities.³ Surely the caliber of the people who serve as Newton's legislators is not so much lower than the caliber of such people in other Massachusetts cities that Newton needs more than 16 people to do the job that the legislators in other cities usually do with 9 to 13 legislators or, in two cases, 15. The great majority of items that are considered by Newton's Board of Aldermen are so straightforward and non-controversial that they are disposed of on first call, usually on the basis of unanimous committee recommendations. We believe that many of those items could be appropriately disposed of administratively without action by the Board at all. For example, there

² Here we speak only of institutional value of the 8 aldermen and do not and cannot seek to assess the value added by any particular at-large alderman or aldermen who serve on the present board.

³ Only Boston (\$75,000) and Cambridge (\$62,594.22) pay salaries to their city councilors at levels that enable them to be full-time positions, although we understand that even in those cities some councilors devote substantial time to outside business or professional interests. Other cities, like Newton, that pay any stipend to their legislators set such stipends at part-time position levels, mostly in the range of \$5,000 to \$15,000 a year, with all of them below \$20,000 a year.

431-04

is presently a proposal to limit further the Board's involvement in a number of traffic and parking items.

The one function of Newton's Board of Aldermen that the legislative bodies in most Massachusetts cities do not have is the special-permit granting authority under the city's zoning ordinance. However, the legislative bodies in Springfield, Haverhill, Quincy, and Woburn do have that function. The city council in every one of those cities manages to carry out that function, together with its other legislative functions, with just 9 city councilors. In Newton the technical support for the special-permit function is done by the Planning Department and the Law Department so this function hardly justifies the need for the 8 aldermanic positions that we propose to eliminate. (In any event, the Board's special-permit workload could appropriately be reduced to exclude Board action on such minor items as three-foot grade changes.) Those 8 positions are just one less than the 9 councilors that carry out all the legislative functions, including the special-permit authority, in Springfield, Haverhill, Quincy, and Woburn. And even our proposed number of 16 aldermen would provide Newton with more legislators to do the Board's work than in any other Massachusetts city with a single-chamber legislative body.

Some aldermen who are reluctant to consider a proposal to reduce the size of the Board assert that no such reduction should be considered unless it is accompanied by a plan establishing the structure of how a 16-member board would operate. But the charter that established the present 24-member board includes no plan establishing the operational structure of the board, properly recognizing that that is a matter for the members of the Board to establish themselves. That is a prerogative that each new Board that is elected every two years exercises in response to the changing needs of the Board and its work. Clearly the charter provision establishing the composition of the Board can be amended without also establishing the

431-04

operational structure of the new Board – a structure that can properly be established only by the new Board itself, whether of 24 or 16, after it is elected. As shown by the data in Exhibit A, there is no question that operating structures are available for the effective functioning of city legislative bodies of 7 to 15 legislators. Surely a legislative body of 16 legislators of the caliber that Newton elects can do at least as well.

In any event, for purposes only of completeness of analysis, we address the question whether reducing the size of the board by 8 members would necessarily increase each member's committee workload. Our six major standing committees have 8 members each, for a total of 48 places, or 2 major committee assignments for each of the 24 aldermen. If the Board were reduced to 16 members, each member would need to take on three major standing committee assignments if the Board were to continue to retain 8 members (1 from each ward) on each committee. But aldermen could continue to serve on just two major standing committees if committee membership were reduced to 5 members (6 committees times 5 members adds up 30 committee spots). Many docket items do not relate significantly to a particular ward so there is no compelling need to have a member from each ward. The two committees that do tend to have ward-specific items – Land Use and Public Safety & Transportation – could retain a member from each ward, if thought desirable, or, for wards that did not have a permanent spot on one of those committees, an alderman from that ward could be permitted to participate as an ad hoc committee member for any items relating specifically to that ward. The work of some committees could be reduced by, for example, having routine financial items considered by just one committee rather than, as at present, two or three. We do not offer these suggestions as necessary adjuncts of our proposal to reduce the size of the Board. We are not persuaded that a board of 16 members could not continue to carry out effectively the work of the Board even as it

431-04

is presently structured. Rather we offer these suggestions simply as possible examples of what a reduced Board of Aldermen might consider if experience were to indicate that some changes were desirable to facilitate the handling of the workload of a 16-member Board.

