

City of Annapolis

Charter Revision Commission

Final Report to the Mayor and City Council

September 13, 2021



Prologue

Our Goals

Every ten years the Annapolis City Council appoints a Commission to review the Charter of the City of Annapolis and make recommendations for its improvement. This year, nine city residents were appointed to the Annapolis Charter Review Commission to undertake this important task. A list of the members and their Wards can be found in Appendix 1 on page 12. The report that follows contains our recommendations for potential Charter revisions which are intended to guide future decisions by the City Council on this important matter.

We draw your fullest attention to our recommendations for revisions to the Charter, which will be summarized on the next page. Importantly, the subject of a full rewrite of the Charter was a matter brought forth in most of our meetings.

We took care to examine the current Charter through a lens that we believe, while not perfect, reflects the dynamic needs of the citizens of Annapolis; recognizes the benefits of change; and considers the character of what makes Annapolis a very special place to live and work.

We believed an improved Charter would account for the changing needs of the community as we move further into the 21st Century, and that any proposed revisions should consider the importance of diversity and inclusion, while balancing changing norms and community needs. An improved Charter would make our civic leaders not only more effective but also more accountable and responsive to the citizens and community. We clearly saw a role that a more effective Charter could play in Annapolis's civil society.

While disappointed that the composition of the Commission did not reflect a balance across all Wards, we worked to fill that gap through outreach and research, not only here in Annapolis, but also by reading other Charters and reaching out to executives in other cities in Maryland and other parts of the United States to learn what they believe are the strengths of their own governance models.

The Effort

The Commission met virtually 13 times, and in person as a working group once – conforming to and observing restricted parameters due to health and safety concerns driven by the Covid-19 pandemic. Members collectively worked over 1,000 person-hours during this six-month effort. All meetings, with the exception of the working group, were televised and recorded by the city and were open to the public for observation. During our initial meeting on the 9th of March 2021, we organized and held a full Commission work-session, arranged ourselves into small working groups and discussed how we would use all available resources to understand how the Charters of like-sized municipalities were established.

One challenge we faced was the lack of specific ground rules or a roadmap for action – other than the report provided by our preceding Commission a decade ago. While this might be seen as a shortcoming, we saw it as an opportunity. We carefully adhered to the language found in Article IX, Section 10 of the Charter, which empowers the Commission to begin its work, but laid out our own working plan to achieve

the stated goal. Initial meetings were used to set objectives, milestones, ground rules and requirements.

The Commission:

- ♦ Agreed to meet every other week until the final report was completed.
- ♦ Elected a Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary, who would also serve as the Executive Committee.
- ♦ Created an Executive Committee that would meet as often as needed but would not make any policy decisions other than creating an agenda and managing the normal flow of the Commission's activities in the intervening week(s) between public meetings. We strongly recommend future Review Commissions consider establishing a similar process to facilitate and streamline the work effort.
- ♦ Identified eight subcommittees early in the process, each addressing an article or section of the existing Charter. At least two members were assigned to every subcommittee.
- ♦ Defined the key stakeholders for the Charter review process (e.g. elected officials, citizens groups, etc.) and created an Outreach Committee that would coordinate meetings between a small set of Commissioners and Commission members. The Committee recommended a standard set of issues and questions for each outreach session – primarily to achieve some consistency in interpreting comments and concerns. A list of these issues and questions can be found in Appendix 3, on page 14.

In accordance with its official remit from the Council (see Ordinance 10-21; January 11, 2021) the Commission devoted its resources to a review of the Charter. However, we recognized early in the process that the Charter and the City Code necessarily intersect, and our recommendations to move certain topics out of the Charter and into the Code reflect this fact.

We created a place on the web (Google Drive) to store all our working documents. This idea proved invaluable for Commission members who were able to track working group interviews and all other materials at their convenience.

Public input was solicited in numerous ways. A unique Charter Review Commission site was created on the City of Annapolis web site which offered the public information about Commission membership, meeting dates and locations, and how to offer written or oral comments.

Attendance by Commission members at the meetings was nearly universal, and participation was both thoughtful and lively – but most importantly fully accessible to the public. We felt engaged and committed to this important task and trust the Council will take time to consider our recommendations and take appropriate steps to implement those recommendations it believes will improve the Charter.

Our Learnings

As mentioned, our outreach was proactive. We established a plan, set a course, met the key stakeholder(s), filed written reports, then briefed the balance of the Commission during each public meeting. A list of individuals and groups contacted by Commission members appears in Appendix 2, on page

13. We had numerous written submissions from and spoken interactions with the public; each was documented and disseminated to the full Commission.

