

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 170

County Home Rule Charters

November 1964

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

APPROVED

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DATE NOV 4 1964

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Government Organization Committee

SUBJECT: Findings and Recommendations on County Home Rule

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. In Hennepin County, county government has become big government. In 1964, most county residents outside of Minneapolis paid more taxes to finance county government than to pay for the operation of their own municipal governments. In view of this, and because of the importance of its activities, county government and its operation are deserving of close scrutiny by the taxpayers and the close attention of the voter.

2. Historically, county government was organized to act as a local agent of the state in law enforcement, tax administration, welfare services, and the administration of other state-established services and regulations. More recently, however, the responsibilities of county government have been broadened, and the county has been called upon to perform many functions similar to those performed by municipalities. The role of the urban counties, such as Hennepin, in providing these important local governmental type services is already large and undoubtedly will continue to expand along with the County's traditional function of acting as local agent for the state.

3. County government was designed to meet the needs of a rural, 19th century society. While conditions have changed greatly since that time, county government structure has changed very little, and the County, with its antiquated governmental structure, is not designed to meet effectively the demands being placed upon it in a fast-growing, highly urbanized county such as Hennepin.

4. By law, all Minnesota counties must now operate under the County Commissioner form of government in which the County Board acts as the county executive authority as well as the policy making branch of county government within rigid statutory restrictions. In addition, all counties have separate elected officials operating largely independently from the County Boards and each receiving authorization for their department's personnel and salary needs directly from the State Legislature.

5. To most voters, county government is a confusing bureaucratic morass wherein it is difficult, if not impossible, to pinpoint responsibility for decisions and actions or even to discover what is transpiring within their government. This leads to a breakdown of realistic democratic control over county government by the voter.

6. County government operates within a legislative straitjacket, which necessitates a trip to St. Paul and the acquiescence of the State Legislature to make even minor changes in the structure, operation or procedures. In the fast-paced world of today, solution of problems cannot always wait for a biennial legislative session and, in the case of special acts pertaining to Hennepin County, it is too unwieldy trying to negotiate complex county issues with 39 legislators operating under a unit rule system, and whose primary responsibility is statewide legislation.

7. In considering and passing general legislation applying to counties, the Legislature tends to think of all counties as being somewhat alike. Therefore, since most Minnesota counties are still rural and much less populous than Hennepin and other urbanized counties, the Legislature passes legislation which is designed for the needs and capabilities of these smaller rural counties but also applies to the more urban populous counties, such as Hennepin.

8. In 1958, the voters of Minnesota approved an amendment to the state constitution which authorizes the Legislature to pass legislation permitting the adoption of home rule charters by counties. By passing legislation permitting the citizens of each county to frame and adopt a county home rule charter, the Legislature would be taking logical and positive action by permitting the citizens of any county to determine for themselves the structure, staffing and operating procedures of their own county government. Thereby, the government of each county could be designed to meet the needs of its citizens.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We urge the 1965 Legislature to implement the 1958 "Home Rule Amendment" to the state constitution by passing general or special legislation permitting the development and adoption of county home rule charters by Minnesota counties, particularly for the more populous counties. Such legislation should provide that:

1. Either the Board of County Commissioners (by resolution) or a specified percentage of the voters (by petition) are authorized to call for the creation of a County Charter Commission.
2. Governmental powers and functions shall not be transferred from the municipal level of government to county government by a county charter.
3. The judges of the judicial district within which the county is situated are required, within a specified time after presentation of a valid request for creation of a charter commission, to appoint a specified number of county residents to a County Charter Commission.
4. Appointment to the County Charter Commission will be for a specified term and anyone who is a citizen and a qualified voter within the county is eligible for appointment to the Charter Commission.
5. The County is required to provide funds and meeting space for the use of the Charter Commission.
6. The County Charter Commission is required to hold public hearings on any charter it proposed.
7. Any County Charter proposed by the Charter Commission must be submitted to a countywide referendum and receive the approval of a majority of the voters voting on the question before it shall become effective.
8. County charters must provide for an elected governing body.
9. Any county charter shall provide for its amendment; for the form of county government; for the number, kinds, manner of selection, and terms of office for the county officers; and for the exercise of all powers and duties of counties and county officers prescribed by the constitution and laws of the State of Minnesota.