As for constituent services, if 11 part-time councilors provide such services for the larger City of Worcester and 9 part-time councilors provide such services for the larger City of Springfield, there is no reason to suppose that 16 aldermen could not provide adequate constituent services for a city of 84,000. Many of those services involve little more than directing a constituent to an appropriate city official or to information on the city's web site. Unlike the residents of Worcester and Springfield, the residents of each ward in Newton would continue to have both a ward alderman and an alderman-at-large from each ward to provide such services.

Finally, limiting aldermen-at-large to one per ward would enhance the likelihood that more voters would be familiar with more individual aldermen and thus be able to hold them accountable for their actions at election time. Such accountability would also be enhanced by making every race for an alderman-at-large position a head-to-head contest, as are ward alderman races, rather than several people running for two alderman-at-large slots so that there is no direct contest between the candidates.

The present size and structure of the Board were established by the present city charter more than 35 years ago. For the foregoing reasons, we believe that it is time to reduce what is an unnecessarily and undesirably large and costly Board of Aldermen. According to our City Solicitor, this need not be done by the cumbersome and time-consuming charter commission process, which would open for reexamination the entire city charter and structure of city government. It could also be done, as proposed in our docket item, by action of the Board of

431-04

BOARD OF ALDERMEN

City of Newton
Massachusetts

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: The Board of Aldermen

From: Ald. Rick Lipof and Ald. Verne Vance

Re: Reduction in the Size of the Board of Aldermen

Date: February 10, 2006

For the convenience of our colleagues, we are pleased to submit this executive summary of our February 2 memorandum on our proposal for reduction in the size of the Board of Aldermen.

We submit this in support of the following docket item:

Aldermen Lipof, Vance, Hess-Mahan, Lennon, Lappin, Schnipper, Harney, Weisbuch, Parker, and Sangiolo requesting that the Board of Aldermen and His Honor the Mayor submit a Home Rule Petition to the Legislature seeking approval by the Legislature of an amendment of the charter of the City of Newton reducing the number of aldermen by at least seven, the exact number and composition of the Board specified in such petition to be determined through discussion and vote by the members of the Board.

Favorable action on this item by the Board would simply clear the way for consideration of this proposal by the Mayor and, if concurred in by him, submission of the petition to the Legislature. If approved by the Legislature, the proposal would be submitted to the voters of Newton, who would have the final say on whether to make the proposed amendment to the city charter. We summarize our reasons for this proposal as follows:

1. A single-chamber legislative body of 24 members is unnecessarily large and expensive to serve fully the needs of a city of 84,000 residents and dilutes the accountability of the aldermen to the public.
 - A. Newton's 24-member single-chamber legislative body is by far the largest such city legislative body in Massachusetts. Other cities have such bodies ranging mostly from 9 to 13 members, with a maximum of 15.
 - B. Newton's ratio of legislators to residents is 1 to 3,513, as compared with such ratios in cities of comparable size to Newton ranging from 8,556 in New Bedford to 16,906 in Springfield.

