

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 182

**Future Role of the Metropolitan Planning
Commission**

May 1965

182

CITIZENS LEAGUE
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
ON
THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Approved by
Board of Directors
May 10, 1965

Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
FE 8-0791

Citizens League
of Minneapolis and Hennepin County
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Metropolitan Planning Commission Review Committee, Archie Spencer, Chairman

SUBJECT: Future Role of the Metropolitan Planning Commission

INTRODUCTION

The seven-county metropolitan area will more than double in population during the next 35 years. Most of this increase will take place in suburbs which under the present governmental structures will not be able to provide this enormous number of new residents with adequate public services, such as schools, transit, sewer, water and parks -- except at exorbitant cost.

If the present manner of growth is allowed to persist, industries and residences will continue to grow up beside each other, traffic congestion will increase to the saturation point, core cities will wither, individuals and commerce will suffer from inadequate public services and the additional costs of government will far outrun its added utility. This metropolitan area will by the year 2000 become irremediably a victim of the ugly urban sprawl which has already disfigured so many of our large cities.

These somber facts have led us to the recommendations contained in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that growth of private resources and public services in the seven-county metropolitan area be guided in the future by areawide planning, such as is provided by the Metropolitan Planning Commission, so that a desirable environment for the area's residents can be economically obtained.

2. The usefulness of metropolitan plans depends on implementation. It appears that implementation cannot be accomplished either by purely advisory actions of the Metropolitan Planning Commission or by voluntary intergovernmental cooperation, as is contemplated by present law. Therefore, we recommend that the 1965 Legislature provide for the proper interim study so that a report can be made to the 1967 Legislature on whether a metropolitan governmental structure should be created and if so what form it should take. The study should be required to include a review of the following points:

(a) What public services or governmental functions seem most likely to demand an areawide approach either now or in the foreseeable future.

(b) Whether it is wise to crease more single-purpose districts to solve metropolitan problems as they arise, and whether the existing single-purpose districts, such as airports, mosquito control and sewerage, should continue as they are or be integrated with an over-all metropolitan structure.

(c) Alternative methods for structuring government at the metropolitan level. These alternatives should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

-- A metropolitan government with members of the governing board elected by the people of the area.

-- A federation of municipalities.

-- A state department of metropolitan affairs under the Legislature or the Governor with the responsibility of carrying out policies to solve problems on a metropolitan basis.

A bill introduced in the 1965 Legislature by Rep. Howard Albertson of Stillwater to create an interim commission to study metropolitan problems (House File 1937) appears to provide for the interim study which we believe is needed. But we question whether the proposed \$15,000 appropriation in the Albertson bill is sufficient to guarantee that the necessary in-depth research will be conducted.

3. We recommend that the the Citizens League Board of Directors either broaden the assignment of this committee or establish a new committee to review whether a metropolitan government should be established by the State Legislature and, if so, what form it should take. Our committee was assigned to review the authority, function and composition of the Metropolitan Planning Commission now and in the future. It was not within our scope to look into the details of governmental structure at the metropolitan level.

4. We recommend that the Metropolitan Planning Commission become the planning arm of any governmental structure that may be created at the metropolitan level.

5. Inevitably, the membership, financing and responsibility of the governing board of the MPC will be altered considerably if our recommendations above are carried out. Pending the establishment of a specific governmental structure, we believe there are a number of actions the Legislature should take now to improve the MPC. Therefore, we recommend the following:

(a) MEMBERSHIP

-- The purpose clause (preamble) to the MPC statute should specify that Commission members, however, appointed, shall represent the interests of residents of the seven-county area at large, rather than primarily the interests of residents of the areas from which they were appointed. The statute also should be changed in the section dealing with the method of appointing members to indicate that members should be "chosen from" specific areas, not "represent" specific areas, as the statute now reads.

-- Governmental bodies should be prohibited from appointing their own employees to the Commission.

-- Commission members should be prohibited from designating substitutes to attend Commission meetings in their places.

-- The statute should be clarified so that only the special-purpose districts which now appoint members of the MPC, the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District, can continue to do so. The statute as now written would allow

several other special-purpose districts, such as watershed districts, to appoint members.

(b) MANDATORY REFERRAL

-- We recommend that the 1965 Legislature approve the Commission's request that all governmental units within the metropolitan area be required to submit matters which have impact on metropolitan development to the Commission for recommendation before a decision is made (mandatory referral). Regardless of future changes in governmental structure at the metropolitan level, we believe that the need for referral to the Commission will continue.

(c) MILL LEVY AND BUDGET

-- Since the committee could not determine the precise projects and functions that the MPC might carry out in the future and therefore its revenue requirements, the committee was not in a position to make a recommendation on the MPC's request to increase its millage from .13 mills (\$180,000) to .20 mills (\$277,000). In acting upon the MPC's request the Legislature should consider the specific work program presented to it by the MPC and any additional duties that may be assigned to the MPC in connection with a transit agency, the Minnesota Municipal Commission, a metropolitan sewer district or other areas still under consideration.

-- However, in connection with the foregoing, we recommend that the 1965 Legislature amend the MPC statute to require that the Commission in its biennial reports to the Legislature set forth an estimate of its budget, including an outline of its work program, for the current year and following year.

-- We recommend that the 1965 Legislature allow the Commission to levy for Public Employees Retirement Association (PERA) expense outside its regular mill levy limit.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Future Role of the Commission

1. Implementation of a metropolitan plan is a goal the Metropolitan Planning Commission intends to achieve in the future. We have reviewed the possibility of its succeeding in the task, and make the following findings:

(a) It does not appear that implementation of a metropolitan plan or the solving of any substantial metropolitan problems can be accomplished by persuasion. We believe that localities will not be in a position to subordinate local interests to the interests of the metropolitan area at large. Experience has shown that different governmental units have been unable to agree on solving any substantial differences, including hospital planning, sewage facilities, parks, annexations, highways and zoning. It is inconceivable they could agree on distribution of tax revenues. Implementation of a plan would seem to require an organization with power to compel its adoption.

(b) We do not believe either that the MPC, in addition to limitations on achieving intergovernmental cooperation, is equipped to bring order to the already fragmented nature of special service districts at the metropolitan level.

(c) A formal governmental structure at the metropolitan level seems necessary, both from the standpoint of carrying out a metropolitan plan and in avoiding the creation of independent special-purpose districts.

(d) The State Legislature no longer can defer facing up to the fact that intergovernmental cooperation accompanied by the haphazard creation of special service districts does not provide the proper framework for solving metropolitan problems. The 1965 Legislature should provide for proper study in the interim so that the 1967 Legislature can act positively in this area.

(e) We conclude that the Legislature should review the role of special purpose districts in metropolitan growth as well as explore various alternatives for a new governmental structure. These alternatives should include such possibilities as metropolitan government with the governing board elected by residents of the metropolitan area, a federation of municipalities and a state department of metropolitan affairs under the Governor or Legislature.

2. Whatever governmental structure develops at the metropolitan level, we believe that the MPC should continue as an advisory planning body, no doubt as a formal part of a metropolitan governmental structure. There will be a continuing need for research, fact-gathering, forecasting and metropolitan planning. MPC's role probably will increase when it is part of a metropolitan governmental structure. It probably will have specific planning responsibilities as they will relate to the various functions of the metropolitan governmental structure.

Present Role of the Commission

1. State law requires that the Metropolitan Planning Commission "make plans for the physical, social and economic development of the metropolitan area with the general purpose of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated and harmonious development of the area. . . ." We have reviewed the Commission's activity in the light of this requirement and make the following findings:

(a) The Commission has taken the proper steps to fulfill this requirement. The preparation of a metropolitan plan to guide development was included as part of the Commission's long-range work program which was developed shortly after the Commission was organized in 1958. Currently, the Commission is in the midst of preparing the plan in cooperation with several local, state and federal agencies.

(b) Because the plan will not be completed for about a year, we are not equipped to give a final assessment of how effective the Commission has been in fulfilling this requirement.

(c) We conclude, however, that the Commission is performing a valuable service to the Twin Cities area in the preparation of a metropolitan plan.

2. State law requires the Commission to promote cooperation among governmental units in the area. We have reviewed this requirement and make the following findings:

(a) The Commission has a special division of intergovernmental relations specifically assigned to promoting cooperation. The Commission has five staff members plus a full-time specialist in publications assigned to intergovernmental relations.

