

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 52

**City of Minneapolis
Organization for City Planning**

January 1956

(52)

For release Feb 6 pm

1/56 - RMB

Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County
601 Syndicate Building
Minneapolis 2, Minn.
Fe 8-0791

REPORT

ON

ORGANIZATION FOR CITY PLANNING IN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

by the

CITY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

of the

CITY AND METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

January 27, 1956

ORGANIZATION FOR CITY PLANNING IN MINNEAPOLIS

Contents

Conclusions and recommendations

I. Origin, purpose and scope of study; the committee	I - 1
II. What is city planning?	II - 1
A. Present concept	II - 1
B. Expanded concept urged	II - 2
C. Planning is a staff service	II - 3
III. What is good organization for planning?	III - 1
A. Elements of good planning organization	III - 1
B. General governmental framework	III - 1
C. Alternative planning structures	III - 2
D. Comparison of alternative planning structures	III - 2
	and
	Table 1
E. Additional points on independent commission	III - 2
F. Planning agency's relationships with city officials	III - 3
G. Relationships with citizens	III - 3
H. Organization and functioning of the planning staff	III - 4
I. Provisions of the Model City Charter of the National Municipal League	III - 5
J. Centralization of planning function in one agency	III - 6
IV. Minneapolis' present organization for planning	IV - 1
A. Organization and powers of the existing agencies	IV - 1
B. What are the differences in responsibility of the City Planning Commission and the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee?	IV - 3
C. Planning Commission could have performed City's total planning job -- if . . .	IV - 4
D. How the Planning Commission actually performed	IV - 4
E. Why didn't the Planning Commission become the effective central planning agency?	IV - 7
F. Development of the City Council's Long Range Capital Improvements Committee	IV - 11
G. How sound is the present organization for planning?	IV - 14

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

1. The Long Range Capital Improvements Committee (LRCIC) was created by the City Council in December 1953 to provide organizational aid to the city in meeting its needs for capital improvements. The objective was to get public and council backing for a constructive program of public improvements, soundly financed and initiated in a logical order of priority. This is a laudable objective which deserves public support.

2. The LRCIC can make a real contribution by working out, in conjunction with the City Planning Commission (CPC), a sound program of public improvements.

3. The fact that there was a need for the creation of the LRCIC and the recent controversy over what kind of staff it should have calls attention to the inadequacy of the planning organization in Minneapolis' city government.

4. The city has had a Planning Commission since 1919 when it was created by legislative act, and its powers include preparation of a comprehensive city plan, and approval, subject to concurrence by the City Council, of the location and design of all public improvements. But the CPC has not been effective in these areas and has been largely preoccupied with problems of zoning.

5. Since the city has urgent need for a capital improvements program and the Planning Commission was not producing one, the LRCIC is filling a gap which badly needs filling.

6. It is appropriate at this time for the community to recognize that there has been a deficiency in our regularly constituted governmental bodies in so far as the performance of the planning function is concerned and to start deliberation and action at this time in the development of a productive and efficient organization for city planning.

7. A fully constructive solution of the problem will require charter amendment as substantiated in Stage II below, but an amendment of the charter sufficiently broad to provide the changes needed deserves to have extended consideration before it is submitted to vote. We are therefore proposing action in two stages: Stage one, designed to make the existing organizations work as well as possible and in such a way as to hasten the long term solution, and stage two, the long term solution.

Recommendations: Stage 1 -- short term

1. That duplication of professional staffs and activities of the two agencies (City Planning Commission and Long Range Capital Improvements Committee) be avoided.

2. That the staff of the LRCIC be held to the minimum necessary to enable it to carry out the coordination and public relations job which it is best constituted to perform;

3. That the City Council continue to expand the budget of the CPC to enable it to hire sufficient qualified staff members, headed by a capable city planner, to complete a comprehensive city plan as authorized by the City Charter and to furnish staff services to the LRCIC in the development of a sound capital improvements program.

Recommendations: Stage 2 -- long term

The longer term objectives of Minneapolis citizens in working for effective city planning should be to seek to merge the best features of both planning agencies into one department under competent leadership. But even that will not result in fully effective organization of city planning unless the consolidation of the two planning agencies is part of a fundamental reorganization of the city government. Both considerations call for amendment of the City Charter.

To understand why city planning broke down under the present Charter and the creation of the LRCIC became necessary as a means of getting underway on a badly needed program of public improvements, and why it is that it will be possible only by Charter amendment to organize city planning on a fully effective and sound basis, we need to examine the record of operations under the present Charter and consider what kind of an organization would produce the best results.

The four citizen members of the Planning Commission are appointed by the Mayor, who is himself one of the nine commissioners. In a weak mayor, strong council form of government this puts the planning commission in a difficult position, since the council has control over budgets, number of personnel and broad administration of city affairs. With this basic difficulty to start, plus long time personality conflicts between the planning engineer and the City Council, the CPC's relation with the Council deteriorated over a period of years. The Council did not authorize a commission budget adequate to enable the commission to do effective long range planning, including work on capital programming, with the result that most of the time and energies of the commission were devoted to the immediate problems of zoning appeals.

Realizing the growing need of capital improvement programming, and because the CPC was not providing it, the City Council created the LRCIC. It was added to the confusing array of boards, commissions and divisions of government which make up our Minneapolis government.

It is certainly not ideal to have two divisions of government -- one under the Mayor and one under the Council -- each responsible for a part of a function which is essentially indivisible. This division is contrary to sound principles of government. It adds to voter confusion over lines of responsibility. It could result in less effective control over capital expenditures. The conflict of jurisdiction does not breed efficiency. It increases direct participation by the City Council in details of administration in contrast to their proper function of policy determination and legislation.

There should be just one agency for central planning.

But city planning to be most effective must also be tied in closely with the day-to-day planning and operations of government. Plans are no good unless they eventually become useful guides to day-to-day operations. Thus, in the field of planning, for example, there must be close correlation between the City Engineer's responsibilities for maintenance and construction and the planning agency's responsibility for zoning, master planning and capital programming. This requires first of all that administrative operations themselves be well coordinated and directed. Such coordination and direction will come about most effectively if the city government is organized so that there is a clear separation of legislation and administration, with legislative power centered in one body elected by the people and administrative authority centered in a

chief administrator with administrative departments under him. The chief administrative officer must have authority and responsibility to formulate programs for presentation to the legislative body and to carry out the programs it adopts. To carry out these responsibilities he needs, among other things, the assistance of a central budget agency to help him prepare and control a budget for all the various needs of the city, including capital improvements, and to suggest the most appropriate ways to finance both capital and operating needs.

The City of Minneapolis does not have such a clearly-organized, coordinated governmental structure, set up for effective action. There are independent boards sharing legislative powers with the City Council and having their independent administrative organizations, and the many agencies under the City Council are in turn not under the direction of a single chief administrator. Effective overall budget preparation and control and financial reporting are lacking.

It thus appears to us that the best organization for city planning -- a single central planning agency tied in closely with day-to-day planning and operations -- is related to the need for overall reorganization of Minneapolis government. That can be achieved in a satisfactory manner only as a result of basic amendment of the City Charter.

As an initial step preliminary to drawing up such an amendment, the community should first make a fundamental decision regarding responsibility for overall administration.

If the desire is to have a single elected representative primarily responsible for administration and to effect a clear separation between administration and policy-making, then the mayor should be made responsible to the people for administration and the Council should have the responsibilities of checking on the administration, determining policy and passing legislation. But if closer correlation between responsibility for administration (contrasted with active participation in administration) and policy determination is desired, then the council-manager form of government is indicated. A decision between these two basic forms of government ("strong mayor" and "council-manager") should be reached by the Charter Commission and interested citizens groups before any program for comprehensive reorganization of Minneapolis government gets fully underway or the drafting of an amendment is initiated.

Adoption of either one of these modern forms of city government tailored to fit Minneapolis' needs would make possible a more continuous, comprehensive and orderly program for the planning and completion of sound capital improvements, as an incidental but an important part of a fundamental reorganization of city government. It is time that Minneapolis again begins to work for something better in the organizational structure of its city government.