SCOPE OF REPORT

In recognition of the increasingly important role of county government within the metropolitan area, the Citizens League's Board of Directors in the fall of 1963 charged the Government Organization Committee with the responsibility of studying the organization and operation of county government in Hennepin County and of attempting to evaluate whether structural changes through county home rule, would be desirable in Hennepin County.

In the course of our study we have met with county officials and others interested in county government. Those who met with us include Richard O. Hanson, Chairman, Hennepin County Board of Commissioners; Stanley R. Cowle, Hennepin County Budget Director; the late Kent Youngdahl, Hennepin County Highway Administrator; George M. Scott, Hennepin County Attorney; Edward R. Kienitz, Director, Hennepin County Welfare Department; Ralph Keyes, Executive Secretary, Minnesota Association of County Officials; John A. Hanson, Hennepin County Personnel Supervisor, Kenneth Wolfe, Mayor, St. Louis Park, and President, Hennepin County League of Municipalities; Joe Robbie, Chairman, Minnesota Municipal Commission; and Ray Olsen, Bloomington City Manager.

This report consists of our evaluation of the structure of Hennepin County government, its powers and its effectiveness, and of the desirability of home rule for Hennepin County. In this report we have not attempted to set forth specific recommendations on the revisions which would be desirable in the structure and operation of Hennepin County government. Rather, we have confined our study and conclusions to the question of whether or not it would be desirable for the people of Hennepin County to be given an opportunity to determine for themselves the structure and operating procedures of their county government. We also considered it to be beyond the scope of our study to attempt to evaluate various proposals which have been made to transfer some authority or functions from municipal governments in Hennepin County to the county level of government. While we believe this is a question of great importance and one deserving of study, we believe that the question of county home rule should be treated separately.

The members of the committee who participated in the deliberations and in the formulation of the findings and recommendations contained in this report are: Mrs. Stanley G. Peterson*, Chairman, Charles Backstrom, Vernon Bergstrom, Reynold Boezi*, Donald Brauer*, Earl F. Colborn, Jr., Ralph Forester*, Dr. William Frantzich, Mrs. W. J. Graham, Jr.*, Walter S. Harris*, Jr., James A. Hawks, Donald C. Heath, R. R. Jacobson, Robert P. Janes, Raeder Larson, Alan MacLean, Zane Mann, Warren Maul, Mrs. J. Paul McGee, Clay R. Moore, Wallace Neal, Jr.*, C. Donald Peterson, G. Stanley Rischard, Allen I. Saeks, Robert Share, Thomas P. Vasaly and Mrs. Edwin Widseth. (* indicates members of the drafting subcommittee).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

County government in America has been variously described as "the dark continent of American politics," "a horse and buggy system designed and best suited for rural areas," a headless wonder without a concentrated head," and in many other imaginative and derisive phrases. While many of the criticisms of county government may be legitimate, they, for the most part, are directed at the organizational structure and operating procedures of county government, rather than its role.

Historically, the county was an administrative district established for the convenience of state government. It was established to serve as a district for judicial administration, law enforcement, tax administration, elections, local road

construction and maintenance, welfare services, and the administration of other state established services, regulations and franchises. Because of this, the County was regarded as an instrument of the State for the local performance of state responsibilities and not as a unit of government to serve the needs of local residents for local services.

Thus, the creation of counties was solely by an act of the State to carry out statewide purposes and in no way for the satisfaction of the wishes of local citizens in fulfilling their needs for local services. The county as an administrative district of the state was in every sense a legal creature of the state and was not considered to possess an inherent right to any option as to a local pattern of government of its own.

The form of county government and its operating procedures have been prescribed in state statutes, which require the election of specific county officers independent of each other and uncoordinated in their activities.