Early in our planning, we promoted the role and importance of the Commission's work in the local press, and to personal contacts. And that effort produced worthy results.

We heard repeatedly from stakeholders and quickly discovered through discussion among the Commission's members, that the Charter lacks clarity, and is in parts obsolete or overly prescriptive. Thus, it does not achieve the job it could.

As we carefully examined the existing Charter, we quickly concluded that there were corrections, concerns, edits that impacted many, if not all, articles. We further noted that some of our recommendations would be more suitable if placed in the Code. Thus we have not included them with our Specific Recommendations on page 6, but rather note them in Appendix 4, which can be found on page 15.

In Appendix 5 on page 16 we have listed the resources and readings we have used to gain exposure to work carried out to improve the charters and governance models within the state and around the country.

What Follows in This Report

This report contains a series of recommendations, but before we delve there, we believe it is beneficial to set the tone for the city's foundational governance document. We start with a brief overview of the History of the Annapolis Charter, providing contours of where this amazing document has traveled. We follow that with a statement about the spirit of what the Charter should and must be. We refer to that as the Preamble. The Commission is unanimously behind the position that any future work the Council agrees for the Charter must include these two sections – where we've been and where we're going.

We will summarize our recommendations below but will explain the format used in presenting our findings. Of key importance is that the Commission agreed in an early meeting to offer few specific textual changes. In discussions with the City Attorney, and representatives of his office, we accept that drafting of specific Charter revisions is better left in the hands of experienced staff. We have divided our report into sections that roughly align with the Articles in the current Charter (elections, powers, Council/Mayor, operations, finance, personnel, etc.). Each detailed section contains a set of proposals. The proposal is identified, then followed by an explanation – called 'Analysis'. We have provided citations where appropriate and useful. We conclude with several Appendices that serve as references to more detailed work.

Our Overarching Recommendation

We recommend a two-pronged approach to improve the Charter. As noted earlier in this report, the Commission quickly came to the realization that the charter needed a comprehensive review and rewrite by a separate Charter Revision team with specific objectives that is professionally staffed (awkward/confusing wording – is the Charter Revision team professionally staffed I think we want the next group to be professionally staffed. We at the same time identified immediate corrections and adjustments that, if adopted, will improve the existing City Charter pending the more formal rewrite noted above. We

recommend that both prongs be acted on concurrently, recognizing that a comprehensive rewrite of the Charter will take time.

- ♦ **Rewrite.** Ideally the Charter should establish a modern vision for our city, which includes a concise set of guardrails that govern the operations and performance of city officials and outlines both their professional and civic responsibilities. It should not be easy to amend, so as to provide stability of government. It should stand on principles that serve as a guide for all citizens, allowing for interpretation as societal norms adjust.
 - It should contain updated authorities for and guidance regarding necessary governmental processes, such as elections, finance, and security, and more clearly outline the operational relationship between the City Council, the Mayor, the City Manager, and all departments.
 - The authority, along with responsibilities, of elected officials should be made clearer and more completely defined.
 - The Charter should be a senior legislation – compared to the Code, that requires a significant margin of Council member votes to amend.
 - Lesser responsibilities, which would not require an amendment to the Charter should fall in a more subordinate document, the Code.
 - Enforcement provisions should be clear and workable.
- ♦ **Specific Recommendations.** We complement this with our review of the articles of the existing Charter – but our recommendations should be seen as needed immediately while the ‘Rewrite’ project is progressing. These will be presented on page 6

A Brief Introduction to the Charter of the City of Annapolis

The City of Annapolis has a long and remarkable history, dating back to its founding by English settlers since its founding in 1649. In its early days, Annapolis was a thriving port town that once served as the capital of the United States from November 1783 until August 1784, before the nation had established a permanent capital city. Today, it is the capital of Maryland, a leading center for maritime activities on the east coast, and a thriving city with 40,000 residents.

It is generally agreed that the City of Annapolis, which earlier had several names, was designated “Porte of Annapolis” in an act of the Maryland General Assembly passed during the May 1695 legislative session. The following year, the General Assembly set up a municipal government for the City, providing citizens limited corporate, legislative and judicial rights. More than a decade would pass before the first city Charter was adopted.