ORIGIN, PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

By legislation passed in 1919, a planning commission was created for Minneapolis. The legislation was included in the Minneapolis City Charter, adopted in 1920, and the Planning Commission is now in its 36th year. During this period it has had as planning engineer A. C. Godward from 1922 to 1928 and Herman E. Olson from 1929 to 1955. In its 36 years the commission and its staff have been subjected to considerable criticism for things they have done and have not done.

In December 1953 the Minneapolis City Council established the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee to assist the City Council in developing, promoting and executing a capital improvements program for the city. Because these functions seemed to overlap functions of the Charter-established Planning Commission, and because of the criticism of the commission, it seemed important to the Citizens League's City and Metropolitan Government Committee to look into the performance of the City Planning Commission and the reasons for having two agencies, with a view to determining, if possible, whether such an organizational set up or some other would be in the best interest of the community. This study is the result.

The study covers a definition of city planning, a consideration of the principles of good planning organization, a description and analysis of the powers and performance of the City Planning Commission and the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee, an analysis of how the present situation developed, and the committee's conclusions and recommendations.

The committee

Members of the City Planning Sub Committee who have been active in preparing this report are F. Gregg Bemis, Jr., and Edson Spencer, co-chairmen, and Donald D. Baron, Richard K. Barton and Charles T. Silverson. Stanley K. Platt is chairman of the Forms and Structure Committee which reviewed the report from the standpoint of long-run effects.

WHAT IS CITY PLANNING?

"City planning" is not a precise term, and discussion of it can lead to confusion unless its meaning is first clarified. It is important, therefore, to spell out our own understanding of the term, which we will use throughout this study. In arriving at this concept we have consulted a number of recognized authorities, including the Model City Charter of the National Municipal League, Local Planning Administration, published by the International City Managers Association, Urban Development Guidebook, published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Municipal Management, written by Thomas H. Reed, and The Planning Function in Urban Government, by Robert A. Walker.

In its broadest sense city planning involves the appraisal of all manner of resources in men and materials and the marshaling of them in the community interest. Its objective, in the words of the International City Managers Association, is "to further the welfare of the people in the community by helping to create an increasingly better, more healthful, convenient, efficient and attractive community environment."

A. Present concept

Most of the authorities think of planning in terms of the physical layout of the community. These are the specific elements of city planning so conceived:

1. Preparing and keeping current a master plan. A primary objective of a planning agency is to assure that each new improvement which is made in the city makes its full contribution to the transforming of the present community into an increasingly better one. To accomplish this objective, the community requires a fairly definite plan of this better future community in all of its principle features. This is the master plan, which shows in general outline the city's desirable future development -- the appropriate uses of private land the general location and extent of all necessary or highly desirable public facilities, all in appropriate relation to each other and in scale with the expected population growth and financial resources of the community. A master plan consists of maps, plans, reports, sometimes models, and a priority listing of all the proposed public improvements with approximate cost estimates. The master plan's preparation is one of the major functions of a planning agency, for the master plan is a requisite tool for effective operation.

Since both the priorities of master plan projects, and the schedule on which they are to be constructed must be related to the financial resources of the city and the program of public services it contemplates, the preparation of the master plan must go hand in hand with the preparation of a municipal services program and a long-term capital budget.

The master plan forms a starting point to which all future proposals for public improvements must be related, and the act of making it builds up the stores of information on which the future planning acts must be based.

2. Preparing and keeping current a zoning plan. This is actually one of the essential elements of a master plan. It restricts the height, area, and use of buildings or premises by districts, in order to set aside broad belts of territory for consistent development.

3. Control of land subdivision. This is related to zoning, and together with zoning constitutes the control of land use under the master plan. Land use control is essential to maintaining the integrity of the master plan.

4. Preparing and keeping current a public improvements program. "Such a program indicates and establishes priorities for the publicly-provided framework within which private enterprise may be expected to undertake the bulk of the community's physical development." (C of C, page 16). It covers a period of at least five or six years. Proposed expenditures for the first year are included in the capital budget of the city. At the end of the year, the entire program is reviewed and the program plan is extended for one year.

By its nature, the capital improvements program is closely tied in with the city's financial planning.

5. Planning for slum clearance and rehabilitation of blighted areas. Slum clearance plans include defining boundaries of the district to be cleared, the proposed location of new or relocation of existing streets and other open spaces within the district, the location and general type, character, bulk, height and use of the new buildings to be erected or permitted within the cleared area, and the location of private open spaces.

Plans for rehabilitating blighted areas include defining boundaries and location as under slum clearance and also plans for the reconditioning of old buildings

B. Expanded concept urged

There is a tendency now among students of the subject to broaden city planning beyond physical planning. As the International City Managers Association explains:

"....it became increasingly evident that the size and character of the physical plant of a city will inevitably be determined in large measure by the city's desire and ability to pay for it. Accordingly, capital expenditures budgets began to receive deserved attention. Since capital budgets, in turn, have direct relationship to feasible annual administrative budgets, the necessity of correlating service programs, physical planning, and financial planning became more obvious. Recognizing the limits on community development imposed by limitations on ability to pay, the more progressive city planning commissions have embarked on studies of the community resource base and of methods of strengthening it. Success in these endeavors will raise the economic standards of the citizens of the community. Since planning of any character is useful only as it serves human needs and aspirations, increasing attention is being given to social and economic studies. One may hope that in the years ahead local planning agencies will broaden their field of interest and operation to embrace the complex of interrelated urban problems--physical, social, economic, and governmental--that must be considered

as one unit if a sound solution is to be achieved." pp 6 and 7

Developing further the planning agency's function of correlating service programs of the city government, Robert A. Walker says:

"....high city officials can, and do, plan their work without the aid of a separate agency. Planning is essentially their responsibility, and a planning agency can do little more than aid them in exercising it more competently. Thus, the existence of an agency with broad interests does not mean that all planning activity will be carried on by one agency. On the contrary, an important part of the work of a central planning agency should be the coordination of departmental planning in the light of general-policy considerations. Its independent research work might encompass the work of departments not adequately equipped to plan their operations, but it should also be directed toward the solution of problems beyond the purview of any one department. Whether as part of its coordinating or of its advisory function, however, the planning agency should concern itself with municipal activity in the fullest sense. From the administrative point of view its job is to aid the responsible officials in taking a comprehensive view of their work and in relating all aspects of government activity to one another and to the future." p 111

This broader concept of "overall administrative planning" as distinguished from physical and financial planning appears to be a logical evolution of the planning function in modern city government and therefore we believe it should be kept in mind when considering the long range development of the planning organization in Minneapolis government.

C. Planning is a staff service

One final point must be emphasized. Planning, as a separate function within a city government, is strictly an advisory and coordinating function. It is a staff function as distinguished from a line or operating function. It is performed in order to guide the action of responsible authorities - the governing body, the chief executive - into intelligent channels. Of itself, planning strictly speaking does nothing. The staff nature of the planning function has an important bearing on where it is located in the organization structure and the way the planning agency conducts its relations with the rest of the city government.

III

WHAT IS GOOD ORGANIZATION FOR CITY PLANNING?

A. The elements of good planning organization.

These appear to be the elements of the process of good city planning: a systematic program of assembling information about the city (research), discovering what it means (analysis), and indicating what action it seems to call for (planning and specific recommendations).

No matter how good this process, however, planning is useless unless it influences official action.

The organization of the city planning function, then, should be aimed at providing research, analysis and recommendations which will be sound and which will influence official action.

How shall this be done?

It is obvious that no single pattern will fit all cities. Peculiarities of the form of government, state laws, community history, the existing status of the master plan and capital improvements and other factors must be taken into account. Yet the experiences of cities throughout the country, and the reflections of planners and others on those experiences, reveal certain basic characteristics of effective planning organization, or conditions which favor one or another kind of arrangement. The results of research on these characteristics are summarized below.

B. General governmental framework

By way of preface, it is important to note that the organization for planning is viewed within a framework of a city government which has a chief executive, either a strong mayor or a city manager. This executive is responsible for appointing and directing key department heads, and as part of his general power of directing and coordinating administration he prepares and submits an executive budget to the council, and is required to carry it out. In general, the mayor or manager has responsibility of administrative leadership and for submitting plans and proposals to the council. This provides him with the opportunity of exercising a good deal of initiative in city programs and operations.

