

How to Remove the New York City Mayor Over Misconduct

A PROPOSAL FOR CLEAR AND BALANCED RULES THAT ENSURE ACCOUNTABILITY AND MAINTAIN DEMOCRATIC SAFEGUARDS

Executive Summary

- An honest government requires strong mechanisms to hold elected officials accountable for misconduct. However, New York City lacks a practical system to remove a mayor in exceptional circumstances related to misconduct, making it an outlier among major cities. Currently, the governor holds unchecked power to remove a mayor for any reason, while the City's only removal option applies to cases of inability or disability.
- A fair mayoral removal process should require a large supermajority of the City Council to recommend removal, followed by a Special Removal Election where voters have the final say. Grounds for removal must be based on misconduct, not political differences, and the process should include a public hearing ensuring due process for the mayor. If voters confirm the Council's removal recommendation, succession rules take effect, and an interim mayor calls for a Special Election.
- Other common methods to remove an elected executive, including recall, impeachment, and court intervention are unsuitable for New York City's political system.
- Additionally, the governor's broad removal powers should be reformed to require clear charges, a public hearing, and a chance for the mayor to defend themselves, ensuring accountability while protecting democratic safeguards.



Introduction

The public debate over removing Mayor Eric Adams following his indictment on federal corruption charges and alleged quid pro quo deal to evade justice has exposed a major flaw in the laws on mayoral misconduct. New York City lacks a practical, balanced, and clearly defined mechanism to remove a mayor under exceptional circumstances related to misconduct. It is one of the only large cities without such a system of accountability.

Currently, the governor holds absolute power to remove a mayor for any reason, provided the mayor receives “a copy of the charges and an opportunity to be heard in his defense,” as stated in the New York Public Officers Law. This unilateral authority is so ill-defined that it has never been exercised, and even the mere threat of its use raises concerns about undermining the will of voters.

Another potential removal process exists under section 10 of the New York City Charter, which allows for the removal of a mayor due to an “inability” to discharge the powers and duties of the office. Modeled after the 25th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, this process is intended for cases of physical, mental, or medical incapacity rather than misconduct. It requires near-unanimous agreement from a Committee on Mayoral Inability—composed of mayoral appointees—and includes multiple opportunities for the mayor to contest removal.

As a result, New York City remains one of the only major U.S. cities without a formal mechanism for removing a mayor due to misconduct. This glaring gap in oversight deprives New Yorkers of a crucial tool to hold the nation’s most powerful mayor accountable for abuses of power.

Why is this issue urgent? Cities plagued by corruption scandals have historically reformed their laws to strengthen accountability. Detroit revised its process for removing elected officials in 2011 after a court blocked the city council’s attempt to oust an indicted mayor—who was later sentenced to prison. Illinois amended its constitution to allow for gubernatorial recall after several governors were convicted of felonies. In Baltimore, after multiple corruption scandals, voters approved a charter amendment to make the Inspector General independent. Similarly, much of New York City’s current ethics framework was established in response to corruption cases during the Koch administration in the 1980s.

Citizens Union believes that an honest government requires strong, effective mechanisms to hold elected officials accountable for misconduct, corruption, and abuse of power.

This report outlines how the New York City Charter and New York State law should be amended to establish a process for removing a mayor under certain circumstances—while preserving democratic safeguards. It also provides an overview and analysis of alternative removal processes and a comparison of other jurisdictions.



Removal by New York City Voters

A Special Mayoral Removal Election Called by the City Council, After It Finds Misconduct

To ensure a fair and effective path to accountability, removing a mayor for misconduct must be a well-defined, two-step process that prevents political misuse while providing meaningful due process.

The two most common methods for removing an elected executive—impeachment and recall—are not suitable for New York City. Impeachment, which would grant a single-chamber legislative branch, the City Council, sole authority to remove a duly-elected mayor, will not provide sufficient scrutiny for such a consequential decision, especially regarding the city’s highest elected office. A recall system, in which voters could initiate removal through a petition-driven election, risks being exploited by high-spending special interests, as seen in other jurisdictions. Additionally, New York City lacks a strong tradition of citizen-led ballot initiatives, and implementing a recall process would require explicit state authorization. A deeper discussion of these and other removal methods is included later in this report.