(b) The Commission has encouraged the creation of more than one dozen regional planning associations (known formally as development districts) among municipalities throughout the area. These districts provide a forum for localities to discuss mutual problems. The Commission tries to provide these regional planning associations with information on what is taking place elsewhere and provides, on request, possible constitutions and by-laws.

3. State law allows the Commission to advise and assist the Legislature and other governmental units and the public on planning matters within the scope of its duties and objectives. The law also allows other governmental units in the metropolitan area to submit matters which may have a substantial impact on regional development to the Commission for recommendation. We have reviewed these provisions and make the following findings:

(a) We believe that the Commission should provide more detailed information to the Legislature in the future on needed legislation to solve metropolitan problems. The Commission should back up its recommendations with enough detail so that legislators will have all the information they need should they want to draft bills based on the recommendations. Many recommendations in the Commission's current report to the Legislature seem inadequate in this respect.

(b) We support the Commission's desire to play a greater role in the future in advising localities on the metropolitan implications of their decisions. The Commission should be consulted before a local unit of government makes a decision which could have metropolitan impact. This would not infringe on local autonomy because the Commission's recommendations are only advisory.

(c) Currently if a governmental unit in the area chooses not to submit a matter to the Commission for recommendation the matter is deemed to be predominantly local. Unless this provision is changed the Commission will not be able to take a more active role in assistance. Governmental units should be required to submit matters which have an impact on metropolitan development to the Commission for recommendation before decisions are made. This is known as "mandatory referral".

(d) We believe, though, that mandatory referral should be so worded that the MPC will not be able to ignore certain matters which it might prefer not to act upon because of their controversial nature.

4. The Commission may conduct research studies, collect and analyze data, prepare maps, charts and tables and conduct all necessary studies for the accomplishment of its other duties. We have reviewed this provision in the law pertaining to the Commission and make the following findings:

(a) The Commission has prepared several reports since 1958 dealing with factual data about the Twin Cities area. These include three population studies, plus yearly estimates of population in localities throughout the area; land use, water, sewer, transportation, economic, parks and mass transit studies; selected determinants of residential development, selected determinants of industrial development, and studies of shopping facilities in the Twin Cities area. The Commission's latest annual report lists 21 maps published by the Commission which are available for interested persons in the Twin Cities area.

(b) One way to measure the value of the information which the Commission has developed is by the number of requests it receives from individuals and groups throughout the area for information. During a recent 12-month period almost 700 requests for information were received which took anywhere from 15 minutes to half a day to compile. The requests for information dealt with such things as parks, population, development problems, land use, transportation, zoning, and subdivision regulations.

5. The Commission may, upon request, and at the expense of the governmental unit concerned, prepare studies or plans relating to the future growth and development of the governmental unit. But such local planning shall not be done if it handicaps or delays the Commission's primary objective of regional studies and plans. We have reviewed this provision and make the following findings:

(a) The Commission is engaged in one such effort now, under contract to prepare a master plan for the Forest Lake Development District. This, though, is an experimental project to see how the plan can be integrated with the metropolitan plan being developed by the Joint Program.

(b) We agree with the Commission's reluctance to handle parochial planning projects in the Twin Cities area. Some regional planning commissions in the nation have floundered in overall planning because they have taken on too many small planning projects. The Metropolitan Planning Commission does not want to be pulled off balance. It wants to remain a "metropolitan" planning commission.

Commission Membership

We have reviewed the method of selecting members to the MPC and other aspects of Commission membership. We envision that with the establishment of a formal governmental structure at the metropolitan level the MPC will become the planning arm of this structure. Then we would expect a major change in the make-up of the Commission's own governing board. Pending the establishment of a new governmental structure, we believe the Legislature should strengthen the present Commission by making some changes. We have reached the following conclusions:

1. Commission members should vote according to what they believe are the best long-range interests of the metropolitan area rather than what are the best short-range interests of their own localities. We have learned that several members of the Commission are uncertain as to who or what they represent--the metropolitan area as a whole or their own localities. It is not undesirable that a county or municipality appoint a member of the Commission if that member has a clear understanding of his responsibility to the entire metropolitan area.

2. A member of the MPC should be free to vote his own conscience. Consequently, we believe that governmental bodies should be prohibited from appointing their employees to the Commission. An employee cannot help, in many cases, but to think of himself as representing the best interests of his employer.

3. We have been informed that it has been a common practice for two Commission members to send substitutes to represent them at Commission meetings. A Ramsey County Attorney's opinion to the Ramsey County Board has indicated this is improper. We believe such arrangements should be formally prohibited.

4. We are disappointed with attendance records of some Commission members. We believe that persons should not accept appointment to the MPC unless they are willing to attend the vast majority of meetings. Commission members should realize that, although the MPC has only advisory authority, it does spend the taxpayers' money and makes recommendations on important metropolitan issues. Such responsibilities should not be regarded lightly.

5. It has come to our attention that the MPC statute as presently worded would allow several other governmental units in the Twin Cities area to appoint members to the MPC if they chose to do so. These governmental units are the various other special-purpose districts in addition to the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District and the Metropolitan Airports Commission which currently appoint MPC members. It is possible that eight or more of these special-purpose districts could appoint MPC members. The Sanitary District and the Airports Commission were the only two special-purpose districts contemplated for appointing members when the MPC was organized. The statute should be changed so that only these two special-purpose districts would be allowed membership.

Commission Staff

The professional staff of the Metropolitan Planning Commission is of high quality and has an excellent reputation nationwide. In our meetings with members of the staff we were impressed with their capabilities and grasp of metropolitan growth problems. We hope that the Commission itself and the Legislature recognize the need to maintain such a staff in the future.

Mill Levy and Budget

We have reviewed the Commission's request to the 1965 Legislature to increase its mill levy maximum from .13 mills to .20 mills, which represents about a \$97,000 increase in revenue. We have made the following findings and conclusions:

1. We have not received sufficient information from the Commission to reach a judgment on specifically how much more money will be needed from the tax levy in 1966. No budget has been prepared yet. The Commission staff provided a few tentative figures, but they could change markedly, staff members have said.

2. We believe that the Commission should have given the State Legislature a more detailed presentation of its need for increased millage.

3. We conclude, though, that the Commission may need some additional local funds in 1966. The program of preparing a metropolitan plan, which has been chiefly supported by the federal government, will be coming to an end and the Commission will have to turn to local sources for increased financial support. Also the Commission may be assigned further duties, such as mandatory referral of local projects or greater involvement with the Minnesota Municipal Commission or a metropolitan transit agency or sewer district, as has been recommended in other Citizens League reports.

4. We find that no governmental body directly elected by the voters reviews the annual budget of the MPC. We believe that the Legislature is the best-equipped body for such a review. The MPC statute should be changed to require that the MPC in its biennial reports to the Legislature include a budget and an outline of its work program for the current year and following year. Based on such a presentation the Legislature would set the MPC mill levy limit for the next two years. The Legislature would not be adopting the budget presented by the MPC as final. The Legislature only would be establishing spending limit for MPC based on more accurate budget estimates than have been presented to the Legislature thus far.

5. We believe also that the MPC should inform the Legislature how much federal aid it intends to seek in the following year and make that a part of its budget. Based on information we have received from the federal government, it appears that federal aid will be available in the foreseeable future. The Commission should seek federal aid where the aid will be provided for projects which are in the Commission's annual work program.

6. We support the Commission's request before the State Legislature that it be allowed to levy for Public Employees Retirement Association (PERA) expense outside its regular millage limit. Prior to an attorney general's opinion last September, MPC did levy in excess of mill limitation for PERA. It is our understanding that the Legislature has inadvertently left the MPC out of the list of political subdivisions eligible to levy for PERA in excess of other mill limitations.

SCOPE OF REPORT

This committee was assigned by the Board of Directors to review the authority, composition and functioning of the Metropolitan Planning Commission. The Board of Directors made the assignment because there appeared to be a growing uncertainty about the specific role the Metropolitan Planning Commission should be playing in helping resolve governmental issues affecting the metropolitan area. The committee was told to review the MPC's objectives and accomplishments, and assess the role this agency should play in the future.

