

Citizens League
530 Syndicate Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

METROPOLITAN ISSUES AND METROPOLITAN ORGANIZATION: 1971

STATEMENT BY THE CITIZENS LEAGUE
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
METROPOLITAN AND URBAN AFFAIRS
AND THE SENATE URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
March 1, 1971

One of the outstanding achievements of the Minnesota Legislature in recent years has been the creation of the Metropolitan Council. This new state-created institution of local government has given the Twin Cities metropolitan area the capacity really to solve the complex and urgent problems of urban development which remain unsolved in most metropolitan areas, and it has in the process brought the State of Minnesota, and the Minnesota Legislature specifically, national attention and national acclaim.

This new institution -- the Metropolitan Council and its related "executive" agencies -- is evolving through a series of legislative sessions. In 1967 the Legislature concentrated first on what was at that time most critical: the construction of essentially the "legislative" or policy-making side of the new areawide structure. In 1969 the Legislature began laying out the structure for the implementation of the Council's plans and policies, particularly in the urgent area of sewage disposal. Now in 1971, with the foundation well established, both sides of the new areawide governmental structure are ready for further development by the Legislature.

The Citizens League is pleased to have this opportunity to appear to offer its views on the issues that are presented this year and on the further steps that can and should be taken. We have followed the work of the Metropolitan Council closely since its creation. We have continued to study the issues. We hope we may be in a position to evaluate both the performance of the institution and the basic legal framework on which it was established.

Why the Metropolitan Council was created

It is useful at the beginning to recall the context in which the proposal for a Metropolitan Council came before the Legislature in 1967. It had been increasingly apparent for some years that problems were appearing which were beyond both the responsibility and the authority of any of the existing units of local government -- municipal or county. They were, at the same time, issues whose direct effects were largely confined to the metropolitan area itself. The most pressing of these, from about 1961 on, was the multi-faceted issue of sewage disposal.

Needing new authority for the creation of new governmental organization and powers at the areawide level, the Twin Cities area turned to the Legislature. But it proved -- in the legislative sessions from 1961 to 1967 -- extremely difficult for the Legislature to act. It was clear the problems were not essentially engineering or technical problems. The fundamental difficulty, the Legislature came to feel by 1967, was, rather, the absence of a formal, representative, responsible consensus within the metropolitan area itself as to what was wanted . . . on the basis of which the Legislature could then make its decision.

In 1967, therefore -- laying aside for the moment questions about administration and finance -- the Legislature concentrated on the creation of a new structure genuinely able to speak for the urbanized area as a whole. The Legislature gave to the new Metropolitan Council a specific charge to return with specific decisions and proposals on key issues -- sewage disposal being chief among them. The Legislature also gave the Metropolitan Council certain limited but important coordinating authority over the independent special-purpose districts which had been created one at a time over the years in response to the perceived need for the handling of certain problems at the metropolitan level.

This formula has succeeded dramatically.

The Legislature's perception that the first job was not to build facilities and run programs, but rather to reach a local agreement on what should be built and what programs should be run, laid a sound foundation. The Metropolitan Council went to work quickly to hammer out within the seven-county area among all the interested parties an agreement on a physical, financial and governmental plan for the collection and disposal of sewage. This plan was presented to the 1969 legislative session. It formed -- as hoped and expected -- a consensus which permitted the Legislature to respond as it typically does to what it considers essentially local bills . . . evaluating the proposal in relationship to state policy, checking to be sure that all affected groups had in fact been given a fair hearing, and in the end modifying and improving the plan submitted.

Two things were thus dramatically demonstrated: First, the appropriateness and effectiveness of the basic arrangements on which the Metropolitan Council was set up; and, second, the critical importance and usefulness of orienting a representative metropolitan agency to a state legislature -- which is, after all, the principal storehouse of powers critical for the solution of urban problems.

The law has received intense attention nationally.