Citizens Union believes the removal process for mayoral misconduct should involve a determination by a large supermajority of the City Council, triggering a referendum to confirm the decision.

This approach ensures: a) that a mayor can only be removed through broad consensus among council members, and b) that voters get the final say as to whether the mayor may continue to serve. If voters approve the removal, the succession process outlined in section 10 of the New York City Charter would take effect, and a special election would be held to fill the vacancy.

Key Elements in a Mayoral Removal Process

- **Grounds for removal:** The removal of a mayor must be based on misconduct, not political differences. The legal grounds for initiating the process should be neither vague and open to broad interpretation, nor so narrowly defined that they limit its application. The mayor should be subject to removal for any of four reasons: malfeasance, neglect of duty, violation of the oath of office, and a conviction of a felony regarding conduct in office.¹ Local jurisdictions across the country use a variety of terms as grounds for removal, including misfeasance, malfeasance, misconduct, inability, neglect in the performance of duties, willful violation of duty, offense involving moral turpitude, convictions, neglect of duty, corrupt conduct in office, refusal to cooperate with ethics investigations, indictments for felony by a grand jury, among others.

¹ NYC Charter Sec. 1139 already disqualifies people from holding city elected offices if they were convicted of certain offenses, but they include a narrow range of state and federal felonies.



- **Voting thresholds** – A mayoral removal process should be deliberately difficult to achieve and should remain an extremely rare occurrence. Supermajorities of two-thirds or higher are nearly always required to remove elected officials at the city, state, and federal levels, as well as in jurisdictions around the world. Some processes even incorporate different voting thresholds at various stages. In New York City, with its overwhelming Democratic majority, we believe the supermajority margin should be quite substantial. Under this proposed process, removal would require increasingly higher majorities at multiple steps: 70% of the City Council to issue charges, 80% to recommend removal, and finally, a majority of New York City voters to confirm the removal.
- **Due process, transparency, and timeline** – Given the gravity of removal proceedings, all proceedings and underlying materials must be made public. The mayor must have the right to present their case, including evidence and witnesses, and be represented by counsel. However, the overall removal process must be conducted within a reasonable timeframe to prevent prolonged disruption and instability in city government. Under this proposal, no more than 67 days would pass from when the Council brings charges until voters vote on removal (7 days to start the hearing, 30 days to complete hearing and vote to recommend removal, 30 more days until a Special Removal Election is held).
- **Local control** – The removal of the Mayor of New York City should be a local matter. This hybrid proposal begins with the City’s legislative branch—representing all communities and neighborhoods—and ends with the City’s voters, without involvement from any state entity (except for potential litigation in state courts). The state constitution and state law grant local governments Home Rule over the “mode of selection and removal” of local officials.² However, the Governor would still retain the legal authority to remove a mayor; a later section of this report proposes reforms to that process.
- **Reform approval** – Establishing a new method in the New York City Charter for removing a mayor must be approved by voters. The current Charter Revision Commission, which is developing proposals for the November 2025 ballot, can propose the removal mechanism described here. Once voters approve the proposal, the City Council should promptly establish rules governing the process.

CITIZENS UNION’S PROPOSED PROCESS FOR MAYORAL REMOVAL

1. The procedure is triggered when the mayor has engaged in one of the following:
 - a. Malfeasance,
 - b. Neglect of duty,
 - c. Violation of the oath of office, or
 - d. Conviction of a felony regarding conduct related to the holding of the office of mayor.