MEMBERSHIP

A total of 37 Citizens League members participated actively on the MPC Review Committee. They are Archie Spencer*, chairman; Tom Anding, Rev. Richard W. Bauer, Miss Ardath Bierlein*, Donald Brauer, Harold E. Burke*, Mrs. Mildred Corson, Mrs. Nicholas Duff*, Dr. Paul Elwood, Rev. John D. Fischer, Ralph Forester*, Rev. Helen MacRobert-Galazka, David Graven*, James Hawks, Donald C. Heath, John Hyzer, Robert R. Jacobson, Neil Kittleson, Harlan Knatvold, Thomas K. Kreilick, J. W. LaBounta, J. M. Leadholm, Rev. George LeMoine, Keith Libbey, C. Donald Peterson, Kenneth Pettijohn, Henry W. Pickett, Jr., Mrs. John Prins*, John W. Pulver*, Richard Schall, Alden C. Smith*, Stephen B. Solomon*, Paul Taylor, Kent van den Berg, Frederick Wall*, Mrs. Leo Weiss, and J. L. Weaver*. (Asterisk indicates member of Steering Committee which drafted the report.) The committee was assisted by Verne C. Johnson, Citizens League Executive Director, and Paul Gilje, Citizens League Research Director.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

The first action of the committee after it was formed was to try to obtain a clear understanding from MPC officials and staff about what the MPC's powers and responsibilities are, how MPC is organized, and what it is doing. The committee held individual sessions with C. David Loeks, Director; John Vance, Assistant Director; and Robert Einsweiler, Chief of the Metropolitan Studies Division. They are the top three staff members of the Commission. Then the committee met with John R. Finnegan, chairman of the MPC, who explained the relationship between the staff and the Commission members.

The committee then scheduled two evening hearings and invited all members of the Commission to appear and set forth their ideas on the authority, composition and function of the Commission. The following members appeared: Finnegan, James J. Dalglish, Douglas Kelm, Thomas Forsberg, E. V. Comstock, Kerwin Mick, Kenneth Kumm, Gerald Dillon, E. F. Robb, Jr., John C. Schwarzwald, Mrs. William J. Graham, Jr., and Zane Mann. Some members were unable to attend, but submitted statements in writing. They were Arch G. Pease, P. C. Bettenburg, Edward C. Schwartz, Lawrence Ploumen and Mrs. Rolland Hatfield.

Others who appeared before the committee were Joseph Robbie, former member of the MPC, now chairman of the Minnesota Municipal Commission; State Representative William G. Kirchner; State Representative Alpha Smaby; John Metcalf, Superintendent

of the Burnsville School District; Clifford Johnson, member of the Carver County Board; and Orville Peterson, Executive Secretary of the League of Minnesota Municipalities. State Representative Otto Bang and H. Peter Odegard, Planning Director, City of Bloomington, submitted written statements to the committee.

A special subcommittee spent two full afternoons at MPC headquarters in intensive discussions of MPC operations with Loeks, Vance and Einsweiler and several other MPC staff members, including Clement Springer, Edward Maranda, Robert Richter, John Udy, and Dallas Dollase. Loeks then appeared again before the full committee, and Vance and John Finnegan, Chairman of the Commission, appeared before the Steering Committee to discuss MPC's budget needs.

In addition, MPC staff members provided extensive assistance to the committee in informal sessions and several phone calls. The committee is grateful to the MPC for its cooperation.

The full committee met nine times between December 1, 1964, and April 30, 1965. The Steering Committee met seven times, five of which were lengthy evening meetings.

BACKGROUND

History of Metropolitan Planning in the Twin Cities Area

Forty years ago, in 1925, a group of citizens under the leadership of Prof. Robert Jones of the University of Minnesota's School of Architecture, organized a voluntary planning association. After two years of preliminary planning the group called a meeting at the University on January 18, 1927, to organize a regional planning association. As far as is known, this was the first time either "regional" or "planning" was used in connection with the problems of the area. An informal agency called the Metropolitan District Planning Commission was formed in 1928 as an outgrowth of this meeting.(1)

The Commission's purpose was "to study plans and advise in matters of common and of intercommunity interest within the region, such as the establishment of arterial highways, interurban transit, boulevards, bridges, parks, recreational agencies, zoning, conservation of lakes, water supply, sewerage, garbage disposal, a grand round drive and other elements of regional planning."

The new agency was to be financed by contributions from four classes of membership. The Commission was to be composed of 26 members, a few designated ex officio, the bulk to be named by organizations broadly representative of the region's public and civic life. It was to conduct basic studies, prepare a regional plan and advise the units of government of the area.

This early effort at regional planning was nullified by the Commission's failure to command financial support, by its inability to "make a sale" to the politicians, and, perhaps most of all, by the onslaught of the depression.

(1) Roscoe C. Martin, Metropolis In Transition, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 52.

The impetus for a regional planning commission was revived by Clarence C. Ludwig, who came to the Twin Cities in 1935 after years of service as a city manager and as a staff member of the American Municipal Association and the International City Managers' Association. He became professor of political science at the University of Minnesota, Director of the University's Municipal Reference Bureau, and Executive Secretary of the League of Minnesota Municipalities. He used all the resources these several positions afforded to bring about the creation of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission.

A major part of Ludwig's philosophy was that a community cannot live in isolation from its neighbors when the area as a whole has problems beyond the powers of the individual local governments.

Early in 1953 Ludwig began formal efforts to create a metropolitan planning agency. The League of Minnesota Municipalities sponsored a Twin Cities Area Regional Planning Conference. The sense of this conference was that the League continue its interest in areawide planning. A bill to create a metropolitan planning commission was introduced in the 1953 State Legislature late in the session, but failed to pass.

The League of Municipalities conducted a major informational effort in the next two years to obtain support for a metropolitan planning commission. In March, 1955, the League devoted a good share of its monthly magazine to a discussion of the need for metropolitan planning. Since the previous session of the Legislature, the federal Congress had passed the Housing Act of 1954, which included a provision that local, regional and metropolitan planning would be eligible for federal aid. This gave added impetus for supporters of metropolitan planning.

C. David Loeks, then city planner for the City of St. Paul, and Chairman of the League of Minnesota Municipalities' planning committee, wrote an article in that issue listing two objectives of metropolitan planning:

"(a) The basic facts about the entire area should be assembled and analyzed to provide a factual basis for developing solutions to both local and areawide problems; (b) A 'guide plan' outlining desirable goals for the future physical development of the region should be prepared providing the general framework within which programs of regional and local significance can be evolved. . . The commission's studies and 'guide plans' cannot be considered as magic 'cure-alls' for the area's development problems. Regional planning is long-range in objective and first things must come first -- careful studies of present conditions and trends must precede the recommendation of solutions to problems. Also, the commission's planning will not displace planning; rather, it will encourage local planning and will supplement and help it through its own studies and serving as a medium for the local planning and governmental authorities to sit around a table for exchange of information and advice."

It was clear both from Loeks' article and one by Ludwig that the most feared resistance was based on considerations of local self-government and home rule.

The metropolitan planning bill passed the Senate in 1955, but died in the House. Finally, in the 1957 session of the Legislature -- which followed an interim in which more conferences were sponsored by the League of Minnesota Municipalities --

the bill creating the Metropolitan Planning Commission was passed. It was signed into law on April 17, 1957.

The Commission held its first meeting on June 19, 1957, and Ludwig was selected as chairman of the Commission. In February, 1958, Loeks was hired as Director and a temporary office was opened at the Capitol. On May 1, 1958, permanent headquarters were established in the present location, the Griggs-Midway Building on University Avenue at Fairview in St. Paul.

At first the area of jurisdiction was Hennepin, Ramsey, Anoka, Dakota and Washington Counties. In September, 1958, Carver County joined, and in April, 1959, Scott County joined.

What is the Metropolitan Planning Commission?

The Metropolitan Planning Commission is an independent governmental unit created by the State Legislature with the responsibility for an areawide approach in planning solutions to problems which cross boundary lines of local governmental units and demand coordinated and cooperative action. The Commission's power is exclusively advisory.