We recognize that this type of integrated city government with strong executive leadership does not exist in Minneapolis. All evidence indicates, however, that such a city government has many advantages and few disadvantages compared with a non-integrated government. Indeed, there are irresistible tendencies in the direction of integration within the Minneapolis city government itself. Because we believe that the Minneapolis government must continue to move in this direction, and because we are concerned with the long run development of city planning and the principles to be followed in its organization, we believe that we must consider the proper planning organization in terms of a system of government in which there is a chief executive exercising the general powers of overall direction, coordination, and leadership of the administrative departments.

C. Alternative planning structures

There appear to be three general ways of organizing the central planning agency in the city government structure:

1. Planning powers vested directly in a planning commission. The commission has fairly independent powers to appoint, staff, prepare plans and make recommendations. Planning decisions are made by the commission upon facts and suggestions submitted by the technical staff.

2. Planning powers vested in a planning director appointed by and responsible to the chief executive.

3. Same as (2) except that there is an advisory planning commission to assist the planning director and the chief executive.

Minneapolis' City Planning Commission corresponds most closely to the first form. Although its budget is controlled by the City Council and its four citizen members are appointed by the mayor, it has largely independent status.

D. Comparison of alternative planning structures

Table 1 compares the three alternative planning structures from the standpoint of (1) points to consider in choosing a planning structure, and (2) organization and function. Table 1 should be studied before proceeding to section E.

E. Additional points on independent commission

1. In communities where the planning function has not yet received adequate recognition, a vigorous planning commission -- if one can be established -- may perform valuable service in educating city officials and the public as to the importance of planning.

2. Most of the evidence of the functioning of planning commissions is of a negative nature -- it shows that planning has not generally been more effective in cities with independent commissions: it does not show conclusively that it has been less effective.

3. It is easy to place undue emphasis upon formal organizational arrangements. Informal relationships between the planning agency and the other parts of the city government, and the attitudes of the latter toward planning, are as important as the formal arrangements. If the evidence demonstrates anything, it demonstrates that effective planning can be done under any organizational arrangement provided that strong support exists for planning, and provided that a rich network of informal administrative and advisory relations can be established. In those cities that are reported to have had outstanding success in planning under an independent commission, it usually appears that the planning staff has served in fact, if not in legal form, as the planning advisor to the chief executive.

It is a primary responsibility of the chief planning technician, whether he serves under a commission or under the chief executive, to see that effective working relationships are established. This he can secure, if it can be

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE PLANNING STRUCTURES

POINTS TO CONSIDER IN CHOOSING A PLANNING STRUCTURE	A INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION AND PLANNING STAFF	B NO COMMISSION, PLANNING DEPT. WITH DIRECTOR & STAFF, ARE DIRECTLY UNDER CHIEF ADMIN. OFFICER. NO ADVISORY PLANNING BD.	C SAME AS B BUT WITH ADVISORY PLANNING BOARD
1. Recognize planning as an important continuing function by officially establishing it on a continuing basis in the city's government	This can be done under A, B, or C. Independent commission may provide some additional protection for the planning function.		
2. Make planning function an integral part of government by its placement in the general framework.	Does not accomplish this except as commission and staff work out relationships informally	Does accomplish this.	Does accomplish this though advisory board may introduce independent element.
3. Assure adequate attention to long term planning. This is hard to write into the law or charter and must in the main be the result of the foresight of the personnel involved.	Depends on commission's being sold on need for long term planning.	Depends on chief administrative officer's being sold on need for long term planning.	
4. Free planners from political interference. No structure will guarantee this..	Depends upon the caliber of the commissioners appointed and of the aldermen elected	Depends upon the caliber of the chief administrator and of the aldermen elected.	Is like B though advisory board may provide some protection against political interference.
5. Assure, as far as possible, the implementation of plans.	This is less likely to assure implementation of plans because of the independence of the commissioner; from both the executive branch and the council	More likely to assure implementation because of close tie with executive.	Most likely to assure implementation because of close tie with executive plus citizen advice and probable support of recommendations

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES - 2

POINTS TO CONSIDER	A INDEPENDENT COMMISSION	B PLANNING DEPARTMENT, NO COMMISSION	C PLANNING DEPARTMENT, ADVISORY BOARD
6. Assure that plans influence legislative policy	If commissioners are close to the council this may result, but seems to happen only rarely.	Assures close tie with chief adm. officer. Effect on legislative policy will depend on his relations with the council. There is some evidence that an executive can put more weight behind planning recommendations than a lay commission	Same as B, though advisory planning board may give planning director's recommendations additional weight with the council.
7. Provide for effective democratic control over basic planning decisions	Voters are confused by division of responsibility between two bodies-planning commission and council.	Less confusion, for it is clear when council approves or overrides executive recommendations who is responsible. May result in executive having too much responsibility for determining policy	Same as B, though advisory board may result in some confusion. But it may also help point out who is responsible for decisions as they are finally made.
8. Provide for public explanation of plans and enlisting of support for them	Depends upon the aptness and interest of the commissioners. Generally commissioners have not proved particularly effective at either explaining plans or enlisting support.	Depends entirely on planning engineer and chief administrative officer.	Adds a lay group to the planning director and chief administrative officer. Lay group may be very helpful in explaining plans and enlisting support.
ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTION			
1. Staff: size	Same	Same	Same
Appointment	By Commission	By chief adm. officer with or without Council approval	By chief adm. officer with or without council approval.
2. Lay membership	5 to 15	None	10 to 25

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES -3

POINTS TO CONSIDER	A INDEPENDENT COMMISSION	B PLANNING DEPARTMENT, NO COMMISSION	C PLANNING DEPARTMENT, ADVISORY BOARD
2-continued Lay membership method of appointment	a) by chief executive, or b) by chief executive approved by council, or c) by council.		a) by chief executive, or b) by chief executive approved by council, or c) by council
3. Ex-officio membership of city officials	Common		Not common
4. Qualifications	Vision, Interest, judgment, integrity, prestige are more important than technical or professional planning know-how		Same as A.
5. Duties	Commission concerns itself with all planning policy questions and makes all major policy recommendations involving planning. Normally it: 1) prepares and adopts master plan. 2) prepares and adopts platting regulations and passes on land subdivision plats. 3) prepares zoning ordinance. 4) prepares urban redevelopment program. 5) prepares mapped street plans and an official map. 6) reports on planning problems referred to it. 7) prepares surveys, reports, studies. 8) prepares priority listing of public capital improvements	Planning director and chief administrator make all major policy recommendations involving planning, including those of 1) to 8) in A.	Same as B except that advisory board advises on major planning recommendations, such as the master plan, platting, regulations, capital improvements list, etc.

secured at all, by demonstrating continually that the planning agency is eager to assist and cooperate with the other city departments in dealing with their long-term planning problems; and by staffing his agency with assistants who by the competence of their work can prove the worth of the agency's advice.

F. Planning agency's relationship with city officials

Regardless of the type of planning agency, its success or failure will depend to a large extent not only on technical competence but also on its administrative competence in making its work so useful to the chief executive, the administrative departments, and the legislative body that they will find it an indispensable agency of local government whose advice merits the most serious consideration.

1. The planning agency can be of major service to the chief executive by helping the departments to coordinate their programs and plans so as to eliminate conflicts, and to shape each program so that it will make the maximum number of by-product contributions to the programs of the other departments. The planning agency can aid in developing programs and plans that involve more than one department and in collecting basic data that are useful to several departments, thus avoiding duplication of efforts.

2. It can stimulate and give technical assistance to the line departments of the city government in developing their departmental program and plans for required physical facilities.

3. It can be useful to the legislative body by preparing special reports that will be helpful in the council's consideration of current legislative proposals. The planning agency should make a special effort to keep the legislative body fully informed of its activities and significant findings.

G. Relationship with citizens

The planning agency should also stimulate citizen interest, understanding, and participation in the planning process. A program of a properly organized voluntary citizen's planning committee can form a liaison between the planning agency and the citizens of the community as a whole. Such a committee has many uses: it can reach many citizens; it can secure actual citizen participation in the planning process; it can form a focal point at which citizen viewpoints on community development problems may be given expression and clarification and may sometimes be merged; it is an important means of citizen self-education in planning.