Governor John Seymour presented a draft Charter to the city council on August 16, 1708, which quickly approved the document. It was modeled upon the St. Mary’s City Charters of 1668 and 1671 and created a governmental structure based upon English law and norms that remains largely intact today, i.e. mayor, recorder, aldermen and common councilmen.

This first Charter was quickly challenged by a group of freemen who complained that it denied them the right to vote for their representatives in government, including state legislators and city officers. Recognizing that the challenge would likely succeed, Governor Seymour accepted amendments to the Charter that provided voting rights to qualified citizens. This new Charter, dated November 22, 1708, was accepted by the General Assembly. Although it has been amended countless times over the years, the second Charter remains the foundational document of our city. A replica of the Annapolis City Charter can be viewed at the Maryland State Archives building, 350 Rowe Blvd, Annapolis, MD 21401.

Specific Recommendations:

Position 1: Strengthen the Preamble

Recommend a second paragraph (noted in bold italics) be added to the existing Preamble in the Charter to broaden and modernize its scope.

We, the people of the City of Annapolis, County of Anne Arundel, State of Maryland, in exercise of the ancient right to organize, maintain and perpetuate a municipal form of self-government, and to provide an orderly execution of municipal functions, to ensure accountability for public funds, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the benefits of home rule in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the State of Maryland, do re-adopt, ratify, ordain and establish as our Charter and form of government this Charter of the City of Annapolis.

The provisions of this Charter shall help ensure that all people living in our city are fully and responsibly represented. That the city is committed to diversity and inclusion in all municipal functions and will protect the human, civil, and voting rights of every citizen. The city is committed to providing a safe, clean and healthy environment for its citizens, employees and visitors and to taking measures to protect them against external and internal threats, be they physical or cyber. As a waterfront community whose wellbeing is inextricably tied to that of

the Chesapeake Bay, the city shall commit to a healthy, sustainable, and resilient environment and to safeguard against the effects of adverse weather and sea level rise.

Position 2: Expand the Board of Supervisors of Elections

Recommend amending Article II – Elections, Section 6(a) as follows:

“The Board of Supervisors of Elections shall be comprised of five (5) residents and registered voters of the city; two of which shall always be from the leading political parties of the state, two from either of the leading political parties of the state, and one not a member of either of the leading parties of the state.”

Analysis

Expanding the Board of Supervisors of Elections from three (3) to five (5) members would allow for increased representation of all city voters; enable a more responsible division of the Board’s substantial workload; and offer members the opportunity to work on a committee basis. The current membership of three (3) individuals does not permit distribution of workload by committee because current city rules provide that anytime a quorum is constituted -- in this case two members of the three (3) member Board -- the meeting is subject to all applicable open meeting rules. Open public meetings of Boards and Commissions require the posting of an agenda prior to the meeting and public access.

Consequential changes to the City Code will be required to ensure that the five-member Board adequately represents the City’s political parties and its diverse population.

Position 3: Non-partisan v Partisan Elections

Recommend the City Council approve a ballot question, in advance of the 2025 municipal general election, proposing a Charter amendment to hold non-partisan municipal elections.

Analysis

Most cities in the State of Maryland and throughout the United States elect local officials on a nonpartisan basis. According to the National League of Cities, over three-quarters of all municipalities have nonpartisan elections. In partisan elections, the party affiliation of the candidate is indicated on the ballot, whereas in nonpartisan elections it is not.

Proponents of non-partisan elections argue that political parties are largely irrelevant to providing city services, such as water, sewer and refuse collection; cooperation between elected officials in a system that prohibits the use of party labels is more likely; turnout is at times higher in non-partisan races; and by eliminating the major political parties from controlling candidate access to the ballot, greater numbers of candidates will seek office.

The Commission has purposefully proposed that the question as to whether the city should move to nonpartisan elections be determined by the voters of the city, via ballot question.

Position 4: Election Cycle

Recommend the City Council approve a ballot question, in advance of the 2025 municipal general election, proposing a Charter amendment to hold municipal elections at the same time as the federal/presidential primary and general elections.

Analysis

The City of Annapolis currently holds its Mayoral and Aldermanic elections during the “off years” of the election cycle. Holding elections during the off years does provide the benefit of candidates and any pertinent city related issues to be the sole focus of the voters. However, it also results in lower turnout and requires the city to administer the elections, including providing voting equipment and negotiating with public locations where balloting can take place amongst many other administrative tasks. In recent elections, the city has partnered with the Anne Arundel County Board of Elections to administer the elections, however, some of the same challenges exist in terms of the difficulty in arranging public locations for balloting as well as low turnout (when compared to other elections).