The Commission has 30 members, who serve for five-year terms, except for the Mayors of Minneapolis and St. Paul or their appointed representatives, whose terms expire when the Mayors go out of office. The Commission members serve without pay. Members are selected in the following manner:

- (a) Two representatives from Minneapolis, one appointed by the Council and the other the Mayor or his representative.
- (b) Two representatives from St. Paul, one appointed by the Council and the other the Mayor or his representative.
- (c) Seven representatives from other municipalities in the metropolitan area, appointed by a majority vote of the mayors of these municipalities.
- (d) Seven members from the seven counties, one appointed by each County Board.
- (e) One member representing the School Districts and appointed by a majority vote of the chairmen of all the school boards in the metropolitan area.
- (f) Two members representing township boards in the area who are appointed by a majority vote of the township board chairmen in the area.
- (g) One member from each public corporation created by law to perform a service within two or more cities, villages or towns from its own membership or from persons in the territory under its jurisdiction.
- (h) Seven members representative of private citizens and groups interested in regional planning and development, appointed by the Governor. They

may hold no public office, other than that of notary public, and at least four must be from the central cities and not more than four may be of the same political party.

Under Commission by-laws the full Commission meets regularly four times a year. Special meetings may be held also. In 1964, for example, there were nine meetings of the full Commission.

A nine-member executive committee meets at least monthly. Its responsibilities are listed in the by-laws as follows: (a) Provide policy direction of the routine activities of the Director and staff, including a review of activities and reports; (b) Prepare recommendations for action by the full Commission; (c) Perform such other duties as may be assigned by the full Commission.

By-laws also provide for three standing committees which have the general duty of advising the Executive Committee and the staff in their respective areas of concern.

These committees are as follows:

Administrative Committee: Staffing, personnel policy, by-laws, management, financing, library.

Intergovernmental Relations Committee: Concentrates on the coordination function of planning by developing and promoting methods of cooperation between units of government, creating wider understanding of intergovernmental problems; providing general education and information for the public about planning and the Commission's work, and providing assistance to units of government which are primarily concerned with only a section of the metropolitan area.

Planning and Research Committee: Performing, contracting, promoting and coordinating research activities and the development of actual plans or proposals of metropolitan significance.

Each member of the Commission is appointed to at least one standing committee.

Following is a list of members of the Commission as of April, 1965:

Central City Mayors' Representatives: Arnett W. Leslie, Minneapolis Alderman, and Mrs. Bernard Marver, St. Paul.

Central City Council Representatives: George W. Martens, Minneapolis Alderman, and James J. Dalglish, St. Paul Commissioner of Finance.

Metropolitan Airports Commission: Position is vacant.

Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District: Kerwin L. Mick, Chief Engineer, Sanitary District.

School Districts' Representative: Erling O. Johnson, Superintendent of the Anoka-Hennepin School District.

Township Representatives: Kenneth A. Kumm, Chairman, White Bear Lake Township Board; and Edward G. Whitman, Chairman, East Oakdale Township Board.

Citizens Appointed by Governor: Eldon V. Comstock, consulting engineer, Edina; Gerald R. Dillon, president, printing firm, Minneapolis; John R. Finnegan, editorial writer, St. Paul Dispatch-Pioneer Press; John C. Schwarzwald, general manager, KTCA-TV, St. Paul; J. Douglas Kelm, insurance methods director, St. Paul; Zane B. Mann, fiscal consultant, Excelsior; and Arch G. Pease, publisher, Anoka.

Suburban Municipal Representatives: P. C. Bettenburg, architect and engineer, Lakeland; F. Robert Edman, former mayor, Mendota Heights; Thomas Forsberg, municipal judge, Coon Rapids; Mrs. William J. Graham, Jr., Bloomington; Mrs. Rolland Hatfield, Roseville; Melvin Lebens, interior designer, Shakopee; E. F. Robb, Jr., former mayor, Deephaven.

County Board Representatives: Anoka County, Edward C. Schwartz, county assessor and administrative assistant; Carver County, Julius Smith, attorney; Dakota County, James E. Gabiou, county highway engineer; Hennepin County, Elwood B. Swanson, former county commissioner; Ramsey County, Edward Salverda, county commissioner; Scott County, Lawrence Ploumen, county highway engineer; Washington County, Dr. O. R. Van Wirt, Forest Lake.

John R. Finnegan is chairman of the Commission.

Commission Finances and Budget

State law allows the Commission a .13 mill levy on all taxable personal and real property in the seven-county area. This levy will bring in about \$180,000 in 1965.

The Commission has full control over its own finances within the maximum mill levy established by law. It is required to adopt a budget for the following calendar year on or before October 1 each year. A public hearing must be held on the budget before it can be approved.

The Commission's budget consistently has been well above the amount it can levy because of the substantial amount of federal aid which has been granted. For example, here is the Commission's 1965 budget as presented in its report to the Legislature:

Estimated Revenue

Receipts from tax levy	\$180,000
Joint Program contributions (from federal government and local agencies)	183,000
Federal Aid for Forest Lake planning project	9,800
Federal Aid for beginning the imple- mentation phase of the Joint Program	<u>98,000</u>
TOTAL	\$470,000

Estimated Expenditures

Salaries	\$342,000
Travel	6,400
Service, supplies and equipment	83,400
Contingencies	2,500
Consultants, computers and project fees	<u>36,500</u>
TOTAL	\$470,800

As is usually the case for other governmental units, state law allows the MPC to borrow money in anticipation of the collection of taxes. It cannot borrow more than an amount, including interest, equal to 50 per cent of total taxes expected to be collected.

The Commission has asked the legislature to increase its local tax levy limit from .13 mill to .20 mill. To support the request, the Commission staff has drafted a tentative statement of proposed revenue and expenditures and possible work program for 1966. The statement has not been approved by the full Commission.

The increased millage would increase local tax revenue from about \$180,000 to \$270,000, the Commission staff estimated. The staff also estimated that about a \$31,000 federal grant would be sought in 1966, regardless of whether the levy is .13 mill or .20 mill.

The Commission staff has prepared the following breakdown of the Commission's proposed work program for 1966 as it now is envisaged with and without the mill increase:

- A) Identified need
- B) .20 mill + \$31,500 Fed. Aid
- C) .13 mill + \$31,000 Fed. Aid

<u>WORK ITEMS</u>	<u>ESTIMATES</u>		
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
BASIC INFORMATION AND RESEARCH			
1. Acquiring and maintaining basic information on urban change	\$ 49,000	\$ 32,000	\$ 20,600
2. Producing predictions and forecasts of urban change	27,000	22,500	22,500
3. Studies of public and private development resources (fiscal, legal, administrative)	31,000	27,000	27,000
REFINING AND CARRYING OUT THE PLAN			
4. Completion and continued updating plan elements (housing, commerce and industry transportation, open space, education, health and safety, natural resources)	150,000	101,000	101,000
5. Achieving the governmental and private structure for planning and development	17,000	17,000	---
6. Achieving the regulatory devices and controls needed for planning and development	28,000	23,000	---
7. Responding to requests for review of proposals or for special studies	30,000	22,000	---
8. Achieving coordination among public and private development interests (information, liaison, education, exhortation, persuasion)	<u>98,000</u>	<u>64,000</u>	<u>40,000</u>
TOTAL	\$430,000	\$308,500	\$211,100
Local		\$277,000	\$180,100
Federal Aid		\$ 31,500	\$ 31,000

The Joint Program for Land Use-Transportation Planning

During the past three years the Metropolitan Planning Commission has devoted most of its resources to a cooperative effort with a number of other public agencies in developing a suggested plan for the growth of the seven-county area through the year 2000. This effort is known as the Joint Program: An Inter-Agency Land Use-Transportation Planning Program for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

The other agencies involved are the Minnesota Highway Department, the planning and engineering departments of the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul; the highway departments of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott and Washington Counties; the federal Housing and Home Finance Agency and the federal Bureau of Public Roads.

Here is how the Joint Program is financed:

Cash and services (MPC, Minneapolis, St. Paul and the seven counties)	\$450,640
Federal grant from the Housing and Home Finance Agency	901,260
Bureau of Public Roads and Minnesota Highway Department funds	<u>480,500</u>
TOTAL	\$1,832,400

The plan is expected to be completed in 1966. The plan will recommend broad courses of action to be undertaken in the metropolitan area in eight different fields: Housing, commercial development, industrial development, open space, transportation, public utilities, governmental organization, and taxation.