While in the past the primary function of the county and its officers has been to act as agents of the state government, this has been changing in more recent years. The county of today -- particularly the more heavily populated urban counties such as Hennepin -- has been called upon to provide services and perform functions which are very similar to those normally associated with municipalities. Hennepin County is now operating a County General Hospital, providing library service in the suburban areas, developing and operating a park system (through an independent board), and starting in January, 1965, will operate a countywide municipal court system. In contrast to the original purposes of the county, services such as these are being provided to meet local needs of the local citizens and are financed almost wholly from local sources and cannot be considered to be an extension of state functions.

The cost of county government has increased rapidly during the past 25 years, with most of the increase coming in the last ten years. Twenty-five years ago, in 1939, the total county budget was approximately \$8 million. By 1954 this had increased three times to a budget of about \$24 million. In 1964, ten years later, the county budget is about \$65 million -- an increase of approximately 170% in ten years. In 1965 county government cost will exceed \$80 million.

In terms of property tax rates, the county mill rate on property in Minneapolis has increased from 13.05 mills in 1939 to 27.71 mills in 1954, to 57.19 in 1964. It will exceed 62 mills in 1965. The increase of county tax rates in suburban areas has been similar, and in 1964 it stands at a rate of 52.51 mills and will rise to about 60 mills in 1965. In 1964 the county tax rate exceeds the municipal tax rate in 41 of the 49 cities, villages and townships in the county. By 1965 most property owners in Hennepin County will be paying more for the support of county government than they are for the support of their own local municipal government.

While higher prices and increased population account for much of the increase in the cost of county government, a large part of the increase has been needed to support additional functions now being performed by the county. In short, the county government is becoming more important to the local citizen, both in terms of the taxes he must pay to support that government and in terms of the services which that government provides for him.

THE STRUCTURE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Minnesota statutes set forth in very specific terms how county government shall be organized. All counties must operate under a commissioner form of government, wherein a 5-member board of county commissioners (seven members in St. Louis County) is supposed to act as the administrative or executive head of the county. This means that a 5-member board is supposed to make the day-to-day decisions entailed in running the county government.

Within the rigid framework of the statutes, the County Board is also the policy-making or legislative branch of county government. For example, in Hennepin County, it appoints and sets the salaries for the County Medical Examiner, County Surveyor, County Highway Administrator, County Highway Engineer, Budget and Purchasing Director, Supervisor of Assessments, Veterans Service Officer, Executive Director of the Welfare Department, Weed Inspector, Civil Defense Director, and County Library Director. To the extent that County funds are involved in operating these functions, it maintains budgetary control over them.

But, in addition, state statutes also call for the election of a County Attorney, County Auditor, County Register of Deeds, County Sheriff, County Superintendent of Schools, County Treasurer, Clerk of District Court, Director of Court Services and a number of District Court Judges. These officials are independent county officers free to run their offices as they see fit and free to cooperate or not to cooperate with other county officials or departments as they may choose. Their salaries and the number of personnel in their offices and departments are set by the State Legislature. Once these levels are set, the County Board must pass on the year to year operational and capital needs of these departments.

This structure, with its lack of a central authority, makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for the voter to pinpoint the responsibility for decisions within county government. It has resulted, for example, in a situation where the County government is now operating with four separate personnel arrangements -- one for the employees of the County Board of Commissioners, another for the employees of the County Welfare Department, another for the employees of the District Court and the Department of Court Services, and a fourth (the Salary Classification and Tenure Commission) for the employees of the independent county officials. As a result, salary schedules, number of holidays, and even the working hours of county employees are different in the various personnel systems. For example, the County Board employees work a 40-hour week, the welfare and court services employees operate on a 38 3/4 hour week, and the employees of the independent officials work a 35-hour week. Thus, some county offices close earlier than others, leading to added confusion for the citizen who has business with the County government.

With this diffusion of authority, administrative reforms affecting diverse departments are well nigh impossible to achieve. Instead of having centralized data processing, mailing or microfilming of records systems, for example, the tendency is for each department to operate on its own in these areas, either instituting its own new system or continuing to operate in these areas by the old-time methods it has always used.