Based on conversations the commission had with the Hagerstown City Clerk and Washington County Board of Elections, their experience with shifting the City of Hagerstown’s election to coincide with the presidential election created both greater efficiencies for the administration of the election as well as better turnout with more voters engaged in city elections than when they were held during the off years.

Position 5: Clarify Responsibilities

Amend Article IV, Sec. 2A to read:

“Aldermen/alderwomen may not direct the work of the mayor, the city manager, a department director, an employee of a department or office that reports to the mayor or city manager, or any board, commission, or committee established pursuant to this Charter.”

Analysis

Interviews with current and past members of the City Council and city government the need for more effective shared authority and improved communication between the Mayor, City Council, and City Manager was consistently mentioned. Lack of understanding and/or issues surrounding the separation of powers, oversight functions, and legislative procedure in the current model of governance were noted. At times, this resulted in confusion, conflict, and inefficiency in the existing organizational environment. Questions were raised about whether to change the current Mayor-City Council- City Manager form of governance.

Position 6: Quorum

Recommend adding the following to the Charter in Article IV – City Council

“Quorum. A majority of City Council members (5) must be present at legislative sessions or meetings in order to conduct business.”

Analysis

While we recognize that a definition of the term “quorum” exists in Article IV, Sec 4, we found it important to set a specific quorum (5) to ensure that the number of members required **to be present** to conduct business reflect the seats of the Council.

Position 7: Votes - Ordinance

Recommend adding the following to the Charter in Article IV – City Council

“No ordinance shall be passed without an affirmative vote of at least five (5) members of City Council.”

Analysis

Further we recognize that a definition exists in Article IV, Sec 4, we found it important to set a specific quorum (5) to ensure that the number of members **needed to conduct business** reflect the seats of the Council.

Position 8: Votes – Charter Amendment

Add the following to the Charter in Article IV – City Council

“No Charter amendment shall be passed without an affirmative vote of at least seven (7) members of City Council. “

Analysis

The intent of this proposal is to ensure charter amendments truly reflect the majority of its citizens as represented by their City Council members. As of June 2021 twenty-four (24) charter amendments have been introduced since 2011 when the Charter Revision Commission last met. Only four emanated from their recommendations. The remaining 20 have been put forth in the last six (6) years and resulted in four (4) being withdrawn, one (1) failed, and fifteen (15) adopted.

Legislative bodies, including municipal, frequently require a 2/3 or ¾ majority for the passage of constitutional or charter changes. Some require it for enactment of tax increases, budgets, and changes in voting requirements.

A supermajority requirement in the Charter would avoid a situation in which the City Council could have a quorum (5) and be able to pass a charter amendment with three (3) affirmative votes. Such a vote would clearly represent an under-representation of the larger legislative body and over time would undermine the public’s trust in its leaders.

Position 9: Develop Legislative Procedures

Recommend the City Council and Office of Law develop clear and binding legislative procedures for inclusion the Charter, Article IV – City Council

Analysis

The Charter contains no directives for City Council legislative procedure. We believe that such procedures would result in an improved and more consistent legislative process, and operational efficiency. As an example, currently amendments can be made on the floor at a City Council meeting and are not required to be written.

Position 10: Define Term for Refilling an Absence by Mayor.

Recommend amending Article V - Mayor, Section 3(a)(b) to define temporary disability or absence as no longer than 90 calendar days and a procedure be adopted for filling the position of Mayor for a period beyond 90 calendar days.

Analysis

The Charter provides no provisions for replacing a Mayor who becomes permanently disabled, absent or resigns his/her position. This inclusion is essential in ensuring the transfer of power and continuance of governance.

Position 11: Board, Commissions, and Committees Review

Recommend amending Article IV - Operations, Section 14 as follows:

"All boards, commissions, and committees be reviewed by the City Council on a regular basis to determine their effectiveness, relevance, and if they warrant changes or dissolution."

Analysis

Presently, Section 14 of Article VI authorizes the creation of boards, commissions, and committees. The Commission believes that diversity of membership on these organizations is important to ensure that all points of view are presented and heard during the deliberative process. In addition, the Section does not require the City Council to review these entities regularly to determine if their remit is still relevant to the needs of the city. We believe such a review is both necessary and appropriate.

Position 12: Makeup of Future CRCs.

Recommend amending Article IX, Section 10 to include the following:

"The composition of the commission shall consist of city residents from at least five (5) different wards and reflect the diversity of the citizens of Annapolis."