The reason for developing such a plan is to attempt to avoid or reduce some of the major problems caused by the growth expected in the metropolitan area in the next 35 years. The participants in the Joint Program believe that the plan will promote the welfare of the people in the metropolitan area by encouraging a more livable and more efficient environment. The Joint Program participants believe that the plan will provide the metropolitan context in which local planning can operate and public and private decisions about development can be made.

Details still are somewhat sketchy as to what the plan will involve. Later in 1965 a major publication of the Joint Program is scheduled to be released which will discuss in detail four possible plans for development of the area. Specific actions which would be necessary to put each alternative plan into effect will be outlined. The Joint Program then plans to solicit the reactions from governmental officials and any other interested citizens in the Twin Cities area as to which alternative is preferred. Based on their reactions the Joint Program participants will choose one alternative or a combination of two of them as the metropolitan plan.

The four alternatives already have been identified as:

(1) Continuation of Present Trends--This is a prediction of what the metropolitan area may be like if there is no coordinated effort to guide change. Joint Program participants say it is difficult to pin down the exact nature of this alternative because so many different goals are being pursued today.

(2) Spread City--This alternative would create a loose-knit, flexible environment that would stress low-intensity development and personal mobility by use of the automobile. The developed area would be extensive, with fragmented edges and small concentrations at a variety of points.

(3) Multiple Centers--In this alternative nonresidential activities would be clustered into single locations for each major subregion of the Twin Cities area. These would be all-purpose centers and could be more than one half the size of downtown St. Paul. In effect, each center would be the hub of a medium-sized city.

(4) Radial Corridors--This alternative would stress a concentrated pattern of development in certain areas so there would be easy access to the downtown areas of Minneapolis and St. Paul from the entire metropolitan area. A form of high-speed transit, possibly an extensive commuter rail system, definitely would be required. Development would be in corridors along the rail and transit lines in a kind of finger arrangement.

Once a decision is reached on the metropolitan plan and the plan is completed, the Joint Program participants believe that the actual decisions which will be necessary to carry out the plan can be made by localities and individuals. The Joint Program participants believe that local changes can be managed with a better knowledge of what is at stake and with an overall direction in mind.

A key part of the Joint Program is that implementation of the plan will be brought about by voluntary intergovernmental cooperation.

The Joint Program participants believe this is possible for two major reasons: (1) The Joint Program itself includes representatives of major decision-making bodies in the metropolitan area. (2) The Joint Program participants are attempting to inform a large segment of the population of the Joint Program's developments so that the Joint Program can take maximum advantage of responses by individuals and groups in the metropolitan area as it is developing the plan.

Other Functions of the Commission

1. To encourage cooperation among local governmental units in the Twin Cities area.

The Commission has encouraged groups of municipalities and townships in various parts of the area to form regional planning associations. There are about one dozen such associations throughout the area with a varying degree of organization.

The Forest Lake Planning District, composed of nine communities north of St. Paul, is the most advanced regional planning association in the area. The communities in this district, acting under the Joint Powers Act of the State

Legislature, have levied taxes jointly to finance the preparation of a comprehensive plan for their area. The Commission is preparing the plan for the Forest Lake area and is coordinating this plan with the Joint Program plan for the entire Twin Cities area. The Commission is not investing any of its own money in the Forest Lake project. The federal Housing and Home Finance Agency is supplying two thirds of the cost, and the Forest Lake communities the rest.

Among other regional planning associations are the North Anoka County group, the South Washington County group, and the West Hennepin County group. The Commission provides information on constitutions and by-laws for these regional associations.

The Commission tries to coordinate local governmental planning throughout the metropolitan area by pointing out to localities that certain actions they take may have implications for the development of neighboring localities. The Commission has not been able to do as much of this kind of coordination as it would like because very few localities have chosen to submit questions to the Commission for advice before final decisions are made.

In its relationships with local governmental units the Commission has made it clear, though, that it does not want to devote a major portion of its resources to tackling small, parochial planning problems throughout the area. There have been examples elsewhere in the nation of regional planning commissions which have devoted so much time to such problems that they have neglected planning for the entire area.

2. To provide information about the metropolitan area to individuals and groups.

This function is handled by the Field Service and Public Information sections of the Commission. During 1963 and 1964, according to the Commission's report to the 1965 Legislature, staff and Commission members attended meetings throughout the metropolitan area as observers, advisors or as featured speakers. Also, according to the report to the Legislature, staff members answered 672 special requests for assistance or information between October, 1963 and December, 1964. These requests each involved 15 minutes or more of staff time. They do not include routine requests for information which are answered by the switchboard operator, library, information officer or others.

3. Special activities.

The Commission has worked frequently with engineers developing areawide sewerage plans for the year 2000. The Commission's principal contribution in this field has been predicting population growth and, where possible, where this growth will take place.

The Commission also has provided assistance in projecting population growth for the State Junior College Board which is planning a new system of junior colleges in the Twin Cities area.

Early this year the Commission was in the final stages of preparing a guide for planning by counties in the Twin Cities area. In 1964 the Commission, on request of the Carver County Board, evaluated a proposal by the Hennepin County Park Reserve District to establish a park in Carver County.

In January, 1964, the Commission, on request of a state legislator, called a meeting of interested groups to discuss implications of a proposed federal office building on land planned for Fort Snelling State Park. The Commission believes that apparently as a result of information generated at the meeting the federal government selected a site that would not interfere with park plans.

Role of the Federal Government

The federal government has played a major role in the activity of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission since the Commission was created. The Commission has received extensive federal aid every year since it was established.

In fact, one of the factors in the creation of the MPC in the first place was the passage of the Housing Act of 1954 by Congress. Section 701 of this Act provides for federal aid to urban areas to cover up to two thirds of costs of comprehensive planning. This is popularly referred to in planning circles as the "701 Program".

Federal aid can be granted for the following types of activities: (2)

1. Survey and analysis of data on population, economy, physiography, land use, transportation, community facilities and similar factors.
2. Preparation of a comprehensive development plan which will include a statement of community goals and policies, a land use plan, a highway and transportation facilities plan, and a plan for location and extent of community facilities.
3. Preparation of programs for implementing the comprehensive development plan, including:
 - (a) Capital improvements program which includes a long-range fiscal plan and a definitive financing plan for the early years of the program.
 - (b) Regulatory ordinances for the use and occupancy of land and buildings, including zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations.
 - (c) Assistance on preparation for local adoption of nationally recognized model housing, building, plumbing, electrical and fire prevention codes.
4. Coordinating and administrative activities, including:
 - (a) Coordination of development plans among the departments or subdivisions of a single level of government.

(2) "Urban Planning Program Guide; Policies and Procedures for Federal Assistance Under the Urban Planning Program", Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, August, 1963.

- (b) Coordination of development plans among the local, regional, state and federal agencies concerned with the planning area.
- (c) Public education activities related to the planning program.
- (d) Advisory services on the general administration of zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations and housing and construction codes.

5. Updating and maintenance of basic data, updating of the capital improvements program and revisions to the comprehensive development plan. These activities are eligible only if the agency has previously prepared both a comprehensive development plan and appropriate implementation measures.

Following are some examples of specific kinds of planning work eligible for federal aid within the above categories:

1. Transportation planning, including use of existing public and private transportation facilities, characteristics of travel, future capacity needs, evaluation of alternative transportation systems, recommended transportation system, implementation of the plan, including general recommendations on financing and organization.
2. Airport planning, including the determination of the number, type and general area locations of airports needed for both commercial and general aviation; relationship of airports to community development, including consideration of economic factors, land use controls and the overall transportation system.
3. Plan for a central business district, industrial districts or commercial areas; open spaceland plan; park and recreation plan; community facilities plan, which includes water and sewer facilities, schools, hospitals, libraries and similar public structures.
4. Educational activities needed to effect the comprehensive planning program. These activities are to be limited to: preparation of materials for, and participation in, meetings and public hearings to achieve public understanding and support for the comprehensive development plan, zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations and capital improvements program; training sessions conducted for persons engaged in administration of the activities listed above and exhibits, models, publications and films to be used here.
5. Operational soil surveys only in areas where both of the following criteria are met: soil is of questionable suitability for on-site sewage disposal or of questionable adequacy as a foundation for structures; the area is urbanized or has a reasonable expectation of being urbanized within 10 years. Also eligible are studies providing an interpretation of a completed operational soil survey for urban planning purposes.