² New York State Constitution, Art. IX Sec. 2.; Municipal Home Rule Law Sec. 10



2. The City Council may issue charges regarding such misconduct in the form of a resolution, by a vote of at least 70% of its members. A notice of the charges and the factual basis for each charge must be filed with the City Clerk, which will make them public, and served upon the mayor.
3. The mayor is given the opportunity to be heard before the Council, under rules to be prescribed by the Council, which must adhere to the following requirements:
 - a. A public hearing begins within seven days.
 - b. The right of the mayor to representation by counsel.
 - c. The right of the mayor to present evidence, call witnesses, subpoena witnesses and evidence, and be heard on his/her own behalf.
4. The Council must complete its hearing and vote on the question of removal within 30 days.
5. At the conclusion of such hearing, the City Council votes whether the mayor has engaged in the misconduct he/she was charged with and should therefore be removed from office. If the vote is approved by at least an 80% majority, the Speaker of the Council shall file the findings with the City Clerk and call a Special Removal Election, which will be held in 30 days.³ If the date of Special Removal Election falls within 30 days of a primary or general election day, it will be consolidated with that election to increase voter participation.
6. The Council's findings should not be subject to judicial review on its merits, but violations of the removal process as set by the City Charter may be challenged in court.
7. The Special Removal Election shall include one ballot question asking whether the mayor should be removed. The language of the question will be predetermined by the Charter. No other question or contest will appear on that ballot, unless the election is consolidated with a primary or general election.
8. Campaign finance disclosure rules governing municipal ballot proposals or referenda will apply in the Special Removal Election. Contributions to political committees and Independent Expenditures campaigning for and against removal must be disclosed in the same manner.
9. If voters confirm the City Council's findings, the succession provisions of the Charter apply, and whoever succeeds to the mayoralty shall follow the provisions of section 10 of the Charter in calling for a special election to fill the vacancy. The removed mayor may not run in this special election.
10. Whoever is elected in the special election immediately takes office.

³ Some cities bar removal of a mayor at the beginning or near the end of the mayor's term. We have not included that recommendation because the seriousness of the charges may merit removal at any time during the term of office.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY: NYC MAYOR REMOVAL PROCESS

<p>City Council Issues Charges by a 70% Supermajority</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grounds: malfeasance, neglect of duty, violation of the oath of office, or felony conviction related to conduct in office • Misconduct charges must be in the form of a Council resolution
<p>30-Day Hearing and Vote by the City Council</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearing begins <u>within 7 days</u> of charges, and can take <u>up to 30 days</u>, including vote • Mayor can present evidence, call witnesses, and be represented by counsel • Hearing is public, rules set by the Council
<p>City Council Votes to Remove Mayor by an 80% Supermajority</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If approved, Council Speaker calls for a Special Removal Election • Findings are filed and made public
<p>Special Removal Election</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ballot question to confirm mayoral removal • Held <u>in 30 days</u> of Council vote • Same campaign finance rules as referenda
<p>Regular Succession and Special Election to Fill Vacancy</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If voters remove, succession rules take effect • Interim mayor calls for Special Election • Removed mayor cannot run in this election



Alternative Mayoral Removal Methods

Impeachment and Removal by Lawmakers

It is uncommon for unicameral jurisdictions to grant lawmakers impeachment power, making this process unsuitable for New York City’s political structure

The removal of executive officers for misconduct is typically handled through an impeachment process overseen by legislative bodies. In the U.S. Congress and 48 states, including New York, one legislative chamber presents charges against the official, and if approved, the other chamber conducts a trial that may result in removal from office.

Yet at the municipal level, impeachment, often just called “removal” in city charters, exists in a small number of jurisdictions. Local elected officials do face impeachment in towns and smaller cities, and some state legislatures have the authority to impeach municipal officials.⁴ However, no city operates under a bicameral system like state and federal governments, and the impeachment of a mayor in a major city by a City Council has not occurred in decades.⁵

Among the nation’s largest cities, Houston, Detroit, Seattle, El Paso, Louisville, and Milwaukee have mayoral removal mechanisms controlled by Council Members. In nearly all of these cases, a supermajority of the City Council is required to confirm the removal—two-thirds in Houston, Detroit, Seattle, and Louisville; three-quarters in Milwaukee; and a simple majority in Memphis. Additionally, the mayor is granted due process, including the right to present evidence, compel witnesses, and be represented by counsel.