Analysis

Future CRC's makeup should reflect and thus capture the diversity of as much of the city as possible. The CRC is in existence to ensure the diverse needs of the city all and mirror the city's population.

Acknowledgements

The members of the 2021 Annapolis Charter Revision Commission would like to express their sincere appreciation to the Mayor and members of the Annapolis City Council for their assistance and support of our work during the six month charter revision process. We also wish to thank the many city employees, civic leaders and members of the public who took the time to share their views with the commission about how the Charter could be modernized and improved. Their insights proved to be invaluable to the Commission during its deliberations.

We particularly wish to thank Ms. Teekia Green, City Council Associate, Office of Law, and Ms. Jacqueline Lee, Legislative Analyst, Office of Law, for their extensive efforts in support of Commission activities throughout the process. Ms. Green and Ms. Lee were unfailingly responsive to our many procedural and legal inquiries along the way, and their advice helped ensure the success of our final report.

Photo credit, page 1: Jacob Czawlytko, Chesapeake Conservancy

Appendix 1 – Commission Membership

Andrew (Andy) Haire (Chair)	Ward 1
Paul Rankin (Vice Chair)	Ward 8
Eileen Leahy (Secretary)	Ward 1
Minor Carter	Ward 1
Jeffrey Durand	Ward 1
Lawrence Harris, Jr.	Ward 3
Benjamin Mednick	Ward 1
Ron Schneider	Ward 1
Robert Tufts	Ward 8

Appendix 2 – Outreach

CRC Members conducted interviews with the following community groups and individuals.

Note: If an individual or group that provided comments to the Commission is not listed, we sincerely apologize for the oversight.

Charter’s Fiduciaries (i.e. Government)

Mayor Gavin Buckley
Ald. Tierney (Ward 1)
Ald. Paone (Ward 2)
Ald. Pindell Charles (Ward 3)
Ald. Finlayson (Ward 4)
Ald. Schandelmeier (Ward 5)
Ald. Gay (Ward 6)
Ald. Savidge (Ward 7)
Ald. Arnett (Ward 8)

Jodee Dickinson - Director of Finance
David Jarrell – City Manager
Michael Lyles – City Attorney
Sally Nash - Director of Planning and Zoning
Hilary Raftovich – Constituent Services Officer & Ombudsman

Susy Smith – Chief of Staff, Mayor’s Office
Regina Watkins-Eldridge - City Clerk

Briayna Cuffie – Member, Board of Supervisors of Elections
Jared Littmann, former Alderman Ward 5
Scott Gibson – Candidate for Alderman Ward 2
Sharon Kennedy – Former Chair, Historic Preservation Commission
Karma O’Neill – Candidate for Alderman, Ward 2

Charter’s Stakeholders (i.e. Community Groups and Associations)

Greater Parole Community Association, Inc.
Eastport Civic Association
Washington County BOE and Hagerstown City Clerk

The following community groups and individuals were also contacted:

Ward One Residents' Association
Bloomsbury Square Community Association
College Creek Terrace/Obery Court Tenant Council
Keanuu Smith-Brown – Candidate for Alderman Ward 3
Admiral Heights Improvement Association
College Creek Terrace/Obery Court Tenant Council
Kingsport Community Association
Newtowne 20 Tenant Council
Toni Strong-Pratt – Candidate for Alderwoman Ward 4
Annapolis Overlook Condo Association, Inc.
Hunt Meadows Homeowners’ Association
Maria Casasco - Immigrant and Multicultural Affairs Officer, AACo./Resident Ward 5
Shaneka Henson - Delegate, District 30A, Resident Ward 6
Housing Authority of Annapolis
Spa Creek Conservancy

Appendix 3 – Questions Raised During Our Outreach

While not every interview and meeting were identically conducted, we aimed for a themed line of questioning to get a sense of where our attention should be centered. Following is a list of the questions the Commissioners relied upon to guide all of our outreach efforts.

Charter Structure

- Do you rely on others, like the City Attorney, to navigate the Charter for you, or do you have a working familiarity with it?
- Do you rely on or refer to the Charter for specific purposes? If so, please provide an example.
- Does the Charter help or hinder you in accomplishing your broader goals?
- Has the Charter ever presented an obstacle (or conversely an advantage) to accomplishing a specific goal that was either the popular will or the mandate of the Mayor/Council?