6. Studies necessary to determine the administrative structure needed for an effective planning operation. (Detailed studies of personnel, organization, controls and similar matters that are a function of continuing administrative management would not be eligible.)

7. Acquisition of preparation of graphic materials, such as aerial photographs, base maps and other graphic devices needed or the development, preparation and presentation of plan elements and activities. Materials must be needed primarily for the comprehensive planning program.

The federal government requires that the aid it provides for metropolitan planning commissions must cover development problems which are of concern to the whole area rather than to those which are the concern of only one or a few of the local jurisdictions. Studies of minor and secondary streets serving only one local jurisdiction, specific local zoning problems or local community facilities are examples of studies that shall not be included in such a work program because they are not of significance to the metropolitan area as a whole.

Federal aid cannot be granted for the following types of activities:

1. Preparation of preliminary or final plans for specific public works.
2. Engineering feasibility studies preparatory to design and construction of structures or facilities.
3. Detailed engineering field surveys or inventories to determine conditions or dimensions of existing structures, facilities, utilities or pavements.
4. Planning for nonurban areas, such as rural or wilderness areas, not directly related to present or future urban needs.
5. Planning for the reorganization of the general tax structure of an area or developing new sources of revenue, unless related to the preparation of long-range fiscal plans or definitive financing plans for improvements otherwise eligible under the comprehensive planning program.
6. Preparation of single-purpose materials, such as an economic or industrial survey or promotional items, not part of a larger comprehensive planning program.
7. Review of individual subdivision plats and individual applications for zoning variances, special exceptions and amendments.

It appears also that the federal government is very much interested in expanding the role of metropolitan planning agencies. For example, federal aid highway legislation was enacted in 1962 to require that federally-assisted highway projects in urban areas be based on a coordinated and cooperative transportation planning process, with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development of those areas. And under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 federally-assisted public transportation projects must be included in a program for an urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

The 701 Program is specifically authorized to help finance studies of transportation needs. Such planning must be an integral part of comprehensive development planning for the whole area, and is provided only to planning agencies eligible under the policies governing the Urban Planning Assistance Program.

An example of how the federal government may increase further the role of metropolitan planning agencies is evidenced by a bill now before Congress authored by Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine. The Muskie bill passed the Senate in the last session of Congress but died in the House. It takes note of the fact that 45 federal aid programs have a significant impact on urban area development. Under Muskie's bill, an application for a federal grant for an urban area would have to be accompanied by the comments and recommendations of the metropolitan planning agency.

Muskie believes that if federal aid programs are to be most effective, there must be adequate planning and real coordination of program administration in Washington and among the local jurisdictions comprising metropolitan regions.

Citizens League Reports on the MPC

The Citizens League on February 14, 1957, endorsed "wholeheartedly" the bill to create the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

That Citizens League report said its studies of problems in Hennepin County resulted in the conclusion that "usually the problems of any one of these governmental units cannot be approached adequately in a vacuum. They must be approached in reference to the effect on other governmental units in the area, in order to achieve sound and economical solutions, and to promote the orderly growth of the whole region.

"To do this requires proper planning on an areawide basis, planning which first of all gathers and analyzes pertinent facts as to the area's economic and social needs and resources so that local governments can coordinate their decisions in reference to the development of the area and the decisions of other governments.

"The efforts of individual communities in such areas as highways, zoning, fire and police protection, sewerage, and water supply can often be made much more effective if they can be coordinated through the advice of a metropolitan planning commission. Without such an organization, many local decisions whose results extend far beyond community borders will continue to be made on a needlessly local basis."

In the 1963 Legislature the Citizens League was instrumental in passage of the bill increasing the mill levy for the Commission from .10 to .13 mill. The League had urged the Legislature to approve the Commission's request of a mill levy increase from .10 to .20 mill. The League considered the increase would be justified because MPC would need more money to become more involved in advising local governmental units on planning problems of an intergovernmental nature and to pick up the slack when federal funds no longer are available. Also, the League said, the potential savings which can be derived from metropolitan planning far exceed the cost, and that to avoid a serious interruption in the MPC program and the loss of experienced personnel needed in future phases of the program, it is necessary to have the millage increased.

DISCUSSION

It is difficult to define the work and to identify the accomplishments of the Metropolitan Planning Commission during its seven years of existence. Mainly, its activities have been in the field of gathering important data about the metropolitan area and in encouraging the cooperation of local governmental units so they can recognize that they are part of one unified area which has several common problems. Beyond that, it is hard to say that certain events happened or failed to happen because of the Commission's existence. One critic of the Commission said he doubts the results of the Commission's work justify the expenditure of \$2 million which has been spent on the Commission so far. But we find it hard to place a price tag on the value of the Commission's work.

As a result of the nature of its activities, critics of the Commission have said that it makes recommendations which are out of touch with reality and that it is interested only in vague long-range planning, not specific immediate problems. We have heard reports, too, that some public officials in the Twin Cities area, including legislators, lack confidence in the work of the MPC.

If, in fact, there are serious questions about the value of MPC's contribution to the metropolitan area, it can be due in large part to the lack of specific responsibility given it in the statute. MPC's duties, as outlined in state law, are quite general in nature. This may partly be because the Legislature, in creating the Commission, was careful not to create a metropolitan government or other agency that would erode local governments' autonomy.

Although the Legislature has been reluctant to assign added duties to the MPC, we see almost the opposite effect at the federal level. Federal funds are available in substantial amounts to the MPC and other regional planning agencies, and there seems to be added incentive on the part of the federal government to assign regional planning agencies more duties, such as reviewing all federal aid programs in metropolitan areas to see that they are properly coordinated and to avoid duplication.

Consequently, as we may be witnessing a decline in MPC's prestige in some local quarters, we are observing an increase in its prestige at the federal level. We have heard several reports that officials of the federal government regard the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission as one of the top -- if not the top -- planning agencies in the country.

Whatever MPC's standing may be with the state or federal government, it appears that MPC should become part of a formal governmental structure with power to solve metropolitan problems. MPC can make meaningful recommendations for solving metropolitan problems, but these recommendations probably should be addressed to a government with authority. It should not simply urge voluntary cooperation among the existing local governments.

There is no doubt that the metropolitan area must be planned comprehensively. Piecemeal solutions of problems which affect the entire area are inadequate economically and from the standpoint of providing a decent environment for area residents. For example, an areawide outlook is necessary so that park land can be acquired and preserved for future generations. What would Minneapolis be like today

if it had not had far-sighted men who preserved the shoreline of the city's lakes for public use? A proper sewage disposal network is necessary so that this public service can be provided in the safest and most economical way to the most people possible. There are several other problems which transcend the boundaries of municipalities and require areawide attention.

This brings us to the point of who the decision-makers are. The decision-makers in the Twin Cities area now are the town boards, village councils, city councils, county boards and boards of special-purpose agencies. Each is operating individually and independently of the other. Each cooperates with others only to the extent that it is in the best interests of its own residents. This is, of course, what the various units of government are required to do. Are these decision-makers adequate to carry out what needs to be done if, for example, the Metropolitan Planning Commission recommends certain action? We believe they are not, because none of them is assigned to look after the best interests of the entire area.

It is interesting to note here a recent study by Prof. Terrance Sandalow of the University of Minnesota Law School under contract with the Joint Program for Land Use-Transportation Planning, the interagency program in which the MPC is participating and which will produce a proposed metropolitan plan. The title of his study is "The Implementation of Metropolitan Plans". He makes the following points in his study:

(1) Under present statutes a county is not required to exercise its powers consistently with a plan it may have adopted. The absence of such a requirement is a serious impediment to use of county plans for implementation of a metropolitan plan.

(2) Municipalities have power to adopt a metropolitan plan. The zoning power of a municipality is a key part of carrying out a plan. However, existing state law provides that plans should be in accord with zoning regulations. The generally accepted belief in the planning profession is that zoning should be in accord with plans, not the other way around.