Beginning immediately in the summer of 1967, Minnesota began to be visited by the urban reporters for newspapers in other metropolitan areas, by political science students, by delegations from other legislatures, by local officials, and by delegations of businessmen . . . all eager to see firsthand what had been created here, how it had come to be created, and how successfully it was operating. Officials of the Metropolitan Council, and some legislators as well, began to be invited elsewhere to answer the same questions. The list of areas interested is a long and impressive one: San Francisco, Chicago, Denver, St. Louis, Baltimore, Washington, Dallas, Atlanta, Detroit among others.

Two principal forces have been at work stimulating this interest.

The desire for regional unity everywhere.

By the late 1960's leaders in most metropolitan areas were coming to realize that in an important sense their concern about "city" problems rested on their definition of a "city." When viewed as individual municipalities, many cities were indeed seriously and increasingly suffering from a shortage both of financial resources and of leadership; yet it was increasingly apparent that the "cities" of America -- viewed as the rapidly-growing metropolitan regions -- were, in fact, the nation's great centers, both of wealth and of brains. The problem was that they were not organized in such a way that these resources could be released locally

for a direct attack on their local problems. Seen this way, the challenge became to organize their systems of local government and local public finance so that these resources could be brought to bear. As early as the mid '50's, efforts in this direction had been made in a number of metropolitan areas -- almost always without success.

The need for a federal urban policy

Increasingly through the late 1960's too, the federal government was beginning to try to relate to urban problems at the metropolitan scale. With the 1970 census, which confirmed that everywhere the central cities are now a minority part of the larger urban region, this has now become imperative. More and more we will see the federal government trying to deal with the urban area as a whole.

The problem is that metropolitan areas are not presently organized to be dealt with as a whole. Organizations at the metropolitan level do exist, now, in most of the 233 standard metropolitan statistical areas. But they are typically set up on a basis which does not let them operate effectively as spokesmen for the area as a whole . . . principally because, as a result of the way in which their voting is structured, they do not fairly represent all the people in the area. There is currently in federal court in Cleveland a test challenging the basic principle of representation in these agencies, which is of potentially enormous significance: If the court does, in fact, strike down the "one unit, one vote" system in these agencies, there will be a critical need -- from the point of view of the national government -- to try to develop new and workable arrangements for representation and voting at the metropolitan scale.

Minnesota's Metropolitan Council seems at this point the best, if not the only, answer: A formal, legislatively-created, effective decision-making body provided with meaningful resources for its planning and invulnerable on the population-equal requirement for voting. The success of the new institution being developed by the Legislature in Minnesota is, therefore, of major national significance.

What Legislative Decisions Have Been Keys to the Success of the Law?

Four principles were built into the 1967 and 1969 act which have turned out to be absolutely essential for the successful functioning of the new metropolitan governmental institutions. They are worth bearing in mind as we take up the question of further changes in 1971.

Limited powers, on areawide functions only. The Metropolitan Council was not given home rule powers: The decision on the functions to be undertaken, the form of organization, and the financing authority remains with the Legislature. In assigning functions, furthermore, the Legislature carefully confined the Council to areawide functions only. We believe the Council in its first four years has respected this distinction. It has sought to coordinate primarily the decisions of the independent special districts set up to operate areawide, or nearly areawide, programs. The line is harder to draw in the case of decisions made by individual municipal or county units, yet here, too, we think the Council has moved carefully. It has on occasion intervened in decisions about the design of highway interchanges; on the other hand, it refused to be drawn into a dispute among municipalities over development of a central fire training facility. An inter-community problem, in other words, the Council reasoned, is not always a metropolitan problem.

Concentrate on policy issues. The Legislature introduced the Metropolitan Council not because the areawide special districts were not effective in building and operating their own facilities (they were, and are), but because it was proving impossible to coordinate these special districts with each other, or with any general plan for the development of the Twin Cities area. In other words, because the policy decisions were missing. This was, and has remained, the Metropolitan Council's primary job.

A number of extremely complex and controversial issues were presented. By confining itself to the policy questions, it would be possible for the Council to move fairly rapidly, across a broad front, in its attack on metropolitan problems.