An alert citizens' committee that feels a sense of proprietorship and responsibility for a community plan can be depended on to support the plan in a variety of ways. It can carry on a program of citizen education, support desirable planning legislation, attend meetings of the city council whenever planning matters are on its calendar, and attend council committee meeting. It can support the planning agency, the chief executive, and the city council in their efforts to give effect to the recommendations of the master plan. It can marshal favorable public opinion for proposed improvements, tax levies, or bond authorization requests that conform to the master plan and the long-range program of capital improvements.

Even though the time and effort required to secure effective citizen participation in planning were to reduce the total technical output of a planning agency, it might be better to have fewer or even somewhat less perfect plans actually accomplished than to have more plans and better plans accumulating dust in office and library files.

H. Organization and functioning of the planning staff

It goes without saying that an adequate staff is necessary to do a good job of planning. The International City Managers' Association's suggestions on good staffing are summarized here.

1. Size and composition

Local conditions will obviously have a lot to do with the precise staff requirements. A complex city will need more than a simpler city, and one in which basic planning studies are fairly well completed will need less than a city just beginning to plan.

In a city of 500,000 population, the ICMA suggests that the permanent full-time staff of the planning agency should be headed by a planning director with at least ten years' experience in city planning. His staff might consist of two senior city planners -- one with specialized training in engineering, architecture, or landscape architecture and the other in sociology, economics, or political science -- four additional city planners of associate, assistant, or junior grade, one statistician, six to ten draftsmen and clerks, and one or two stenographers -- a permanent staff of from 15 to 20 persons. A number of temporary personnel -- census takers, traffic checkers, field men, clerks, draftsmen -- may be needed occasionally for special surveys.

The professional services of a technical staff may be supplemented by the use of consultants and one or more voluntary technical subcommittees advising on such special phases of planning as zoning, transportation, or industrial development.

2. Required budget

The ICMA stated in 1948 that as little as 10 or 15 cents per capita would provide an adequate operating budget in cities between 260,000 and 1,000,000 population. A June 1955 survey of 185 cities by the American Society of Planning Officials indicated an average per capita planning budget of 24.1 cents.

3. Staff organization and administration

The planning director (executive secretary or planning engineer) is the head of the planning staff. He should take the lead and exercise a great amount of initiative (subject to the advice and guidance of the commission or chief executive) in developing a sound planning program, preparing the required budget, and initiating and developing desirable studies, plans and reports. He should likewise take the initiative in bringing to the attention of the commission or chief executive those matters requiring action, pointing up the particular issues or questions involved. If the matters he brings before the planning commission or chief executive are properly selected and presented, he can tap to the fullest their special competence and judgment and prevent their becoming absorbed in details that can appropriately be dealt with by the staff.

In handling public relations the planning director should stay in the background as much as possible and push to the front the chairman and members of the planning commission or the chief executive, in order to evoke better public acceptance of proposals and more enthusiastic participation by members of the commission. In organizing the staff, so far as the size of the staff permits there should be a division between long-term planning activities and day-to-day administration and enforcement of planning regulations.

I. Provisions of the Model City Charter of the National Municipal League

The Model City Charter of the National Municipal League represents the distillation of knowledge and experience of many of the leading administrators, consultants, teachers and students in the field of municipal government. It is helpful to consider briefly how the charter conceives of the planning organization.

The Model City Charter provides for a strong mayor or city manager type of government, that is, with administrative power centralized in a chief executive. The mayor or manager is also responsible for taking the initiative in proposing governmental programs, to a great extent through his primary responsibility for preparing the current and capital budgets and submitting them for action to the city council.

The charter provides for a city planning commission of five members, appointed by the chief executive, with the chief executive serving ex officio. No other ex officio members are provided.

The commission is given power to:

1. Make, amend, extend and add to the master plan;
2. Exercise control over platting or subdividing land ^{within} the city;
3. Draft ~~for the~~ council an official map of the city and recommend or disapprove proposed changes in such map;
4. Make and adopt a zoning plan and recommend or disapprove proposed changes in such plan;
5. Make and adopt plans for clearance and rebuilding of slum districts and blighted areas within the city;
6. Submit annually to the chief executive, not less than 90 days prior to the beginning of the budget year, a list of recommended capital improvements which in the opinion of the commission are necessary or desirable to be constructed during the forthcoming six-year period. Such list shall be arranged in order of preference, with recommendations as to which projects shall be constructed in which year;
7. Promote public interest in and understanding of the master plan and of planning, zoning and slum clearance.

A director of planning is appointed by the chief executive with the commission's approval. He is qualified by special training and experience in the field of city planning. He is the commission's technical adviser and its executive secretary.

A zoning board of appeals of three members is appointed by the council. It hears and determines appeals from refusal of building permits, and permits exceptions to or variations from the zoning regulations in classes of cases and in accordance with the principles, conditions and procedure specified in the ordinance.

As part of his budget message, the chief executive includes a statement of pending capital projects and proposed new capital projects, relating the respective amounts proposed to be raised therefor by appropriations in the budget and the respective amounts, if any, proposed to be raised therefor by the issuance of bonds during the budget year. He also includes a capital program of proposed capital projects for the five fiscal years next succeeding the budget year, prepared by the planning commission, together with his comments thereon and any estimates of costs prepared by the department of public works or other office, department or agency. For the use of the planning commission in preparing such capital program, copies of the departmental estimates of capital projects, which have been previously filed with the chief executive, are filed with the commission.

J. Centralization of planning function in one agency

Implicit in the organizational ideas reviewed above is the idea that in the interest of a well-coordinated, efficient planning operation, it is important to vest responsibility for these functions in a single agency. It is probably significant that Local Planning Administration felt it unnecessary even to raise this point.

To stress the importance of centralizing planning responsibility in one agency is not to say that in performing these functions the agency need not consult and cooperate with other agencies of the government and with community groups. We have in mind especially the function of programming capital improvements. It is essential to the proper discharge of this duty by the planning agency that it maintain close relationship with the chief executive and particularly officials concerned with financial planning and groups outside the government.

MINNEAPOLIS' PRESENT ORGANIZATION FOR PLANNING

Minneapolis currently has three agencies performing functions which we found in the preceding chapter are the functions of a soundly conceived central planning agency. These agencies are the City Planning Commission (CPC), the City Council's Long Range Capital Improvements Committee (LRCIC) and the Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA). Actually, the HRA is set up under general state law and its functions are somewhat beyond the effective power of the city to reorganize, so we need only give passing attention to it below.

To understand to what degree division of planning responsibility exists in the dual arrangement of the CPC and the LRCIC, why it has developed, and how it may be corrected, it is necessary to understand the organization and powers of the three agencies and the recent history of planning efforts in Minneapolis.

A. Organization and powers of the existing agencies

1. The Planning Commission

The City Planning Commission was established by state law in 1919. This law was adopted by the voters as part of the City's home rule charter in 1920, and has remained a part of the charter ever since.

According to the charter, the city planning department is under the nine-member Planning Commission. The members of the commission are the Mayor, an ex officio member each from the City Council, School Board, Park Board and County Board, and four others not members of the above boards appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the City Council. Commission members serve without pay. The Mayor's appointees serve for four-year staggered terms.

According to the Charter, the Commission's powers are;

a. To employ staff and incur expenses. The staff are under the classified civil service and expenses are subject to authorization by the City Council.

b. To acquire or prepare a comprehensive city plan, to be known as the official city plan.

c. To prepare and recommend to the proper city officers specific plans for public improvements consistent with the comprehensive plan.

d. To approve the location and design of all public improvements before they may be authorized for construction by the city, except that the City Council by majority vote may override the commission's disapproval.

e. To approve or reject plans or plats for subdivisions.

f. To recommend zoning ordinances to the Council. In addition, the City Council has referred all zoning appeals to the Planning Commission for recommendation.

2. The Long Range Capital Improvements Committee

The Long Range Capital Improvements Committee was created by a motion of the City Council on December 23, 1953 "for the purpose of proposing to the Council and the citizens of Minneapolis a long range capital improvement program, orderly and sound methods of current and capital finance, and a coordinated plan of taxation for local government activities."