- C. The rationale for the charter provision for two aldermen-at-large from each ward was to ensure that the bulk of legislative power rests in aldermen elected citywide with a presumed more citywide perspective than ward aldermen. That rationale rests on a myth that is not borne out by experience in Newton or in other Massachusetts cities. Such cities that have district and at-large legislators all have fewer at-large legislators or, at most, one more at-large legislator than district legislators. There is no evidence that the legislative decisions in any of those cities do not reasonably reflect the interests of the particular city as a whole. And in Newton there is no evidence to show voting patterns of at-large aldermen that differ from those of ward aldermen.
 - D. Elimination of each aldermanic position would save the city \$9,750 in stipends annually, together with the city's costs of health care and other fringe benefits for those aldermen who opt for such benefits, and copying and other costs of serving a large number of aldermen. Such cost savings, while a tiny part of the overall city budget, dwarf the annual savings of \$2,750 per alderman resulting from the Board's rejection last year of an increase in the aldermanic stipend.
 - E. A 24-member Board of Aldermen, that includes two at-large aldermen from each ward, unreasonably dilutes the accountability of the aldermen to the public. In aldermanic elections there are too many names for the public to follow, and elections for two at-large aldermen from each ward preclude head-to-head challenges that enhance aldermanic accountability.
2. Reducing the size of the Board by seven or eight members would not diminish the Board's ability to do its work effectively and efficiently.
- A. Most of the Board's work involves relatively non-controversial items that are disposed of on first call, usually based on a unanimous committee report or reports.
 - B. Other cities of comparable size to Newton dispose of their legislative business with legislative bodies of no more than 15. Four other cities that, like Newton, place their special-permit granting authority in their legislative body carry out that and all their other legislative functions with a legislative body of just 9 members. In all cities, except possibly Boston and Cambridge, city legislators, like those in Newton, are paid small stipends and are expected to serve part-time. We find it difficult to believe that 13 to 17 legislators in Newton, supported by highly-qualified city departments and financial resources that far outstrip those of most other Massachusetts cities, could not perform the Board's functions at least as effectively and efficiently as the legislative bodies in cities that have as many or fewer legislators as Newton would then have.
 - C. A reduced Board of Aldermen would still be able to provide full constituent service to the city's residents. Having 16 or 17 aldermen would leave a representation ratio in Newton of one alderman per about 5,000 residents, as

431-04

compared with such ratios in cities of comparable size of one legislator per more than 8,000 residents.

3. Action to reduce the size of the Board of Aldermen can and should be initiated by the Board without the need to establish a possible new Board operating structure and without waiting for a charter commission process that may never happen.

- A. If the size of the Board were reduced, it would properly be the task of the newly elected Board to establish the Board's operating structure. There exist numerous operating models for effectively conducting the business of a city's legislative body of 9 to 15 members in the many other Massachusetts cities that do so.

- B. If a majority of the Board of Aldermen is satisfied that the city and its residents would be well served by a reduction in the size of the Board, then the Board should act now rather than waiting for a citizen-initiated charter commission process that may never happen. Such action by the Board would not itself make the proposed charter change but would simply initiate a process that would ultimately enable the voters to decide on the change.

BOARD OF ALDERMEN

City of Newton
Massachusetts

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: The Board of Aldermen

From: Ald. Rick Lipof and Ald. Verne Vance

Re: Reduction of the Size of the Board of Aldermen

Date: February 17, 2006

We have given careful consideration to the few comments – some thoughtful and some not so thoughtful – that have been submitted in response to our arguments in support of our proposal to reduce the size of the Board of Aldermen. For the consideration of our colleagues, we submit this brief response to those responses.

When one cuts through the verbiage in the response by Aldermen Baker, Coletti, and Gentile and former alderman Lipsitt, the sole justification for retaining the present structure of the Board of Aldermen is, in the words of Alexander Pope in his “Essay on Man,” “Whatever is, is right.” For those who subscribe to that view, no amount of evidence or argument will suffice to change it. We would hope, however, that those of our colleagues who have not yet arrived at a decision on this issue would take into account what we believe are the factual and logical shortcomings of the responses to our proposal.

1. The assertion that “a large Board” provides for diversity of opinion does not prove that a Board of 24 members ensures more of such diversity than a Board of 15 to 17.

In the memorandum of our colleagues Aldermen Baker, Coletti, and Gentile, and former alderman Lipsitt (“the Baker, et al Memorandum”) it is asserted that “a large Board provides for diversity of opinion.” That statement properly makes no claim that a Board of 24 members is necessary to provide for diversity of opinion in a city of 84,000 residents or otherwise. A Board of 15 to 17 members would still be the largest single-chamber legislative body in the state, including such bodies in cities much larger than Newton. There is no reason to believe that 7 to 9 additional aldermen provide any real additional diversity of opinion.

2. Any differences between Newton and some other Massachusetts cities have no logical relationship to the 24-member size of Newton’s Board of Aldermen or the performance of its government.