We have found, and sense ourselves, some feeling that the Metropolitan Council has moved more slowly than the Legislature had hoped, and perhaps more slowly than it might have, on these policy issues -- particularly in the preparation of its Metropolitan Development Guide and in the translation of the principles and policies of the Guide into specific situations on the ground. Nevertheless, we cannot believe that these key policy decisions would have been made faster if a greater part of the Council's time had been drained away by the issues that inevitably arise in the supervision of construction, the operation of facilities, and the hiring of people. By keeping the Council free of this kind of time-consuming operational decisions, the Legislature has at least provided the opportunity for a more rapid attack on the key issues facing the area. Members of the Metropolitan Council have involved themselves, personally, deeply in these issues. They have not simply come to the every-other-Thursday meeting to approve proposals laid before them. As a result, they have become educated about the intricacies of the issues -- and thus able to go out into their constituency to explain the Council's program. We must recognize, too, that, especially between 1967 and 1969 the Council found itself involved in issues beyond those presented to it by the Legislature -- as a result of federal legislation in the areas of criminal justice, health, and housing, which required decisions on a regional scale.

An ability to make decisions. The Legislature in 1967 saw clearly that, if the Metropolitan Council were to function to produce the kind of consensus in the Twin Cities area on the basis of which the Legislature could act, it must be structured so the voting system worked effectively. This meant that the representation had to be set up so that districts represented simply equal numbers of people. In establishing the Metropolitan Council on this basis, the Minnesota Legislature made a distinction which has totally escaped most, if not all, other metropolitan areas: That is, the distinction between a mechanism for reaching consensus among the people of the metropolitan area, and a mechanism for reaching consensus among the units of local government within the metropolitan area. We have provided, here in Minnesota, for both these mechanisms. The Metropolitan Council represents the interests of the people of the Twin Cities area in issues of metropolitan concern. The interests of the local governments are represented through the associations of municipal, county and school officials. Both are essential. But they are different. And it has been essential not to confuse the two. Put another way: The Legislature acted within the basic structure and tradition of Minnesota, which does not provide for interlocking levels of government. One level is not built out of another.

Manifestly, this system works. Controversies continue in some cases about the merits of what the Metropolitan Council decides. But the Metropolitan Council is able to make decisions. And the system of voting is felt to be fair.

Assign operations to "subordinate boards." The Legislature's approach to metropolitan government has been essentially to pull together the areawide special districts under a representative and responsive metropolitan council. The Council represents essentially the policy-making side; the "operating," "executive" side consists of the special districts that remain responsible for the construction and administration of their respective systems, and for the specialized "program policy" issues that need not, and should not, find their way into the Metropolitan Council at this state of its work.

The closest prototype for this organization of metropolitan decision-making has, of course, been the Sewer Board. The Council appoints the board members, prepares and adopts a comprehensive sewer plan and program for the board to implement, and it approves the annual budget of the board. We believe the record of 1969-71 confirms the soundness of this approach: The legislative charge in 1969 to finance and develop a truly areawide sewerage system has been implemented probably more rapidly than almost anyone would have expected. In less than two years, the new agency has been set up and staffed. It has taken into areawide ownership the treatment plants and major interceptors, bonds have been sold, construction is under way; the area is, in short, well on its way really to getting on top of the fundamental problem of water pollution and waste disposal which remains so very largely unsolved in so many major metropolitan areas. We believe this success is in part traceable to the legislative decision to spin off the construction program into a sewer board separate from, but not independent of, the Metropolitan Council.

How Are the Major Relationships Working?

The insertion of a level of metropolitan decision-making into the governmental system between the state and the existing local units could not have been expected to come without some uncertainty and some friction. Not all questions could be anticipated. Not all working relationships could be predicted. Measured against the importance and complexity of this change in governmental organization, however, the difficulties that have, in fact, arisen since 1967 are not fundamentally serious. It is essential to remember that up to 1967 there was virtually no metropolitan area in the country where a metropolitan reorganization of this sort has ever succeeded at all.