THE COUNTY AND THE STATE LEGISLATURE

As mentioned earlier, the form of County government has been prescribed in state statutes which require the election of specific officers who are independent of each other and often uncoordinated in their activities. Not only is county

government limited to those powers specifically given to it by the State Legislature, but also in most instances the legislation spells out which officer shall do what and how the County's powers shall be discharged. Thus, the County operates in a virtual legislative straitjacket and must seek legislative consent to make even minor changes in the structure or functioning of county government.

The approval of the entire Legislature is needed to re-assign responsibility or authority from one official to another, even when such a reassignment clearly would lead to greater efficiency or more coordinated government. For example, before the County could set up a central purchasing department or a central budget office, legislative approval was required. Although the County Board did proceed to establish a Personnel Department without legislative approval, it is generally conceded that in establishing even such a limited Personnel Department without prior legislative approval, the County Board exceeded its authority.

The list of minor administrative or housekeeping changes in county government which cannot be instituted without legislative approval is almost endless. In effect, then, the real governing body for Hennepin County, as for the other 86 counties in Minnesota, is the State Legislature. However, because of the custom of generally deferring to the local legislative delegation on local issues, it probably is more accurate to say that the 39 member Hennepin County legislative delegation acts as the governing body for Hennepin County. Since the county delegation operates under a unit rule system, whereby the consent of all, or all but one or two, of the delegation members is required before a local bill receives delegation support in the Legislature, it is necessary to obtain the support of 35 or more Hennepin County legislators to make changes in the County's government.

Since the primary function of the Legislature and its members is, or should be, the solution of state problems through the enactment of statewide legislation, the local county problems which must come before the Legislature if they are to be solved are often an intrusion on legislative time and attention. And, since the Hennepin County delegation makes no provisions for considering legislation between legislative sessions, it means that county problems, housekeeping as well as major problems, such as county courts or hospitals, must be presented to the legislators during the midst of a busy legislative session. Thus, the legislators will be trying to consider such matters as whether or not Hennepin County should be permitted to establish a central mobile equipment division, or how big a monthly allowance the Hennepin County Surveyor should receive for the use of his own automobile in the performance of his official duties, at the same time they are wrestling with state financial problems, problems of support for education, and other matters of statewide impact. In short, then, these local county issues, the major ones as well as the housekeeping matters, often do not receive as much consideration as they deserve. Furthermore, changes in the structure of County government and matters involving reform in the operation of County government can be blocked by the opposition of only a handful of legislators.

The extent of legislative involvement in local government is illustrated in part by the following table which shows that in the five legislative sessions between 1955 and 1963 the Legislature enacted 516 special bills for individual counties. Of this total, 38 were enacted for Hennepin County, 51 for Ramsey County, 61 for St. Louis County, and 366 for the other 84 counties.

Minnesota Legislation

Number of Local Bills Passed for Counties

1955-63 Legislative Sessions

<u>County</u>	<u>Legislative Session</u>					
	<u>1955</u>	<u>1957</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Hennepin	10	10	5	6	7	38
Ramsey	12	15	11	5	7	51
St. Louis	12	9	14	15	10	61
All Others	<u>31</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>366</u>
	65	97	103	132	119	516

A brief summary of a random sample of the 132 special acts pertaining to individual counties, which were passed by the 1961 legislative session, and of some of the many legislative acts pertaining to all counties, illustrates the nature of this county legislation, and is attached to this report as an Appendix.

From the sample contained in the Appendix, it can be seen that special legislation is passed to regulate even the smallest details of county operation in Minnesota -- even including authorizing the County Board to regulate parking on a parking lot owned by that county. Naturally, the Legislature also passes general legislation applying to all counties in the state. However, in most cases the legislators tend to think of all counties as being somewhat alike or at least that their needs are similar. However, the population of Minnesota counties ranges from a high of 843,000 people in Hennepin County to 3,400 in Cook County. The median population for Minnesota counties is 17,300, which is equivalent to about 2% of the population of Hennepin County, 4% of the population of Ramsey County, and $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the population of St. Louis County. It is rather difficult to believe that governmental needs are the same in each county in the state or that a single method of governmental organization and a single set of operating procedures will enable each of the counties, no matter what its size, to provide effective government at the lowest possible cost.