Most local laws governing removal procedures date back to the mid-20th century or earlier, but some have been codified more recently. In 2011, Detroit voters approved a new City Charter that reformed the “forfeiture” process for elected officials after the Detroit City Council’s previous attempt to remove a mayor was blocked by the courts.⁶ Similarly, after three Cincinnati City Council members were indicted for corruption in 2020, voters amended the City Charter to grant the Council authority to suspend its own members.⁷

⁴ See for example, Nicholas Bogel-Burroughs, The New York Times, Oct. 4, 2019. How Does It Feel to Be Impeached? These Mayors Can Tell You All About It.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/04/us/impeached-mayors.html> For impeachment of local officials by state legislatures see, for example, Indiana Code Titles 5 Article 8: Officers' Impeachment, Removal, Resignation, And Disqualification <https://iga.in.gov/laws/2024/ic/titles/5#5-8-1-2>

⁵ Unlike the rarity of mayoral impeachments, it is quite common for city councils to have the power to remove one of their own for misconduct. The New York City Council can expel a member following charges and a hearing, with a two-thirds vote (Charter Sec. 45). This authority was exercised for the first time in 2020.

⁶ Judge blocks effort to oust Detroit mayor, Aug. 18, 2008, The Associated Press <https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna26273498>

⁷ WVXU, Becca Costello, April 15, 2021. Explaining Issues 1 And 2, The Anti-Corruption Amendments on Cincinnati’s May Ballot.

<https://www.wvxu.org/local-news/2021-04-15/explaining-issues-1-and-2-the-anti-corruption-amendments-on-cincinnati-may-ballot>



The traditional impeachment method as established in the federal government, states, and several cities, will not work in New York City. New York City has a unicameral legislature, the City Council, and it often finds itself at odds with the mayor. Impeachment typically requires a supermajority vote to convict and remove from office, a high threshold meant to reserve such unusual action to serious abuses of power, but a two-thirds vote to override a mayoral veto is not uncommon in the New York City Council. Even a higher threshold for removal could be influenced by partisanship, considering that Democrats have always held more than 85% of Council seats, including during Republican mayors. For these reasons, we do not support impeachment as a method for removing the mayor.

Removal Involving the Courts

Courts play a central role in impeachments outside the U.S., but involving New York courts in removing the mayor would add a layer of complexity

Outside the United States, the most common method of impeaching an elected executive official involves the judicial branch—either by granting courts the power to try an official impeached by the legislature or to review a removal decision made by lawmakers.

For example, in Colombia, Germany, the Czech Republic, and many other countries, once the legislative body votes to impeach a president by a supermajority, a constitutional court hears the case and determines whether the official should be removed. In other cases, such as South Korea, a president can be suspended by lawmakers, but the Constitutional Court reviews the decision and has the authority to reverse the impeachment. The composition and function of these high courts vary across jurisdictions.⁸


In the U.S., courts play a limited role in removal proceedings. In Nebraska, the only unicameral U.S. state, if the state legislature impeaches a governor, the Nebraska Supreme Court conducts the trial. In Virginia, voters can gather signatures to petition a local trial court (Circuit Court) to conduct a trial against a city elected official over misconduct, and the court has the authority to remove the official.⁹ Under the Pittsburgh Charter, Pennsylvania's trial court (Court of Common Pleas) can appoint a citizen committee to investigate misconduct of an elected official, and the final decision may then be referred to the City Council.¹⁰

Granting the judicial branch the final authority over the removal of New York City's mayor is unlikely to be effective. Justices of the State Supreme Court in New York City are elected and not insulated from party politics. Additionally, such an approach would shift the decision-making power away from New York City's jurisdiction and into the hands of a body governed by state law, reducing local control over the process. Finally, the courts may well be called

⁸ See for example, Aziz Z. Huq, Tom Ginsburg & David E. Landau, "The Comparative Constitutional Law of Presidential Impeachment," 88 *University of Chicago Law Review* 81 (2021); Brown, Lucas (2024) "A Taxonomy of Impeachment Methods Used Worldwide," *Indiana Journal of Constitutional Design*: Vol. 10, Article 3.