Metropolitan/state relationships. In 1967 the Legislature essentially recognized that the Twin Cities urban area, like each other urban area in Minnesota, needed a council within which the problems of the urban area as a whole could be talked out. Typically, elsewhere in the state, this purpose is served by the municipal council. In the Twin Cities area, because the existing municipalities embrace only "neighborhoods" of the entire area, it was necessary to create a new council for the metropolitan area. The Legislature did not want to create a single municipal government at this scale replacing the existing local units. It did, however, recognize that the Metropolitan Council is, in some respects, performing the local policy function handled elsewhere in the state by the municipality. The Attorney General's opinion reflects this unique status of the Metropolitan Council: Neither a fully state agency nor a fully local agency, but something in between, having some of the characteristics of each.

Clearly, each level depends on the other. The State Pollution Control Agency, for example, depends on the "local" Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan Sewer Board, actually to construct and operate the sewerage system necessary to meet

state water quality standards in the Twin Cities area. The metropolitan agencies, from the other point of view, depend on the PCA for the framework of standards and guidelines that will let them know what to build and how it is to be operated. In the pollution and sewage disposal area this relationship seems to have worked well over the past several years. Much the same kind of relationship exists in the development of other major systems in the Twin Cities area. With respect to airports, for example, the state, which does not build airports, depends on a state-created local agency to locate, construct and operate facilities. Again: The metropolitan agency depends on the state for the framework of statewide plans and guidelines.

Metropolitan/local relationships. One of the most striking things about the 1967 legislation -- in which the Legislature established a metropolitan council without (as in the metropolitan consolidations in the South) eliminating the local units -- was that the officials in municipal government not only concurred in but also actively championed the proposal. We have not reviewed in depth the history of Metropolitan Council/municipal relations over the last two or four years. We are aware of some complaints by some municipalities of a "lack of contact" by the members or staff of the Metropolitan Council, or both. There have also been, of course, individual disputes -- as over the design of a particular highway interchange -- between the Council and an individual city or village. By and large, it is our impression that the relationship between the new metropolitan level and the municipal level is no worse -- and is perhaps substantially better -- than the relationship between municipal and county government, or between municipal and state government. We see nothing in the last several years, at any rate, to compel at this point a structural change in the organization as established so far. Some additional efforts, and procedures, to assure timely consultation with the affected local units would be helpful.

Clearly, we are in a period in which the responsibility for carrying out governmental functions in many different areas is shifting back and forth across the invisible line that divides municipal from county, county from metropolitan, and metropolitan from state. It is the Legislature that is basically organizing and directing this reallocation of powers and functions. It is too early at this point to tell what the new division of responsibilities will look like, when the process is substantially completed. Municipalities may then, for example, be performing street maintenance even on "county roads." Counties may be owning and operating certain libraries or parks now owned and operated by municipalities . . . just as in recent years counties have taken over what were formerly municipal public hospitals and even lower courts. The line between county and metropolitan is, at this point, perhaps the most unclear, and in dispute.

Metropolitan Council/subordinate board relationship. The Legislature in 1969 set up the Sewer Board separate from, though not independent of, the Metropolitan Council. This relationship -- much in the nature of a basic legislative/executive relationship -- has produced (as has been reflected in news accounts in recent weeks) some visible conflict between these two entities. Again: While we think it would be desirable for the Legislature to watch this relationship between the Council and its subordinate agencies closely, we do not see at this point that a restructuring is called for. In some respects, the apparent conflict is probably not unhealthy: Real disagreements over policy direction are thus brought out into the open. And the aggressiveness of the subordinate agency may perhaps be pushing along the development of issues, and of decisions, faster than would otherwise occur.