In the Baker, et al Memorandum it is asserted that there are certain differences between Newton and some other cities in Massachusetts that make the experience of those cities inapplicable to the matter of the size of the Newton's legislative body. Of course no two cities are precisely alike. That is why our argument for reducing the size of the Board does not rest on the experience of just a few cities such as Boston and Cambridge that are admittedly quite different from Newton in a few important respects. That is why we looked at all cities in Massachusetts, including many that do not have full-time city councilors, do not have city managers, and are not on the edge of bankruptcy. While the operation of Newton's government may, as the Baker et al Memorandum, asserts, compare favorably with that of other cities, there is no showing, and no logical basis for believing, that that is because Newton has a 24-member legislative body rather than something smaller. The Baker memorandum fails to show any causal link between the overall performance of Newton's government and the 24-member size of the Board. Under our proposal for a 15-17 member board the members would still serve part time.

Newton's charter hardly provides for a "balance" of power between the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen. Rather the charter provides for a distribution of power between them which gives the bulk of real power to the Mayor. Over the years the Board of Alderman has rarely overruled proposals by the Mayor. There is no reason to believe that what limited check the Board has exercised on the Mayor could not be as effectively exercised by a 15-17 member Board.

3. All the arguments that the 24-member Board "has served the city well" rest on the fallacy that the performance of the Board necessarily results from its 24-member size.

Even if it is acknowledged that in general the Board "has served the city well," it does not follow that that performance is the necessary result of, or is causally related to, the 24-member size of the Board. The Baker et al Memorandum implies that the consensus required for many Board decisions is the result of the 24-member size. But a consensus of two-thirds for such key decisions as bonding, special permits, and zoning ordinance changes would still be required in a Board of 15-17, which would still be large enough to avoid control by a small clique and to fully reflect the constituency being served. Does anyone truly believe that reducing the legislative body of Newton from 24 to 15-17 might result in venality, corruption, or dysfunction, as the Baker et al Memorandum seems to imply? That implication in the Baker et al Memorandum is simply the old "parade of horrors" argument without a shred of evidence to support it.

4. The Baker et al Memorandum greatly overstates the committee workloads and the need for 24 aldermen to shoulder them.

The Baker et al Memorandum asserts that 24 aldermen are needed to shoulder effectively the work of the Board's six primary committees, three minor committees, and two special committees. The committee workload and the need for 24 aldermen are greatly overstated. A good deal of that work entails such routine items as taxi license

renewals, auto dealer license renewals, utility locations, and approvals by two committees of routine financial items. There is so little work for the Real Property Reuse and Aldermanic Oversight Committees that they rarely have items that come before the Board. The work of the Community Preservation Committee largely involves reviewing project funding recommendations by the citizen Community Preservation Act Committee, which does the real work of reviewing funding applications in detail, prioritizing such applications, and preparing the backup material in support of its recommendations. The Board's Community Preservation Committee rarely, if ever, rejects any of those recommendations and seldom makes significant changes to them. Even the work of the Land Use Committee has been declining with, as Alderman Samuelson has pointed, the decline in applications for special permits. That decline is hardly surprising in a quasi-urban city such as Newton which is almost fully built out. Finally, the special committee to review the design of the Newton North project is an ad hoc committee for which there would be no further need by the time any reduction in the size of the Board of Aldermen could occur.

Finally, much of the time in committees is taken up with discussing items that the aldermen can only vote "no action necessary." Much of our committee work is unnecessary work that we make for ourselves. A somewhat smaller Board would force us to focus our efforts on matters that are within our jurisdiction and on which we can take action that is of meaningful benefit to the community we serve.

5. The assertions in the Baker et al Memorandum relating to special permits are irrelevant.

In the Baker et al Memorandum it is asserted that the other cities in which the legislative body exercises the special-permit granting authority are smaller communities or pay higher compensation to legislators. Of the four, two – Springfield and Quincy – are larger than Newton, a third – Haverhill – is three quarters the size of Newton, and only Woburn is significantly smaller than Newton. While the compensation paid to their 9 legislators in Springfield and Quincy is somewhat higher than that paid in Newton, the compensation in Springfield and Quincy is still at low part-time levels for legislators who serve part-time, as in Newton.

6. The need for 24 aldermen to perform constituent services for a city of 84,000 is greatly overstated.

While we do not deny the importance of the constituent services furnished by the aldermen, we are not persuaded that it is necessary to have two or three aldermen from a ward attend a community meeting on a land-use or a parking item. From our experience two aldermen from a ward are fully sufficient to divide, or double-cover, the meetings and other needs of constituents in a ward. In addition, all at-large aldermen, who are electorally responsible to the city as a whole, are available to meet the needs of all constituents.