(3) There is no assurance that if one municipality adopts a metropolitan plan that another municipality in the area also will adopt the plan. In fact the avenues of escape at the present time are so numerous that one governmental unit could not reasonably be expected to rely on another's adherence to metropolitan policies.

(4) If there is no assurance that a metropolitan plan will be carried out, it is not logical for the Metropolitan Planning Commission, for example, to advise that a proposed local project involving federal assistance is inconsistent with a metropolitan plan. If the activities are not to be coordinated in any event, it is difficult to see what useful purpose is served by impeding a project which may be quite desirable from a local perspective.

(5) It might be possible for a municipality to approve a contract in which it would be bound to follow a metropolitan plan. There are some shortcomings, though, because so many local governments would have to approve contracts. If the contract device cannot be employed to implement an entire plan, it may be useful in solving particular problems.

(6) The present governmental framework in the Twin Cities area is inadequate for implementation of a plan which would require a high degree of coordination. There is no adequate mechanism to resolving conflict among the constituent

governmental units. Although a metropolitan planning agency can provide information to allow more intelligent local decision-making, each decision would be made locally in terms of local objectives and the sum of the decisions would lack the coordination implicit in the concept of true planning.

(7) Decision-making at the local level does not provide the framework where interests of all affected parties will be taken into consideration. For example, land use decisions by a municipal government occasionally may have an effect on the entire metropolitan area. Furthermore, a local governing body is neither responsible nor responsive to many of the affected interests.

(8) Members of the Metropolitan Planning Commission are not directly responsible to the public. Many of them have no greater accountability than results from appointment by an elected official. As presently constituted the Commission is not sufficiently responsible to the public to justify conferring upon it the power to adopt a binding plan. It seems desirable that the metropolitan plan should be adopted by a body with a wide base of political support.

(9) Transfer of a substantial number of metropolitan-wide functions to a multi-purpose district would materially aid implementation of a metropolitan plan because of the district's power to bring about desired public development.

(10) Much local planning is directed toward the goal of increasing the local unit's property tax. If there were one metropolitan area taxing district, the need for a good deal of "defensive" local planning would be obviated. Accordingly, there would be less reason to fear unfairness from requiring adherence to the metropolitan plan.

Sandalow then concludes as follows: "Experience to date suggests the need for curbing the now almost unlimited power of local authorities to maximize the interests of their own governmental unit at the expense of others. Finally, the techniques of implementation available in the absence of a metropolitan government may well be insufficient to execute a plan requiring a high level of intergovernmental coordination.

"In the absence of metropolitan government, it seems unlikely that the MPC or any other metropolitan level agency would or should be given many of the powers necessary to implementation of such a plan. Of primary importance is the absence of power to bring about either public or private development contemplated by the plan."

What appears to be necessary is a responsible governmental structure with power to solve metropolitan problems. Without this structure it is doubtful there will be a central responsibility for meeting existing and future needs.

The State Legislature cannot continue to act in response to each new metropolitan problem as it arises without taking a look at the overall picture of

governmental structure at the metropolitan level. The Legislature has not chosen to do this so far. It has chosen to solve the airport problem with the Metropolitan Airports Commission, the sewerage problem with the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District, the mosquito problem with the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, the planning problem with the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the park problem with the Park Reserve District.

More demands for legislative action to meet metropolitan problems are coming in regularly. The most recent is the request for a metropolitan transit agency.

The Legislature, we believe, must decide what metropolitan problems should be solved by an areawide governmental structure.

The Legislature must determine the distribution of functions between such a structure and the existing cats-cradle of county, municipal, township and single-purpose governmental agencies. Certain activities would, as now, be carried on by an areawide agency. Examples of these functions would be airports, mosquito control, annexations and sewers.

The metropolitan structure might have planning and supervisory authority in some areas, such as libraries, zoning, planning roads, transit, parks and water, with detailed implementation being left in the local communities. The existing governments might retain full control over other functions such as courts, police, fire, municipal facilities, local parks, beaches, city buildings and schools.

The tax structure of the area would have to be revised substantially to avoid the serious distortions that would otherwise follow from implementation of the metropolitan plan. Perhaps the new governmental structure would equalize tax assessments and distribute tax revenues among the various local governments.

We have not been assigned to recommend what type of governmental structure would be best at the metropolitan level. We merely have concluded that it appears that in the long run the Metropolitan Planning Commission should be part of a governmental structure with power and responsibility at the metropolitan level.

Built-in prejudices against "metropolitan government" because of a loss of "local control" are myths which must be destroyed. We already have a series of metropolitan governments in the Twin Cities today, each operating by itself with little or no accountability to the voters. How many citizens can name even one member of the Mosquito Control District or the Airports Commission or the Sanitary District? Each of these is a metropolitan government in and of itself.

There are a number of potential governmental structures which the Legislature could consider. Perhaps a multi-purpose district could be created. Or maybe a federation of municipalities similar to the Toronto, Canada, plan is possible. Another alternative is to create a department of state government assigned to handle problems of the metropolitan area. No doubt there are other alternatives.

The important thing is for the Legislature to face the issue of metropolitan government head-on and not skirt it by creating a new metropolitan agency every time there is a problem to be solved. It also must be recognized that the Legislature

cannot resolve the question of governmental structure at the metropolitan level in this legislative session. The Legislature must order the proper interim work now so that adequate background information will have been obtained before 1967. The Legislature could create an interim commission or assign the regular committees of the House and Senate to review this matter. In its investigation the Legislature should explore whether it would be feasible to end the present fragmentation of single-purpose districts and bring them all under the same governmental structure.

A bill has been introduced in the 1965 Legislature calling for an interim commission to study "the feasibility of the creation of some metropolitan agency to administer and perform those activities which are metropolitan in scope." Chief author of the bill, House File 1937, is Rep. Howard Albertson of Stillwater, chairman of the House Metropolitan and Urban Affairs Committee.

We also believe that the Citizens League Board of Directors should assign this committee or another committee to review the need for a governmental structure to handle metropolitan problems. Citizens League recommendations could be developed for the interim commission or committees or for the 1967 Legislature.

We foresee that the MPC would be a dynamic agency under a metropolitan governmental structure. It would be in the "governmental stream", and not off by itself making recommendations to interested people. It would be making recommendations to an organization with responsibility and power for examining them and implementing them.

If no governmental structure with overall responsibility is created, the MPC will continue to languish in limbo with no real responsibility to anyone except itself. It probably will be able to promote some intergovernmental cooperation, but voluntary cooperation will not be adequate to meet the problems.

Mandatory Referral

Although it appears that in the long run MPC should be part of a governmental structure at the metropolitan level, we still envision that the MPC, properly equipped, can be of greater assistance to individual governmental units in the metropolitan area than it now is. Because it has a metropolitan-wide perspective, the MPC is able to tell a local unit of government what the implications of certain actions will be on other parts of the metropolitan area. We regard this as a very important function of the Commission.

Unfortunately, too few units of government in the area choose to refer matters to the Commission for review and recommendation.

As presently worded the MPC statute states that:

"Before a governmental unit in the metropolitan area makes a final decision on any matter which, in the sole discretion of its governing body, is not predominantly local but has a substantial effect on regional development, the tentative proposal or plans shall be presented to the commission for its recommendation, and the governing body shall take no binding action on the matter thereafter until the commission has made its

recommendations or until 30 days have elapsed from the time of submission to the commission without a report from the commission. Failure to present the proposal or plans to the commission shall be a finding by the governing body that the matter is predominantly local."

What this simply means, of course, is that a governmental unit can seek the recommendation of the MPC if it wants to, but the governmental unit is not required to do so.

A governmental unit loses none of its sovereignty when it submits a matter to the MPC for recommendation. The governmental unit does acknowledge by such action, though, that it is part of a metropolitan community and that its actions affect other parts of the area.

We agree with the MPC in urging the Legislature to strengthen the referral provision to require that a governmental unit, before making a decision on a matter which has an impact on regional development, submit the matter to the MPC for its recommendation. This means that referral to the MPC would be mandatory.

The MPC, though, has some corresponding responsibilities in mandatory referral. It should not be allowed to ignore a matter because it may be controversial. Though the MPC need not make a recommendation on everything which is submitted to it, the MPC should be required to state why it has decided not to act.