Certainly, more difficulty has been experienced between the Metropolitan Council and other areawide (or larger-than-municipal) agencies that are not yet in the Metropolitan Council/Sewer Board relationship. The principal example has, of course, been the Metropolitan Council/Metropolitan Airports Commission relationship. The present arrangement, in which the MAC initiates proposals and the Council reacts, has proved an unproductive arrangement for reaching decisions. After the second suspension of the Ham Lake proposal, it does appear the Metropolitan Council is moving to prepare -- again in its capacity of something like the "general contractor" on the job of metropolitan development -- the basic policy guidelines that will give the MAC some direction in the planning for its facilities . . . particularly some direction about the number of major airports and the general area in which they should be located. The experience with sewers, on the other hand, and the rapid development of that system suggest that more progress could have been made on the airport problem if the MAC had been in an essentially subordinate board, or "sub-contractor", relationship to the Metropolitan Council.

Once more: We should not forget that, whatever the problems to date in the experience with the new metropolitan institutions in the Twin Cities area, the record -- compared with the record in most other metropolitan areas around the country -- is, and is generally regarded as, an outstanding one. Almost nowhere else has it been possible at all to create a metropolitan council that is at the same time effective and accepted. The rapid progress we have made here since 1967 is a great credit both to the people in the governmental system and to the State Legislature which has designed it.

What are the Decisions Needed in 1971?

A great many proposals are already on their way to, or are already in, the 1971 Legislature for further changes in the organization and powers of the metropolitan agencies . . . or in their relationships with state or local agencies. Inevitably, therefore, this Legislature will be making decisions about the direction and pace of development of this new areawide governmental structure. We have tried to suggest, in what we have said so far, the principles that seemed to have worked up to this point and that ought to be applied to the decisions to be made this year. The specific areas of proposed change, and our conclusions about the actions that need to be taken, may be summarized as follows:

Changes in existing independent special districts. We believe the remaining areawide special districts, not now clearly under the policy direction of the Metropolitan Council, ought to be brought into this relationship in 1971. There will need to be some variations from one district to another. And, not every district should continue to exist separately once brought under the Council's jurisdiction.

- * Metropolitan Airports Commission. We urge the MAC be made a separate service commission under the Council on the "Sewer Board Model." Representation should then cover the suburban as well as the central city portions of the area. The MAC, thus reconstituted, should continue to own and operate the airport system for the Twin Cities area. We fully recognize the interests of the state in this system, through which most residents of the state pass when they are traveling to other parts of the country. But it seems clear to us that the interest of the state requires, not a transfer of the administrative management of the system to some state agency, but rather a completion of the state's own plans for airports, indicating the way in which various cities are to be served. The Metropolitan Council and its subordinate MAC will then follow these guidelines.

- * Intra-urban transportation. We recommend the Legislature convert the "management committee" in the inter-agency transportation planning program established in 1968 into a statutory Transportation Board, with members selected by the Metropolitan Council. This board, taking its general direction from the Council and its development guide, should give direction, in turn, to the "operating" agencies responsible for the auto/highway and the transit modes. These agencies should have their roles redefined by the Legislature, so that the Highway Department -- as the competent public works agency -- becomes responsible for building the facilities both for autos and for transit; and the Metropolitan Transit Commission becomes an enterprise-oriented agency responsible for managing the use, and improving the utilization, both of the vehicles and of the rights-of-way.
- * Parks and open space. We believe there needs to be a metropolitan agency under the Council. The law, as re-passed this year, should include a procedure for the gradual incorporation of the Hennepin County Park Reserve District into the areawide district -- on terms agreeable to the present members of the HCPRD. Individual counties should be given a role in the operation and maintenance of the parks in the metropolitan system to the maximum extent they desire.
- * Watersheds. We believe it must be made clear that these are independent special districts in the metropolitan area whose plans and projects are subject to review by the Metropolitan Council, since they so profoundly affect the basic ecology and development of the region.

Additional responsibilities in "non-operating" areas. New responsibilities have recently been coming to the Metropolitan Council for planning, for priority-setting and for the allocation of block-grant funds in several new problem areas. This is happening primarily as a result of federal requirements (or requests). If additional block-granting proposed in the administration's revenue-sharing program is implemented, these responsibilities will further increase.