⁹ Sec. 24.2-233 of the Code of Virginia

¹⁰ Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter Sections 806 and 807



upon to resolve issues relating to this process, so having them also make the removal decision can be seen as in conflict with their judicial role.

Removal by an Ad-Hoc Body Created for This Purpose

Granting removal power to other City elected officials could introduce conflicts of interest, particularly among those with aspirations for higher office

New York City has elected officials beyond the City Council who could potentially play a role in a two-step impeachment process in the absence of an upper legislative chamber or judicial involvement. For example, after the City Council approves charges against the mayor, the impeachment trial could be conducted by an ad-hoc removal body composed of the Public Advocate, the City Comptroller, the five borough presidents, and the City Council Speaker.

For comparison, the current Committee on Mayoral Inability consists of the City Comptroller, the Speaker of the City Council, the longest-serving borough president, the Corporation Counsel, and one deputy mayor chosen by the mayor. This committee has the authority to refer decisions regarding the mayor's inability to serve to the full Council for a vote.

However, the political dynamics within New York City may introduce unwanted conflicts of interest to the decisions of such ad-hoc body. Citywide and boroughwide elected officials often have ambitions for higher office, including the mayor's office, and one of them would become the acting mayor if the mayor were removed. Any removal mechanism should be designed to minimize personal political motivations and ensure impartial decision-making.

Removal Through a Recall Election

The most widely used method for removing mayors would likely face challenges in New York with petitions driven by well-funded special interests

Recall elections are the most common method for removing mayors due to misconduct. Thirty-nine states allow local elected officials to be recalled, typically through constitutional or statutory provisions that govern localities statewide. Some states permit cities to establish their own recall rules through their charters. Of the 30 largest U.S. cities, 22 mayors can be recalled. Recall elections are particularly prevalent in municipalities in the Western U.S. and the Midwest, though they are not exclusive to those regions.

An appendix for this report includes a comparison of major cities with recall and other removal methods.

A recall is initiated by citizen petitions and results in a ballot question asking voters whether an elected official—in this case, the mayor—should remain in office. Procedures vary widely, including: The number of signatures required to trigger a recall election; the timeframe for signature collection; whether specific grounds for recall must be cited; the ballot structure, like whether a successor is chosen on the same ballot; vacancy rules once the official is recalled; and whether a recalled mayor can run again.



One of the biggest weaknesses of the recall system lies in the petition process. If the signature threshold is too low, the collection period too long, and rules too lax, recalls can become tools for well-funded political opponents and special interests that drive signature petitions rather than a safeguard against misconduct. Excessive recall attempts over policy disagreements rather than misconduct can create instability. Conversely, if the threshold is too high, recall petitions will rarely, if ever, succeed.

For instance, Los Angeles's signature threshold is 15% of registered voters in the city, while in Michigan, petitioners need to collect signatures from at least 25% of voters who participated in the last election for the targeted office. Some have inserted unique provisions to ensure a recall is representative of the public. Washington, D.C. requires signatures from 10% of registered voters, but they must be spread across at least five of the city's eight wards to ensure broad support. In Idaho, a recall is approved only if the number of votes in favor exceeds the votes received by the targeted official in their most recent election win.¹¹

In New York City, petition-driven ballot initiatives already face significant hurdles. The City Charter requires at least 50,000 signatures from registered voters to place a City Charter amendment referendum on the ballot. This constitutes about 0.009% of the number of registered voters in New York City, or 0.04% of the number of votes cast in the last mayoral election. Those signatures must be collected within 120 days.¹² In the last four decades, five efforts have succeeded in collecting the required number of signatures for a petition-initiative referendum, although all of them but one were struck down from the ballot by the court.

Implementing a recall system in New York City would pose major challenges.