The only significant referral function which the Commission now serves is that the state Department of Business Development routinely seeks the recommendation of the Commission on whether federal planning grants should be granted to localities in the Twin Cities area. The Department of Business Development has been designated as the state planning agency which applies to the federal government for planning grants on behalf of localities.

Membership on the Metropolitan Planning Commission

Our committee spent many hours discussing whether the present 30-member commission is too large and whether the method of selecting commission members needs improvement. We concluded that with the Commission's present functions we find little need to change its composition.

If we were to propose major changes in the make-up of the commission at this time, it would imply that we somehow foresee that the Commission should continue with its same responsibilities for the future. We do not believe this is the case. The Commission properly belongs within the context of an overall governmental structure at the metropolitan level. When this comes about, there naturally will be a change in the governing body.

Although we do not propose that the number of Commission members be changed or the method of selecting them be changed, we do have some observations to make about the present situation.

Some Commission members have very poor attendance records. One member, for example, missed all nine meetings in 1964. Fourteen members missed at least four of the Commission's nine meetings in 1964.

In a recent period in which 12 meetings were held, the percentage attendance ranged from a low of 53 per cent to a high of 93 per cent, with an overall average for the 12 meetings of 69.2 per cent. In 7 of the 12 meetings, 11 or more Commission members were absent.

These attendance figures indicate to us that some Commission members do not seem to take their positions very seriously. This is unfortunate. The commission is not "just another board". It is an independent governmental unit, with powers of taxation, hiring and firing of staff, budget-making and other powers usually given to governmental units.

A few Commission members, we have learned, have had the unusual practice of sending regular substitutes to meetings of the Commission. In fact, one governmental body has appointed an official substitute for its representative on the Commission. It seems highly irregular that members of an official governmental body can empower substitutes to attend meetings for them. It is no more logical than if a member of the Minneapolis City Council were to send someone in his place to meetings of the City Council. Substitutes should be prohibited at MPC meetings.

Within the last two weeks a Ramsey County Attorney's opinion has been given to the Ramsey County Board that substitutes should not be sent to meetings of the Metropolitan Planning Commission. The Ramsey County Board formerly had designated an official substitute to attend Commission meetings in the absence of Ramsey County's regular representative. This matter has not been ruled upon specifically by the Minnesota Attorney General, who is the legal advisor for the Metropolitan Planning Commission. However, the opinion given to the Ramsey County Board has been informally agreed to by the assistant Attorney General assigned to the MPC.

Another improvement needed is for Commission members themselves to understand clearly who or what they represent on the Commission. We believe it is all right for a county to appoint a member of the Commission, for example, but we believe that that member should consider himself representing all the people of the metropolitan area. He must not consider himself as representing the best interests of the county or other governmental unit which appointed him. A Commission member should not feel bound to vote any way except according to what he believes is best for the metropolitan area. The MPC statute should state specifically that Commission members once appointed are to consider themselves as representing all people of the metropolitan area.

Certain governmental bodies now appoint their own employees as members of the Metropolitan Planning Commission. We believe this practice should end. An employee seldom can feel free, we believe, to act in any manner other than what he considers to be the best interests of his employer.

There is one further interesting aspect of membership on the Commission which has been made known to us. There probably are at least eight other governmental units in the Twin Cities area which are entitled to appoint members to the Metropolitan Planning Commission but have not chosen to do so. These are the "public corporations created by law to perform a service within two or more cities, villages, or towns in the metropolitan area". So far only the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District have chosen to take advantage of this provision and appoint members to the Commission. Other agencies which could send

members are the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, the North Suburban Sanitary Sewer District, the North Suburban Hospital District, the Hennepin County Park Reserve District, the Coon Creek Watershed District, the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District, the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District, possibly the St. Paul-Ramsey County Detention and Corrections Authority, and probably several others. Chances are many of these units of government are not even aware of the possibility. As far as our committee can determine, the MPC never has made a complete check on who is or is not eligible to have representatives on the MPC.

Conceivably, if all these special districts saw fit to appoint representatives to the MPC, almost one-third of the total MPC membership could be from special districts. We believe that state law should specify that only the Airports Commission and the Sanitary District, which now appoint MPC members, can continue to do so. The existing "open-ended" arrangement should cease.

Mill Levy and Budget

We have had a difficult time analyzing the Commission's request for an increase in its maximum mill levy from .13 mills to .20 mills, an increase which would give it \$97,000 more in local funds each year.

We had hoped that the Commission would tell us specifically where it intends to spend the money, if granted. Unfortunately, this is not the case. In fact, the Commission has not prepared a budget yet for 1966, the first year the mill increase would go into effect.

Staff members of the Commission did prepare a highly tentative, two-page statement with some outlines of what expenditures might be in 1966, but the statement has not been approved by the full Commission and we were informed that the statement's contents could change considerably.

We realize that under present law the Commission is not required to adopt a budget for 1966 before October 1, 1965. However, it would seem that to maximize its chances for receiving the additional mill authorization the Commission should have prepared a detailed statement of how it proposes to spend the money.

We do believe, though, that the Commission will need some additional local funds in 1966. How much, we cannot say. If the Commission is given mandatory referral, more money will be needed. Also, if the Commission is given additional responsibilities to the Minnesota Municipal Commission, a metropolitan transit agency and a metropolitan sanitary district, as suggested in other Citizens League reports, it will need additional operating funds.

The Commission itself is basing its argument for increased millage principally on the need to be more flexible in 1966 and subsequent years. With increased millage, Commission officials say, the MPC will not have to rely on the federal government so extensively for support. Then the Commission will be flexible to respond quickly to planning requests in the metropolitan area. When the Commission works on federally-aided projects, it has rigid deadlines to meet and cannot, it states, be flexible to respond to local requests. Commission officials maintain that with the completion of the Joint Program work (preparation of a metropolitan plan) in 1966 the Commission will want to concentrate on responding to specific planning requests as they arise.

The amount of flexibility the Commission will have in 1966, though, is not contingent only on an increase in millage. It depends to a great extent on how much of the locally-raised money is used to match federal funds for certain projects. In 1965, for example, \$60,000 of the money raised by the Commission's tax levy is being used to match federal funds. The Commission staff has estimated the Commission may ask for about \$31,000 in federal aid in 1966. Federal aid usually is given on a two-thirds-federal, one-third-local basis. This means that about \$15,000 of the 1966 local tax levy would be committed for federal projects. Consequently, even without an increase in millage, the Commission in 1966 would be able to increase its flexibility to respond to local projects by \$45,000 (the difference between \$60,000 pledged to federal projects this year and the estimated \$15,000 which might be pledged in 1966).

Unfortunately, the full Commission has not established a policy yet on how much federal aid will be requested next year. Staff members of the Commission have conceded to us that the figure of \$31,000 is a very rough estimate and could change considerably. There appears to be a wide difference of opinion among members of the Commission as to how extensively it should rely on federal funds. A few members object that the local tax revenue seems to be used mainly as "seed money" for large federal grants. On the other hand, other Commission members believe the Commission should take advantage of federal aid where available.

We have been informed by the regional office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (where federal planning aid is administered) in Chicago that the MPC will continue to be eligible for federal grants. The regional office has informed us as follows: "After completion of a comprehensive metropolitan plan it appears that the commission would become eligible for grants to assist in implementation of the plan and later to aid in updating or revising the plan as may be required."

We believe that a sound policy for the MPC to follow would be to decide what it intends to undertake in an upcoming year in terms of its work program. Having decided on projects, the Commission should apply for federal aid for those projects which might be eligible.

In some cases the Commission's flexibility might increase if it accepts federal aid. For example, if the Commission is planning a project for 1966 which will cost \$45,000, the Commission might be able to receive two-thirds of the cost from the federal government. Thus local tax funds, which otherwise would have been needed to meet the cost of the project, would be freed for local needs.

Because of the difficulty in analyzing whether the Commission needs more millage, we believe the statute should be changed to require the Commission to submit a budget to the Legislature each biennium as part of its biennial report. The budget, with an outline of the Commission's planned work program, should be for the current year and for the upcoming year. Not only will this provide the Legislature with better information to help it decide whether to grant millage increases; it also will guarantee that some governmental unit directly responsible to the voters will be reviewing the MPC budget.