The committee, which was conceived as a bi-partisan group, now consists of 19 members: The Mayor, three aldermen each from the Liberal and Progressive caucuses in the City Council, a municipal judge who was one of the original alderman members before receiving his judicial appointment, five representatives of business and five of labor, and one woman. The non-official members are Council appointees. All members serve indefinite terms without compensation.

The City Attorney has ruled that the committee's staff must come under the classified civil service. The City Council appropriates its funds.

The first chairman of the committee listed these as the five initial functions of the committee:

- a. Careful analysis of the long range needs of the city.
- b. Analysis of the financial resources of the community which might be available to pay for these projects.
- c. What additional sources of revenue might be secured if the community is sold upon the urgency of this program sufficiently to approve additional sources of revenue.
- d. Publicity for the plans and acquainting the citizens with them, leading to acceptance of the program by the community.
- e. Constant vigilance over the program to see that it is expedited and carried out as rapidly as possible.

3. The Housing and Redevelopment Authority

a. Organization and powers

The HRA was established by Council resolution in September 1947 under a general state law of 1947. The purpose of the law was to provide for replanning, rehabilitation and rebuilding of substandard, slum, blighted and other areas; for furnishing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for veterans, servicemen, and persons of low income and their families; and for creating local housing and redevelopment authorities.

The authority consists of five commissioners appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the Council. They serve for five year staggered terms. The authority is a body corporate and politic, with the power to sue and be sued, to have a seal, perpetual succession and make and amend rules and regulations. Its powers and duties include those:

- 1) To employ an executive director, technical experts, and other employees, and determine their duties, qualifications and pay; to use the legal services of the city and other services of city agencies.

2) To undertake, prepare, carry out and operate low income housing projects and provide for their construction, reconstruction, improvement, extension, alteration and repair.

3) To give, sell, transfer, convey, dispose of real and personal property.

4) To conduct condemnation proceedings.

5) To undertake and carry out studies and analyses of housing and redevelopment needs.

6) When a local public body does not have a planning agency or when a comprehensive community development plan is not already available by the planning agency, to make or cause to be made such plan as a guide in the more detailed planning of housing and redevelopment areas.

The authority, with the consent of the City Council, is authorized to levy a property tax of not more than one-half mill. It is required to formulate and submit its budget to the City Council each year as regular Council-directed agencies do. When the authority has prepared a redevelopment plan, the plan must be submitted to the Planning Commission for study and recommendation. The City Council has final say on the plan at the local level.

b. Outside possible scope of central planning agency

In the overall, the HRA's major energies are devoted to housing projects and the detailed planning and implementation of redevelopment projects. The latter includes such measures as land acquisition and clearance, relocation of displaced persons and sale of cleared lands.

Certainly, however, the general planning included under (5) and (6) above is the broad physical planning which could logically be done by a central planning agency, such as the Planning Commission. Probably this aspect of slum clearance and redevelopment is what is contemplated as the planning commission's function under the Model City Charter. However, as a practical matter in Minnesota the function of planning under (5) has been reserved by general law to the special Housing and Redevelopment Authority, so there is little point in considering its possible location in some other governmental body.

We may note, however, that in Minneapolis the HRA has gone farther into the planning than it would have had to if the Planning Commission had functioned effectively. Thus, the planning contemplated under (6) was not done by the Planning Commission and therefore had to be done by the HRA.

B. What are the differences in responsibility between the CPC and the LRCIC?

Considering then the listing of the duties of the CPC and the LRCIC in reference to the inventory of planning functions described in Chapter II, it is not entirely clear where one agency leaves off and the other begins. Certainly compared with the table in Chapter I and the Model City Charter, the Minneapolis Charter provisions and Council actions leave something to be desired so far as precision of meaning is concerned. The present set up may be summarized as follows:

The Planning Commission is clearly given authority over zoning and zoning appeals, master plan preparation, subdivision regulation, approval of plats, recommending improvements, and approval of location and design of improvements. The Charter apparently did not intend that the Commission should have sole authority to recommend improvements. The Charter does not mention the long range program of capital improvements, nor any power to study and recommend methods of financing. Certainly, though, the preparation of a master plan would require taking cognizance of physical development and the community's resources. Whether this would mean the more specific power to suggest concrete capital programs and to study taxation problems and the financing of immediate and early future needs is problematical.

The Long Range Capital Improvements Committee is clearly given authority to propose a long range capital improvement program and the methods of financing the improvements, and to stimulate public support.

C. Planning Commission could have performed City's total planning job -- if....

With all respect for the uncertainty of the Charter language and the recent narrow interpretation that has been put on the Planning Commission's powers, it seems clear that, under certain conditions the commission actually could have exercised all the planning functions now performed by the CPC and the LRCIC. Certainly there would have been advantages in its doing so; it has Charter-based status and permanence, and the functions it did not exercise... specifically in the long range improvement programming field -- are very closely related to the preparation and updating of the master plan, as explained in Chapter II.

The conditions necessary would have been the understanding, by the City Council and other City agencies of the need for capital improvement programming; the ability of the Council to provide leadership in ordering such programming to be done and the acted upon; the Planning Commission's ability to do it in an acceptable manner; and the Council's confidence in the Planning Commission's ability. Had those conditions existed, the Council could have given the Commission the informal permission and encouragement to go ahead, or could have given the Commission the power through ordinance or resolution, as it has done in the case of zoning powers.

To find out why these conditions did not exist, and why the LRCIC was created, we need to look first at how the Planning Commission actually functioned.

D. How the Planning Commission actually performed

We have made the following appraisal of the CPC's performance of the duties set forth in Charter and ordinances;

1. To employ staff and incur expenses

One Planning Engineer served from 1929 until this fall when he left the service for sick leave and eventual retirement. In post-war years the staff varied from a high of 17 in 1947 to a low of 9. /the nine employees only two were professionally trained city planners. The budget remained relatively stable during the post-war period, ranging from \$47,000 to \$56,000. In each year more than 90 per cent of the budget was spent for salaries.

The commission is directed to make annual report to the Council. In most years lack of funds prevented publication and circulation of formal annual reports.

2. To acquire or prepare a comprehensive city plan

Many of the basic studies for such a plan had been made, but were never organized as an integrated whole, although progress has been made toward this end lately. The commission was aware of the tremendous scope of the project and expressed itself thus in a 1942 report on its intentions:

"The big problem in forwarding such plans is to determine over a given period, what developments are needed, the length, width and depth of the needs, what will have continuing value, what can the community afford, and how to harmonize the progress with the long term financial resources available to pay the cost of construction and maintenance."

Again, in the same report, the commission stated:

"The outline should be so complete that in any case of contact with other agencies on a particular subject, there is provided a complete, comprehensive, and practical statement of the proposed project which will, if humanly possible, satisfy the expectancies of every outside group approached or interested, and gain their confidence and support. Incomplete proposals are not only not effective, by they will destroy interest and confidence in the work."

More recently the master plan began to take shape. In 1953 the Commission authorized the preparation of the "Official City Plan of the City of Minneapolis" in an eight-page document outlining the details of the plan. This action was triggered by the fact that such a plan was a prerequisite to securing federal funds for the Glenwood area redevelopment project. The first 10 sections of the plan were presented to the commission in the fall of 1954. At this writing 10 sections have been submitted to the City Council, but they are in varying stages of completion.

The former Planning Engineer stated that the commission's accumulated studies in fact constituted a comprehensive city plan. It is certain, however, that the mass of information stored in the planning department files never before was available to the city government or the public in useful form. The plan, if plan it was, was sterile and largely without influence. Lack of formal organization into a single document or series of documents made it very difficult to see the overall planning picture in Minneapolis.

3. To prepare and recommend specific plans for public improvements consistent with the comprehensive plan for the city

We tried to catalog the most important projects and studies undertaken by the commission since World War II. The planning staff was unable to provide an orderly listing of such studies or a record of subsequent action on each. We were not able to compile a complete list of these projects and are not prepared to judge the adequacy of the work done by the commission or the extent to which the commission functioned in preparation of the plans.