Interviewee's Background / Experience

- Have you ever worked in a city or county that operated under a different Charter. If so, how would you compare the Annapolis City Charter to it/them (positives and negatives)?
- Are there policy or other gaps in the Charter that you believe should be addressed? If so, please offer an example. (Ideas: noise, environment, animal control, services, public safety, culture enrichment, traffic, provision of utilities.)

Views on the Present Annapolis Charter

- If you could change the Charter, how would you change it (generally or specifically)?
- Do you believe the Charter should be rewritten in its entirety?

How Well the City Works

- In your (work)/(relationship) with the city, what are the most effective powers, systems or lines of authority that produce expected results? What are the most ineffective ones?
 - ♦ Note: The purpose of this question is to flesh out from the respondent what works and what does not work as it relates to the establishment of power and authority in the Charter.
- When thinking about your (work)/(relationship) with the city, what powers, systems or lines of authority arising from the Charter would create meaningful change for you? How would you characterize that change (i.e., responsiveness by the city? empowerment of stakeholders? streamlining of processes? building for future needs?).
 - ♦ Note: The purpose of this question is to elicit vision from the respondent as it relates to the establishment of power and authority in the Charter.

Appendix 4 – Corrections, Adjustments, and Edits

Beyond the recommendations identified above the Commission had noted repeated areas of the present Charter that need attention. We divide our proposals between:

The broad and general adjustments necessary:

- ♦ Correcting grammar; deleting obsolete language.
- ♦ The language should be updated to include the use of gender-neutral pronouns.
- ♦ Overly long job descriptions should be reduced to include only essential and encompassing elements. Educational and professional requirements should be relegated to Code provisions.
- ♦ Clearly outdated overly lengthy descriptions of City services should be eliminated or revised.

Specific recommendations.

- ♦ Article I: General Provisions – Reviewed but no action identified as being needed.
- ♦ Article III: Powers – Section requires further review
- ♦ Included above Article VI - Operations
 - City Council shall receive emergency response training from the Office of Emergency Management every two years, with special attention to cybersecurity issues.
 - Public Safety Commanders from the police and fire departments shall receive advanced training for large scale advanced national incident management system /(IMS).
- ♦ Article IX: Miscellaneous – No changes recommended.

Appendix 5 – Resources/References Used

Charter of the City of Annapolis

Code of the City of Annapolis

Annotated Code of Maryland - Local Government Article; Title 4, Subtitle, Municipal Charter Amendment

City Council of the City of Annapolis; Resolution 10-21 (Charter Revision Commission)

Charters 101, a publication of the National League of Cities www.nlc.org

Charters of MD Cities

- Berlin
- Bowie
- College Park
- Easton
- Greenbelt
- Hagerstown
- Rockville
- Snow Hill
- Salisbury
- Frederick
- Takoma

Model City Charter, Eighth Edition, a publication of the National Civic League 2011

National Civic League, Model City Charter, 8th Ed. (2003) www.ncl.org

Guide for Charter Commissions; Sixth Edition, National Civic League ([link](#))

City of Annapolis; Charter Revision Commission; Report to the Mayor and City Council (November 28, 2011)

[nytimes.com2021/06/16/briefing/a-guide-to-ranked-choice-voting.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/16/briefing/a-guide-to-ranked-choice-voting.html)

[nytimes.com2020/02/10/politics/ranked-choice-voting.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/10/politics/ranked-choice-voting.html)

[nytimes.com2020/02/26/opinion/democrats-primary-south-carolina.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/26/opinion/democrats-primary-south-carolina.html)

Publications of the Maryland Municipal League (mdmunicipal.org)

- Charter Amendment Procedures for Maryland Municipalities, 2018
- Essential Elements Forms of Government
- Maryland's 157 – A book detailing all 157 of Maryland cities and towns.

- Maryland Legislative Drafting Manual 2015
- Model Charter, a publication of the Maryland Municipal League 1997.

Publications from the Michigan Municipal League

- Charter Commissioners Handbook: Tapping Appropriate Resources
- Charter Revision & Amendment, Michigan Municipal League, 2002
- Impact of Changing from a Village to a City, Michigan Municipal League, 1993, 2003
- The Nature and Purpose of a Home Rule Charter, Citizens Research Council, Michigan Municipal League, the Michigan Association of Municipal Attorneys, 1993
- Charter Revision and Amendment for Home Rule Cities and Villages

Maryland History

McWilliams, Jane Wilson. "Annapolis, City on the Severn: a history." 2011 *Md. Arch.*, XXVII, 216, Archives of Maryland Online ([link](#)).