In most cases, no areawide "operating" agency is involved. Many of these are programs delivered through the units of local government. Others -- for example, the programs of federal aid for health facilities, or for housing -- are primarily if not entirely the responsibility of private organizations. Nevertheless, specialized "extensions" of the Metropolitan Council are being developed for these new responsibilities.

- * Health Planning. We have urged that the Metropolitan Council, through its Health Board, be given statutory authority to regulate the rate of expansion of hospital beds in the Twin Cities area . . . in the absence of legislative authority to the statewide health planning agency to regulate beds at the state level.
- * Criminal Justice Planning. We believe the regional agency should have greater authority in making decisions on applications for federal grants, and for planning the criminal justice system within the area for which it is responsible . . . as part of a statewide law making the Governor's Crime Commission a statutory body.
- * Housing. We recommended in 1969 the creation of a Metropolitan Housing Board under the Metropolitan Council. We did not then see it as an

"operator" or building of housing, but proposed it move aggressively to put together the data now conspicuously lacking, to prepare plans for the location, timing and nature of housing construction and rehabilitation on an areawide basis, with priority attention to the needs of low-income individuals and families, and to make the fullest possible use of all available public and private housing assistance programs.

Structure of the Metropolitan Council itself. Both the imminent redistricting of the State Legislature and the continuing growth of sentiment within the Twin Cities area for the election of the Metropolitan Council present the 1971 Legislature with important and complex choices about the structuring of the Council itself.

- * Area. We urge that, for the time being, the present seven-county boundaries be continued.
- * Basis of representation. The fundamental principle which must be preserved is the use of equal population districts for the selection of members to the Council. We would like to see these continue to be tied to the reapportioned State Legislative Districts, if this is possible, even if it means -- with the growth of total population in the Twin Cities area -- some small increase in the size of the Metropolitan Council membership. If, however, some major change is made in the districting of the Legislature -- such as a reduction by half of the number of Senate seats -- then the districting for the Metropolitan Council should be cut loose and a new set of boundaries established. In this event, we think also the Metropolitan Council should be maintained at about its present size.
- * Method of selection. We believe the 1971 Legislature should make provision for the election of the members of the Metropolitan Council. Election should begin in the general election of 1972. We believe the arrangements for election should preserve, so far as possible, the best characteristics of the Council 1967-71 . . . that is, a Council made up of members able to think in real depth, and with considerable freedom, about really fundamental issues of metropolitan development. This, together with the size of the districts and the expense of the campaign, suggests the use of fairly long terms. We would prefer to see the transition to an elective council made gradually, staggered over a set of elections, for overlapping six-year terms.
- * Compensation. We have proposed members of the Council, when elected, be paid salaries consistent with attracting and retaining high caliber, less-than-fulltime public officials. Members of the service commissions should be paid at per diem for their services.
- * Chairman. It is important to distinguish clearly the two issues involved in the structuring of the chairman as the Council becomes elective. One is the question of the office itself; the other is the question of the method by which the individual is chosen for that office.
 - We believe it is essential that the office exist clearly as a leadership office, and not simply as an additional duty imposed on one of the Council members elected from, and continuing to represent, one of the Council districts. The chairman should continue as a voting member representing and serving the area as a whole, and must be free of the potential conflicts of interest that could arise if he were to be also the representative of a district. Precisely what role the chairman will need to play,

to maintain an appropriate emphasis on at-large considerations within the deliberations of the Council, will become clear only as the area gets experience with its elected council.

- The chairman should continue -- at least for the near term -- to be a resident of the Twin Cities area selected by the Governor, with confirmation by the Senate. This will emphasize the character of the office as a leadership post, representing the area as a whole, in relation to a council elected entirely by districts. It will clearly focus responsibility for the selection of the individual who will occupy the office. And it will continue a meaningful tie with the state government, on both the executive and legislative sides -- affording maximum opportunity for the coordination of metropolitan programs with the state programs in which they are so closely involved.