With these limitations, then, we list these activities of the planning department since the war:

- a. New zoning ordinance, 1948. Not yet completed.
- b. Highways, streets and traffic (2 reports)
- c. Civic center and library report, 1949.
- d. Public and private housing survey.
- e. Area redevelopment studies for Glenwood, ~~Summer~~ Field, Franklin School and lower loop areas.
- f. Plan for a capital budget of \$6,000,000 a year (1952)
- g. Completed highway and street projects recommended by commission:
 - 1) Sixth avenue north grade crossing
 - 2) Railroad bridge at Seventh street north
 - 3) Lyndale avenue south paving from 54th to 62nd streets
 - 4) Railroad bridge and approaches, Wayzata boulevard
 - 5) Milwaukee railroad grade crossing at Franklin avenue.

4. To recommend zoning ordinances to the Council

A new zoning ordinance study was completed in 1948. ~~In~~ the opinion of the former Planning Engineer and two members of the commission, 90 per cent of the commission's time and about 75 per cent of the staff's time were devoted to zoning matters. The city Building Inspector's office carries out routine administration of the ordinance, but cases requiring special interpretation are referred to the planning department.

The records for one recent year showed approximately 5,500 contacts over the telephone and by interview in the field. Ninety-six additional cases required special consideration and formal action by the commission and the City Council. Forty-five appeals from a literal interpretation of the ordinance and 97 petitions for change in basic zoning provisions were filed with the commission in the same year, 1952.

We concluded that this responsibility was taking too much of the commission's time and money.

6. To approve or disapprove all proposed public improvements including works of art.

This section was followed haphazardly and intermittently. In some cases, the Council and the various boards of the City government proceeded with their own plans and projects without referring them to the commission. In other cases, where reference was made, the commission's recommendations were ignored or received little attention.

7. To approve or reject plans and plats for new subdivisions

We believed the commission was carrying out this responsibility satisfactorily.

8. Summary of commission's performance

To summarize, the Planning Commission only recently prepared parts of a master plan for the city. It spent the greatest share of its time on zoning matters. While its study of zoning revisions led to authority for a new zoning ordinance, the commission is still several years away from completion of the ordinance. Proposed public improvements have not been referred to the commission by city departments regularly and completely. The commission has approved or rejected plans and plats for new subdivisions.

In brief, the Planning Commission fell far short of fulfilling the functions of an effective planning agency. We may now look into the reasons for this inadequacy.

D. Why didn't the Planning Commission become the effective central planning agency?

I. City's basic organization provides poor framework for effective planning

Effective planning may be thought of as having three characteristics. (1) It looks ahead. (2) It considers problems in the whole. (3) It results in action. In other words, city planning is the process of looking ahead in an effort to influence governmental actions so that they result in the best overall governmental program for the community. In a democratic society it is also essential to add that the best overall governmental program is the one that serves the people's needs the best, that is, which is responsive to their needs.

To best influence action requires that the advisory and coordinating services of planning be woven into day-to-day operations.

The basic structure of the government itself has an important influence on whether the government is able to plan effectively. This can be illustrated by answers to a series of questions.

I. Is it more likely that total governmental services will be considered and acted on in a balanced way if

(a) Governmental power to make policy is divided among numerous independent bodies? or

(b) Governmental power to make policy is given to one governing body? The answer is clearly (b).

II. Is it more likely that good leadership in proposing overall policy -- in looking ahead -- will come from

(a) A group of coequal individuals each responsible to only a geographical segment of the community, and only occasionally in touch with operating problems of government?

(b) One individual responsible to the entire community for total governmental operations and familiar with those operations because of the necessity of making many decisions on them?

The answer is clearly (b).

III. Is it more likely that good coordination in carrying out legislative policy will come under the direction of

(a) A group of coequal individuals, each responsible to only a geographical segment of the community, chosen at least to a great extent for his stands on policy issues, and only occasionally in touch with operating problems of the government?

(b) One individual responsible to the entire community for carrying out policy, chosen at least to some extent for his ability to administer, and constantly in touch with day-to-day administrative operations?

The answer is clearly (b)

The questions are intended to point up the characteristics of effective planning enumerated above, that is, viewing the governmental picture-- services and finance -- in the whole, looking ahead, and getting action. The (a) answers described the structure of Minneapolis city government or the important part under the City Council. We may summarize the situation in Minneapolis brought out by the (a) answers as follows:

I. Responsibility for determining services, financing them, and carrying them out is divided among several independent governing bodies; the City Council, the School, Park and Library boards and to some extent the Board of Estimate and Taxation. **This** raises great obstacles to determining balanced overall policy.

II. The School, Park and Library boards do vest responsibility for proposing overall policy, on their particular function, in one individual, the chief administrator, who is close to day-to-day operations (answer b). In departments under the City Council, however, policy leadership has to come from the aldermen, since there is no one administrator responsible for proposing overall policy to the Council.

III. The independent boards have administration coordinated through their chief administrators. The Council has no chief administrator and coordination and direction have to come through the Council, or on an informal, hit-or-miss basis among coequal department heads, answerable in the last analysis, however, to the Council.

This brief catechism does not exhaust the points which can be made about good organization structure and the situation in Minneapolis. However, it does point up the fact that Minneapolis' structure is ill-adapted to provide the basic conditions under which planning can become really effective, that is, promote the overall view, the forward look, and effective action.

This is not to say that structure alone will make or break good government performance. But it can help or hinder it, and considering the situation in Minneapolis, the structure is certainly a hindrance.

Governmental experience has shown that the best structure is one in which legislative power is vested in one governing body elected by the people and the responsibility to propose policy and carry it out when adopted is vested in a chief administrator, chosen by the voters directly or appointed by the legislative body. The chief administrator has an integrated administrative structure under him. Such a structure lends itself much more

readily to viewing the governmental problem in the whole, looking ahead, and putting plans into action.

With a very non-integrated structure in Minneapolis, it seems clear to us that any planning agency in Minneapolis would have found itself handicapped from the start in getting effective planning.

We may recall that the book, Local Planning Administration, emphasized that the "first requirement is that the planning function must be an officially established and continuing function, thoroughly integrated with the structure and operation of local government (underlining added)." It is difficult to see how this integration can be achieved when the structure of that government is itself very much non-integrated.

2. Good informal relationships not developed

Basic defects of organization structure impose definite limitations on a good planning job. Yet within those limitations it is possible to do a great deal. As the book, Local Planning Administration, says: "If the evidence demonstrates anything, it demonstrates that effective planning can be done under any organizational arrangement (1), provided that strong support exists for planning, and providing that a rich network of informal administrative and advisory relations can be established. In those cities that have had an outstanding success in planning under an independent commission, it usually appears that the planning staff has served in fact, if not in legal form, as the planning adviser to the chief executive."

"It is a primary responsibility of the chief planning technician to see that effective working relationships are established. This he can secure, if it can be secured at all, by demonstrating continually that the planning agency is eager to assist and cooperate with the other city departments in dealing with their longterm planning problems; and by staffing his agency with assistants who by the competence of their work can prove the worth of the agency's advice."

Strong support for planning and a rich network of informal administrative and advisory relations did not exist in Minneapolis under the Planning Commission prior to the establishment of the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee. The reasons for this were many and interdependent.

a. The Planning Engineer from 1929 until recently was well-recognized for his technical knowledge and ability in the techniques of planning, yet it was evident that he was not capable of developing and maintaining effective informal relationships with the City Council, other governing bodies and administrators.

b. The lack of a master plan was both a cause and a result of the commission's ineffectiveness. Preparing and revising a master plan is a major function of a planning agency and the basis for future action. Lack of a plan is a great obstacle to production of a well thought-out capital improvement program. Also, the more limited specific recommendations of the

(1) Note that the organizational arrangement referred to here is that of the planning agency itself, that is, whether it is to be a commission or single-headed department. A basically integrated administrative structure is still assumed, as is apparent from the reference to the chief executive.

commission inspire less confidence in competing with counter proposals from other public and private sources.

c. The commission itself exhibited some of the weaknesses of planning commissions. Many of the lay members have not been particularly notable for the breadth of their views. On the contrary, a balancing of special interests seems to be a primary criterion in mayoral appointments. The commission did not exercise the restraint on the Planning Engineer when he was clearly jeopardizing the planning agency's relations with city departments and agencies.

d. The commission did not get the size budget needed to carry on a full planning program. In 1954 the Planning Engineer submitted the results of a survey of planning agencies in cities over 500,000 showing average budget per capita of 20.24¢, compared with Minneapolis' 9.2¢.

e. The commission did not do enough educational work through publication of reports and planning studies. Budgetary shortages were of course handicaps.