7. It is not necessary or appropriate for this Board to develop the rules for operation of a smaller Board of Aldermen before voting for a home-rule petition to reduce the size of the Board.

The number of aldermen was not set at 24 in the city charter with relation to a consideration of the workload of the Board or the operating structure of the Board. The number was set in response to other considerations -- the desires for ward representation, for citywide distribution of at-large aldermen, and for a two to one balance of at-large aldermen to ward aldermen. One can legitimately argue the continued necessity of each of those considerations, on which opinions differ. If a majority of the Board can reach agreement on a resolution of each of those considerations and corresponding change in the size and structure of the Board, it will appropriately have addressed the bases on which the charter established the size and structure of the Board. Beyond that, the present Board need only consider whether it is feasible for a Board of 15-17 aldermen in Newton to carry out the work of the Board effectively. The broad experience of all other cities in Massachusetts indicates that the answer is clearly "yes." If a Board reduction proposal is ultimately adopted, it would properly be the task of the new Board to establish the operating structure of the new Board. We have no doubt that aldermen with the savvy and experience of Alderman Baker, Coletti, and Gentile, and other colleagues, could do well what every city in Massachusetts has done -- establish an effective operating structure for a legislative body of 9 to 15.

We believe that this response addresses the comments of Aldermen Yates and Burg. With reference to Alderman Burg's comments, we would only point out that our survey of the legislative bodies of Massachusetts municipalities includes only cities and not towns, which do have governmental structures that differ significantly from those of cities. In Brookline, as in other towns, neither the Board of Selectmen nor the Advisory Committee is equivalent to the legislative body of a city. The Board of Selectmen exercises the executive function in Brookline and other towns. The Advisory Committee develops financial proposals that must ultimately be acted on by the Town Meeting. So the experience of Brookline and other Massachusetts towns is utterly irrelevant to the government structure of Newton and other Massachusetts cities.

431-04

All Massachusetts Communities with a City Form of Government

City/Town	Population	At-Large	Ward/District	Total
Agawam	28,528	11		11
Amesbury	16,737	3	6	9
Attleboro	43,502	5	6	11
Barnstable	48,907		13	13
Beverly	40,255	3	6	9
Boston	581,616	4	9	13
Brockton	95,090	4	7	11
Cambridge	101,587	9		9
Chelsea	34,106	3	8	11
Chicopee	54,992	4	9	13
Easthampton	15,537	4	5	9
Everett*	37,540	1	24	25
Fall River	92,760	9		9
Fitchburg	39,948	5	6	11
Franklin	30,175	9		9
Gardner	21,049	6	5	11
Gloucester	30,730	4	5	9
Greenfield	17,926	4	9	13
Haverhil	60,326	9		9
Holyoke	40,015	8	7	15
Lawrence	72,492	3	6	9
Leominster	42,000	4	5	9
Lowell	104,351	9		9
Malden	55,816	3	8	11
Marlborough	37,980	4	7	11
Medford	54,734	7		7
Melrose	26,784	4	7	11
Methuen	44,850	3	6	9
New Bedford	94,112	5	6	11
Newburyport	17,552	5	6	11
Newton	84,323	16	8	24
North Adams		9		9
Northampton	29,287	2	7	9
Palmer	12,902	5	4	9
Peabody	49,759	5	6	11
Pittsfield	44,779	4	7	11
Quincy	89,059	3	6	9
Revere	47,002	5	6	11
Salem	42,067	4	7	11

431-04

City/Town	Population	At-Large	Ward/District	Total
Somerville	76,296	4	7	11
Southbridge	17,314	9		9
Springfield	152,157	9		9
Taunton	56,781	9		9
Waltham	58,894	6	9	15
Watertown	32,915	5	4	9
Westfield	40,560	7	6	13
West Springfield	29,753	9		9
Weymouth	54,527	5	6	11
Woburn	37,809	2	7	9
Worcester	175,706	6	5	11

*Bicameral (18 Council Members and 7 Aldermen)