State law does not provide for recall of officials and does not grant that power to localities under the Home Rule article of the constitution or the Municipal Home Rule Law, so a recall petition would likely require state action.¹³ Citizen petitions are uncommon in New York's political culture, and it would be extremely difficult for a campaign to gather enough of them. A relatively low threshold like Los Angeles's 15% of registered voters would reflect over 800,000 New Yorkers—more than any mayoral candidate has received in recent decades.

Given these legal and logistical hurdles, a recall system in New York City would be extremely difficult to implement and execute effectively.

¹¹ See also: Joshua Spivak (2021) *Recall Elections: From Alexander Hamilton to Gavin Newsom*

¹² In addition, the Municipal Home Rule Law Sec. 36 requires at least 45,000 signatures to place a question on the ballot on establishing a Charter Revision Commission.

¹³ NYS Comptroller Opinion 89-31 (1989): <http://www.osc.ny.gov/legal-opinions/opinion-89-31>



Removal by the New York Governor

Fair and Open Process with Clear Grounds and Guardrails

The governor's unilateral and vaguely defined removal powers are not commensurate with the potential democratic harm of ousting a duly elected official who represents over 8 million people.

New York Public Officers Law Section 33 grants the governor broad authority to remove mayors and police commissioners across the state. The law simply states: "The chief executive officer of every city [...] may be removed by the governor after giving to such officer a copy of the charges against him and an opportunity to be heard in his defense."

Such broad authority is also unusual. The few states that allow governors to remove local officials have established guardrails to ensure the process is used strictly for misconduct. In Michigan, the governor may remove a city officer only if there is "sufficient evidence [...] that the officer has been guilty of official misconduct, willful neglect of duty, extortion, or habitual drunkenness, or has been convicted of being drunk, or [...] of a felony."¹⁴ Similarly, in Florida, the governor may suspend a municipal officer for malfeasance, misfeasance, neglect of duty, habitual drunkenness, incompetence, permanent inability to perform official duties, or if they are charged with a crime.¹⁵

New York's law also fails to provide meaningful due process for a mayor facing removal. The only time this process was tested in New York—when Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt considered removing Mayor Jimmy Walker—trial-like public hearings were held before the governor, with Judge Samuel Seabury acting as a quasi-prosecutor. However, Walker resigned before a decision was reached. Without any legal requirements or precedent governing the process, a governor could theoretically provide a mayor with nothing more than a written notice and an opportunity to submit a written response.

The lack of legal standards and procedural guidelines, combined with the political risks of removing the mayor of New York City, makes it unlikely that governors will act—even in extreme cases of mayoral misconduct that warrant removal. Conversely, the broad and

¹⁴ Michigan Election Law Sec. 168.327: Removal of city officers by governor; grounds; action on charges; service of charges; hearing; eligibility for election or appointment following removal or conviction. <https://www.legislature.mi.gov/Laws/MCL?objectName=mcl-168-327>

¹⁵ Florida Statutes Sec. 112.51: Municipal officers; suspension; removal from office. <https://www.flsenate.gov/Laws/Statutes/2024/0112.51> Although in recent years, Governor DeSantis has been misusing this power even with grounds for suspension defined in law, his decisions have been subject to court review.

For example: Politico, 01/20/2023, Judge rules DeSantis' ouster of prosecutor was unconstitutional but upholds suspension <https://www.politico.com/news/2023/01/20/judge-said-desantis-violated-constitution-in-suspending-warren-00078789>



unchecked power could be used as a political weapon to pressure or threaten a sitting mayor.

Therefore, Public Officers Law Section 33 should be amended.

CITIZENS UNION'S PROPOAL FOR MAYORAL REMOVAL BY GOVERNOR

1. The governor may issue charges against a chief executive of a city for
 - a. Malfeasance,
 - b. Neglect of duty,
 - c. Violation of the oath of office, or
 - d. Conviction of a felony regarding conduct related to the holding of the office of mayor.
2. The governor must provide the official with written notice of the charges and the factual basis for each charge, and make them public.
3. A public hearing before the governor will begin within seven days.
4. The official will have the right to representation by counsel.
5. The official will have the right to present evidence, call witnesses, subpoena witnesses and evidence, and be heard on his/her own behalf.
6. The hearing process prescribed above is limited to 30 days.
7. At the conclusion of such hearing, the governor submits her/his decision in writing to the official.
8. If the mayor is removed from office, the succession provisions of the New York City Charter apply, and whoever succeeds to the mayoralty shall follow the provisions of section 10 of the Charter in calling for an election to fill the vacancy.