Given the conditions we have summarized, it is not surprising that city planning in Minneapolis deteriorated, and that the Planning Commission did not become the effective central agency that it might have become. The diffused structure of city government was not encouraging to the development and use of long range planning. The Planning Engineer was not able to make the most of a situation which was difficult at best. A master plan was not developed to provide the basis and the instrument for "selling" city planning. All these things together in turn led to a lack of confidence in the commission's ability, with the City Council's refusing to appropriate more funds and taking positive measures to place responsibility for planning in other agencies.

In these circumstances, therefore, it was perhaps inevitable that an effort should be made to get one important part of planning--the development of a capital improvement program--accomplished in another way. The way was the LRCIC.

3. Recent developments in the City Planning Commission

Before passing on to the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee, it is well to acknowledge the fact that the CPC has recently shown signs of new life. Under the new acting Planning Engineer, the commission has undertaken to clarify its function and improve its relationship with other city departments and agencies. It is currently holding meetings with such groups as the City Council, the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, the School, Park and Library boards, and the Board of Public Welfare. The upshot of the meeting with the Council was a request from the latter that the commission submit a report to the Council on the exact status of the various parts of the master plan and also estimates on time and work involved in drafting the new zoning ordinance. The City Council is anxious that the commission give major attention to the new zoning ordinance.

The CPC and LRCIC also recently directed the acting Planning Engineer and the temporary Executive Secretary of the LRCIC to work out recommendations for a joint plan for coordinating the staff work of the two agencies.

Finally, the Council has increased the CPC's 1956 budget \$18,331 over its 1955 appropriations, all in the personal service account. The acting Planning Engineer says this will permit hiring two or three additional people with planning qualifications.

F. Development of the City Council's Long Range Capital Improvements Committee

1. Factors leading to establishment

A number of factors were responsible for the City Council's establishment of the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee in December 1953.

a. The Council's general lack of confidence in, and inability to work with, the Planning Commission for the reasons already noted.

b. The growing awareness that the City had a large backlog of needed capital improvements that should be met in an orderly manner.

c. Belief that the property tax was being used to its capacity and a new source of revenue^{needed} to be developed and sold to the powers that could grant necessary authority, i. e., the voters and the Hennepin County legislative delegation.

d. Need for immediate development of plans for capital improvements, such as for highways, if the city were to get available grants in aid from the federal and state governments.

e. Desire by the City Council to have capital improvement programming removed from the immediate pressures which attend the year-to-year allocation of bond funds among requesting agencies.

f. Lack of comprehensive budgeting in the city government.

The last item needs elaboration. It is very much a part of the discussion of integration of government structure we mentioned before.

2. The LRCIC and the city's budget organization

Comprehensive budgeting properly takes into account all the needs of the city government, capital as well as operating. It covers the greatest possible number of agencies in the city government and is a central responsibility of the chief administrator as an essential part of his power for proposing programs to the legislative body and of his duty of seeing that they are carried out as adopted.

The Charter provides for overall budgetary authority to be exercised by the Board of Estimate and Taxation, which consists of the Mayor, the chairman of the Council's Ways and Means Committee, the City Comptroller, an ex officio member each selected from and by the School and Park boards, and two members elected by the voters at large. The important parts of that authority are: (1) to act as the central budget-compiling agency; (2) to set the maximum rate on property taxes for various funds; (3) to determine the maximum amount of bonds that may be issued, within overall legal limits; and (4) to determine bond maturities.

Considering the criteria of effective administrative structure mentioned earlier in this chapter, vesting budget authority in the Board of Estimate and Taxation in the first place is not calculated to result in effective policy determination, administration, and popular control. Even within these serious limitations, however, the Board of Estimate and Taxation

in practice has not proven an effective central budget agency, mainly for these reasons:

- a. It has lacked the staff and the authority to carry on effective expenditure control.
- b. It has lacked staff to carry on effective analysis of proposed budgets.
- c. First authorized property tax levies have been at their legal maxima, making the Board's review task largely an academic one.
- d. The City Council has taken over a good deal of the initiative in bond matters by virtue of its duty to concur or disagree with bond requests of independent boards. The Council has thus come to exercise virtual control over the city's overall bonding program.

The Council's growing initiative in bond policy was a force in the direction of effective budgeting. Yet it still fell short of effective comprehensive budgeting, for several reasons:

- a. The Council lacked authority over operating budgets of independent boards. From the financial standpoint, the difference between an operating expenditure and a capital expenditure is only a matter of degree. The two must be considered together for intelligent programming and financing.
- b. The Council's control over operating budgets of departments under its own jurisdiction was limited by the limitations of its budgetary process. The Research Engineer has been an invaluable aid to the City Council in preparing and executing the budget. But with one assistant he can not be expected to perform the job that is done in other cities by a well-staffed office of budget analysts and examiners.
- c. The Council's control over capital expenditures of departments under its own jurisdiction was based on insufficient research and deliberation.

Setting up the LRCIC was a step in the direction of overcoming the defects inherent in the city's organization for capital budgeting. We shall deal later, however, with the question of what the continuing limitations of this organization mean for the long range recommendations for organizing the planning function.

3. Organization of the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee

Apparently aware of the need for making up for lost time in getting the community behind a capital improvements program, and particularly the new revenue aspects of that program, the City Council organized the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee so as to generate broad community support. The two Council caucuses were given equal representation, the Mayor was included, and equal membership was given to labor and business groups. Subsequently, a representative of the League of Women Voters was added in recognition of the sustained interest in, and assistance toward, a capital improvements program displayed by the League.

The Council seemed to conceive of the LRCIC as an aid to its own

authority and leadership in developing a long range program and additional methods of financing. Thus, the Council did not include members of the Park, Library or School boards in the LRCIC, nor a member of the Estimate Board, although the Mayor and chairman of the Council's Ways and Means Committee serve both on the LRCIC and the Estimate Board. This limitation of the official membership of the committee was probably a realistic appraisal of the responsibility for long range capital improvements at present, tied as it was to the bonding power, and the fact that as the central governing body in the city, the Council was the logical one to try to furnish leadership.

It should be noted, however, that in setting up task forces later on, the LRCIC has drawn on members of the various independent boards. Just how much consideration will be given to the recommendations of these task forces by the LRCIC is not yet known, but the intention seems to be to give them the freedom to review the preliminary decisions of the LRCIC and make their own comments to the committee. This may give the representatives of the independent boards, and their supporters, an opportunity to have real influence on the LRCIC's final decisions on projects and priorities.

4. Budget and staff

During the first year and a half or so of its existence, the LRCIC operated without a staff of its own. It received valuable orientation and backgrounding from the Research Engineer and it called on the City Engineer, the Superintendents of Schools and Parks, and other operating heads, particularly in reference to the capital requests of each. It also heard the Planning Engineer. Then in 1954 the Housing and Redevelopment Authority loaned its executive director to the committee to help in setting up a system of priorities upon which to draw up the preliminary report.

In the fall of 1955 the committee retained the assistant manager of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce as temporary Executive Secretary for three months to assist in organizing task forces and hiring a permanent secretary. In setting about hiring a permanent staff, the committee had an opinion from the City Attorney to the effect that all positions under the committee would need to be under the classified civil service. The LRCIC recommended an individual to the City Council to fill the post of Executive Secretary temporarily pending the holding of an examination by the Civil Service Commission and the establishment of an eligible list. Evidently the LRCIC regarded the job as one of organizing and expediting rather than one requiring the qualifications of a professional planner. However, the committee's recommendation was not accepted by the City Council, which instead appointed the chairman of the LRCIC to the position of temporary Executive Secretary. He is a former alderman and long-time Council member of the Planning Commission and an architect by profession. He has now taken the job.

Such expenditures as the LRCIC has made have come out of the City Council's contingent fund. \$10,000 was budgeted for 1955 and \$25,000 has been approved for 1956.