As relationships become better settled, and as the responsibilities of the Metropolitan Council expand, the need for a political leader directly responsible to the people of the Twin Cities area may dictate a shift to direct election of the chairman. This would also open up an opportunity for a reorganization of the metropolitan governmental structure into a more conventional legislative/executive relationship. We did not feel that the addition of an elective position at the metropolitan level was realistic, however, at this stage in the evolution of the areawide government.

The likelihood of, and need for, an elected chairman at some date in the future is a further reason for our decision to reject the appointment of the chairman by the Council itself: The transition to a directly-elected chairman would be easier, we believe, from the present state-selected arrangement. In addition, we have serious concern that a chairman chosen through a process of bargaining among the members of the Council, themselves elected by districts, would emerge without the independent status and authority necessary to function as a strong and effective leader truly representing the area at large.

The Metropolitan Council is critically important to the state as a whole.

Legislators from non-metropolitan as well as from the metropolitan regions of Minnesota played active roles, both in the designing and implementation of this new metropolitan governmental structure. Clearly, there has been from the beginning a strong sense of the importance of metropolitan unification, not only to the Twin Cities area but to the rest of the state as well.

The Metropolitan Council has brought Minnesota major national acclaim and attention . . . as -- with the coming of revenue-sharing -- concern grows about the competence of our state and local governments. The action of the Minnesota Legislature in creating the Council and its services was described recently in a letter from an executive of a major "new town" developer in the East as "an astounding achievement." If the new governmental arrangements designed here work, Minnesota may profoundly influence the organization of government in urban areas all across the country.

Second, a competent planning and decision-making agency at the metropolitan level is important to the state through the way it can maximize the return on investment of state dollars in the Twin Cities area. State investments in area vocational schools,

in the state colleges, in the University of Minnesota, in highways, in airports and in state parks and other facilities will be made most soundly if they can be coordinated with the local development plan for this urban region.

Third, an effective Metropolitan Council is critical to the social and political health of the Twin Cities area . . . and, therefore, to its economic development which -- in turn -- is critical to the future economic prospects of the state as a whole. The Twin Cities area has been for the past decade one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the country, evolving rapidly toward a high-value service and manufacturing center. It is, however, engaged in intense national competition -- in economic development as in professional sports -- with the other major urban areas, and particularly with the other metropolitan areas of about the same size: Atlanta, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco, and Dallas. Its success in this competition is particularly related to its ability to provide clean lakes and streams, clean air, swift transportation, parks and open spaces, and to provide those highly specialized educational and cultural facilities and services which, typically, there can be only one of in any urban area. These are precisely the things which can be provided by -- and only by -- an effective metropolitan governmental organization.

* * * * *

APPENDIX

This statement draws on other Citizens League reports, which have examined both the general case for a metropolitan Council and the needs in particular program areas, in detail. Specifically:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
A Metropolitan Council for the Twin Cities Area	March 1967
Suggested Criteria for Chairman of the Metropolitan Council	June 30, 1967
Creation of Additional Special Districts in the Metropolitan Area	Nov. 1, 1967
Policy on the Creation of Additional Special Districts in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area	Jan. 26, 1968
Preserving Green Space in Metropolitan Development. A Parks and Open Space Commission for the Twin Cities Area.	July 2, 1968
Metropolitan Policy and Metropolitan Development	Oct. 14, 1968
Highways, Transit and the Metropolitan Council	Dec. 6, 1968
Adequate Housing is Now Everyone's Problem	May 5, 1969
New Airports for the '70's (and After)	Oct. 15, 1969
Hospital Centers . . . and a Health Care System	July 15, 1970
Getting Answers for the Control of Crime	Dec. 22, 1970
Needed: Better Ways of Making Environmental Choices	Jan. 13, 1971
Transit: The Key Thing to Build is Usage!	Feb. 17, 1971

A limited number of copies of most of these reports is available at the Citizens League office. In cases where the supply is exhausted, summaries of the proposals are available.