Appendix

Removal Methods of Mayors in the Largest Cities in the U.S.

Pop. size	City	ST	Recall Set by State Law	Recall Set by City Charter	Removal Powers Set by State Law	Removal by City Council, Set by City Charter
1	New York	NY			By Governor	
2	Los Angeles	CA	Yes	Yes		
3	Chicago	IL				
4	Houston	TX		Yes		Yes
5	Phoenix	AZ	Yes	Yes		
6	Philadelphia	PA				
7	San Antonio	TX		Yes		
8	San Diego	CA	Yes	Yes		
9	Dallas	TX		Yes		
10	Jacksonville	FL	Yes	Yes	By Governor	
11	Austin	TX		Yes		
12	Fort Worth	TX		Yes		
13	San Jose	CA	Yes	Yes		
14	Columbus	OH	Yes	Yes		
15	Charlotte	NC				
16	Indianapolis	IN			By Legislature	
17	San Francisco	CA	Yes	Yes		
18	Seattle	WA	Yes			Yes
19	Denver	CO	Yes	Yes		
20	Oklahoma City	OK		Yes		
21	Nashville	TN	Yes	Yes		
22	Washington	DC				
23	El Paso	TX		Yes		Yes
24	Las Vegas	NV	Yes			Yes (suspension)
25	Boston	MA				
26	Detroit	MI	Yes	Yes	By Governor	Yes
27	Portland	OR	Yes	Yes		
28	Louisville	KY			By City Council	
29	Memphis	TN	Yes			Yes
30	Baltimore	MD				
31	Milwaukee	WI			By City Council	Yes
68	Pittsburgh	PA				Yes (involves the courts)



Mayoral Removal by Lawmakers – Examples of Provisions

- **Houston City Charter** Art VI, Sec. 5. - Removal of the Mayor
https://library.municode.com/tx/houston/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodId=CH_ARTVITHMA_S5REMA
- **Detroit City Charter** Sec. 2-107 - Dismissal Proceedings
https://library.municode.com/mi/detroit/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodId=PTI2012DECH1963MICOMIH_ORUAC_SPA2012DECH_ART2GEPR_S2-107DIPR
- **Seattle City Charter** Article V Sec. 10. – Removal of Mayor
https://library.municode.com/wa/seattle/codes/municipal_code?nodId=THCHSE_ARTVEXDE_S10REMA
- **El Paso City Charter** Sec. 3.4 Determination of Elections and Qualifications
<https://www.elpasotexas.gov/assets/Documents/CoEP/CityClerk/Others/City-Charter-amended.pdf>
- **Milwaukee City Charter** Sections 3-29 Commissions and Fees Prohibited, 3-30 Prohibited Practices, 3-31 Sales to Public Utilities Prohibited, 4-28 Malfeasance
<https://city.milwaukee.gov/ImageLibrary/Groups/ccClerk/Ordinances/City-Charter/Master-Charter.pdf>
Wisconsin Statutes Chapter 17.12 - Removal and suspension of city officers
<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/17/12>
- **Louisville - Kentucky Revised Statutes** Sec. 67C.143. Removal of elected officers of consolidated local government; hearing; vote of council; appeal; restrictions on eligibility for office or appointment following removal
<https://codes.findlaw.com/ky/title-ix-counties-cities-and-other-local-units/ky-rev-st-sect-67c-143.html>

Acknowledgments

This report was written by Ben Weinberg, Director of Public Policy, with research assistance from Amaury Dujardin, Policy Manager, and CU interns Alice Gaalswyk, Myles Moore, Max Weber, and Suzanna Weber. The proposal was developed by the Citizens Union Policy Committee and approved by the Citizens Union Board of Directors.