5. The LRCIC's functioning to date

As of this writing, the LRCIC has accomplished these specific things:

- a. Adopted a preliminary report which sets forth tentatively:

- 1) General conclusions on existing local taxation.
- 2) A six year minimum program of \$42,000,000 of projects to be financed out of tax-supported bonds.
- 3) A \$154,460,000 program of additional projects to be financed from other sources, including state and federal funds.
- 4) Procedures for authorizing specific projects and annually reconsidering the six year program;
- 5) Recommendations for task forces of government officials and citizens to review, coordinate and expedite the construction of recommended projects.

b. Set up 10 task forces.

c. Hired a temporary Executive Secretary and taken steps to hire a permanent one.

In its relatively short existence, the LRCIC has crystallized public awareness of the community's capital needs, has stimulated considerable interest in the way the committee proposes to meet the needs, and has aroused substantial hope that the city at long last is to get a workable long range capital improvement program.

It has also aroused in many the hope that the LRCIC will prove an effective vehicle for getting new sources of revenue to supplement the property tax.

Whatever success the LRCIC has had to date is no doubt due to the fact that the City Council and the community have been behind it. With its important bonding and other powers it is essential that the Council be behind the capital program. Community support is due to the involvement of representative and outstanding leaders in the committee itself and now on its task forces.

6. Recent controversy over appointment of Executive Secretary

The Council's appointment of a temporary Executive Secretary contrary to the recommendation of a majority of the LRCIC led to a split in the City Council, to the resignation of one Council member (he has since returned) and to threats of resignation from two of the five labor representatives. Thus far a one-vote majority of the Council has emphasized its intention to continue with the LRCIC, and no additional official or citizen members have withdrawn from the committee. The controversy has doubtless been a setback to the LRCIC, but it need not prove to be of irreparable damage and may even increase the seriousness of purpose of the group.

G. How sound is the present organization for planning?

Perhaps the best way to appraise the soundness of the present planning organization is to consider the favorable and unfavorable factors.

1. Favorable

At least until the recent controversy over appointment of the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee's Executive Secretary, the committee had the virtue of a great promise to get something done for the city at long last on a long range capital improvements program. The committee is a hard-working organization which draws the support and participation of community leaders representing varied community interests. It showed in its preliminary reports and later setting up of task forces that it could deliberate and organize on a sound basis.

The response it has evoked indicates it has good community understanding and support. This bodes especially well for what is recognized as a crucial point in an adequate improvement program, namely, general community agreement on a new source of revenue for the city.

While the committee was a Council-organized group and contained no official representatives of the independent boards, it was still given good cooperation by those boards, no doubt for the practical reason, among others, that the Council is the effective controller of bond money. On the other hand, the Council recognized the interests and influence of those boards by providing for their representation, and the representation of their citizen supporters, on the task forces.

2. Unfavorable

a. The non-integrated structure of Minneapolis Government

We concluded above that even if the City Planning Commission had not had internal difficulties, it faced great obstacles in doing an effective planning job by virtue of the city's basic organization structure; diffusion of policy-making powers and the lack of an integrated administrative system heading up in a chief administrator. We believe that the same basic defect continues to present a great roadblock in the way of effective planning in Minneapolis. After having reviewed the recent history of Minneapolis planning we must now bring this conclusion down to its present application to our situation wherein we have not only the City Planning Commission but also the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee.

Acknowledging the fact that the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee has promise of getting a badly needed job done, we believe that the fact that the need is so bad has significant implications. Consider these critical circumstances under which the Long Range Capital Improvements Committee was born and now functions: there has been a long accumulation of deferred capital projects which has grown almost to an alarming size and has aroused concern in many quarters; the city stands to lose intergovernmental financial aids unless it immediately gets to work on plans for projects like streets; there is almost a desperate need for additional sources of revenue which will demand widespread community support before any such sources can be obtained.

In these circumstances one can hardly say that the City has had foresighted leadership in organizing for capital improvements. In fact, one might say the city government has shown negligence in meeting the City's needs.

One must also consider this: that probably the excellent participation of outstanding civic leaders has been due to their recognition that things have come to a sorry state, and action is necessary immediately if Minneapolis is to continue to progress.

Thus, the City has in effect been pushed into a position where it has had to take action. Much of this push came from outside sources like the Chamber of Commerce.

We may say then, in summary, that under the City Council's banner we are now getting a capital improvements program. But this program can not be regarded as the product of a good planning organization. Good planning of necessity looks forward. It anticipates. If Minneapolis had had a good planning organization in the past, it would have had a planned capital improvements program in the works long ago. Leadership would have been provided to get community support for additional revenue.

This has a bearing on a vital aspect of the LRCIC, namely, the excellent participation of citizens. As has been noted, such participation has come mainly because of the general emergency character of the need. One may ask: What will happen after the immediate, emergency need is met? Under any planning organization it is essential to have good citizen support all times. Yet in our present situation as a practical matter it seems likely that as the immediate problem is licked, the outstanding type of person who has been involved in the LRCIC will find much less incentive for giving of his valuable time. Then, when planning becomes more of a day to day job of coordinating and advising, the city's planning services will stand or fall on the soundness of the full-time planning organization.

Planning should be a day to day process, woven into the normal functioning of the government. Policies and administrative decisions should be made in reference to long range plans, and the planning agency should be active in assisting in coordinating the separate plans that are made by the various agencies. Planning, and its most concrete governmental expression, the long range capital improvement program, should not be a sporadic affair. Cities have recognized this by making the capital budget an integral part of the total city budget along with the operating budget.

To get this close integration with day to day operations, we believe it is necessary to have a government which itself is integrated for action. If the "whole look" of the planning agency is to be effective it has to be made available to the action agencies which can command a "whole" approach to the governmental problem. This means insofar as possible a single administrative person responsible for proposing the "whole look" and carrying it out as adopted through his responsibility for the total administrative organization.

The task of the planning agency is to assist those who must make decisions and those who must act on them. This assistance is in the form of proposing plans and helping to coordinate the plans of others. Unless the decisions can be made taking into account all aspects of the government, and unless the execution of those decisions can be effectively coordinated and directed the full benefit of the planning will not be had. The present non-integrated structure in Minneapolis is not conducive to making overall, balanced policies, nor to effective coordination of their execution.

b. Tied in with (a) but worth mentioning separately because of its crucial importance, is the lack of centralized, comprehensive budgeting, adequately relating financial resources to services needed, and relating capital expenditures to current expenditures. The diffusion of taxing power through separate mill rates of independent boards and departments is an important facet of this problem.

While the City Council has rather effective control over the city's borrowing power which in effect for many years has meant the capital expenditures program the Council can have little real effect on the operating budgets of the independent boards. And though the Council is probably intending to relate the capital expenditure recommendations of the LRCIC to the operating budgets of its own agencies, this is not likely to provide the comprehensive budgeting needed even for the City Council agencies. This is because, among other things, the Council does not have effective budgeting and expenditure control of its own current expenditures. With the invaluable assistance of the Research Engineer, the Ways and Means Committee has made good strides toward better budgeting of current expenditures in the past several years, but the budget staff and procedure are still far below what is needed for modern budgetary analysis, planning and control.

c. The existence of two agencies to perform essentially a single function leads to confusion, multiplies problems of coordination, and increases the possibility of duplicated effort. The confusion of responsibility was very apparent at the recent joint meeting of the City Planning Commission and the City Council. Great efforts were made to clarify the respective roles of the CPC and the LRCIC, but at the conclusion of the meeting it was apparent that confusion still existed in the minds of many of the participants, including one citizen member of the LRCIC who was present.

That there should be difficulty in defining the respective roles of the two agencies seems inevitable because the detachment of the capital programming activity from the responsibility for preparing the master plan at best would need to be arbitrary and artificial.

3. Summary

We believe that the present dual organization of planning, brought into existence by the exigencies of the time and in many respects owing its original success to the existence of those exigencies, has a potential for getting a badly needed capital improvement program rolling in Minneapolis.

We believe, however, that these exigencies need not have arisen if sound planning organization had existed; that such sound planning organization depends first of all on sound overall governmental structure; and that only if a basic reorganization of the city government takes place will effective planning be possible.

We believe that within that basic structure the central planning functions should be vested in one, not two, or more agencies.

Finally, we believe that among the major hindrances to the effectiveness of capital improvement programming in the short run under our dual system is the lack of comprehensive budgeting. A basic structural reorganization along the lines we have suggested should provide the framework and authority for setting up a comprehensive budget system.