THE 1958 HOME RULE AMENDMENT

On November 4, 1958, the voters of Minnesota, by a vote of 712,552 to 309,848, approved the so-called "Home Rule Amendment" to the Minnesota state constitution. Passage of this amendment authorized the State Legislature to permit counties to adopt home rule charters for their government. Following passage of the 1958 amendment, Article XI, Section 3, of the Minnesota constitution reads:

"Any city or village, and any county or other local government unit when authorized by law, may adopt a home rule charter for its government in accordance with this constitution and the laws. No such charter shall become effective without the approval of the voters of the local government unit affected by such majority as the Legislature may prescribe by general law. If a charter provides for the consolidation or separation of a city and a county, in whole or in part, it shall not be effective without approval of the voters both in the city and in the remainder of the county by the majority required by law."

Article XI, Section 4, of the constitution states:

"The Legislature shall provide by law for charter commissions. Notwithstanding any other constitutional limitations, the legislature may require that commission members shall be freeholders, provide for their appointment by judges of the district court, and permit any member to hold any other elective or appointive office other than judicial. Home rule charter amendments may be proposed by a charter commission or by a petition of five per cent of the voters of the local government until as determined by law and shall not become effective until approved by the voters by the majority required by law. Amendments may be proposed and adopted in any other manner provided by law. A local government unit may repeal its home rule charter and adopt a statutory form of government or a new charter upon the same majority vote as is required by law for the adoption of a charter in the first instance."

Clearly, the above two sections authorize the Legislature to provide procedures by which counties may be permitted to adopt home rule charters. Indeed, it can even be said that by their over two to one vote in favor of the 1958 home rule amendment, the people of Minnesota have asked the Legislature to pass such a law.

While the adoption of home rule charters by Minnesota counties, or at least by the larger counties, would somewhat diminish the authority which the legislators now hold over county government, it would also greatly diminish the legislators' involvement in these local affairs, thereby giving the Legislature more time in which to give greater attention to state issues. More important, the citizens of each county could frame a charter which could be designed to meet the particular needs of the particular county. By passage of legislation permitting the citizens of each county to frame and adopt a county home rule charter, the Legislature would be giving no more and no less than the right of self-government at the county level.

HOME RULE DISCUSSED

Is it "Metropolitan Government"?

The term county home rule is much misunderstood. Home rule has nothing to do with "metropolitan government." A home rule charter does not necessarily provide a modern or futuristic county government structure. It does allow for local determination of county governmental structure and operations. It is necessary to free the counties to perform efficiently and effectively the many functions which have been and in the future may be thrust upon county government.

County home rule involves broad devolution of authority to county government to make decisions within a broad statewide framework of statewide policy. The new growth in county government is mainly in the area of municipal or urban type services previously provided exclusively by cities, independent special purpose bodies or other municipal-type organizations. This being the case, the business of meeting the needs of local citizenry would demand that counties be treated more like municipalites. It is imperative that, given these new services to perform, the county government must have some degree of flexibility in selecting the procedures, controls, staffing and budgeting necessary to fulfill the new functions, taking into account the efficiencies which derive from plans and operations dictated by overall considerations of the many services and functions provided by county government.

Is it incompatible with greater areawide cooperation?

Permissive legislation such as is recommended by the committee does not envision the transfer through implementation of a home rule charter of any new functions of government either to or from the county. It is rather a means toward more efficient and effective county government. Under it the counties would gain no new powers or functions they do not already have under Minnesota law. Home rule would, however, make county government more responsible to the electors of the county with respect to carrying out the functions and powers the counties already possess.

To the extent county government becomes better organized and better run through implementation of home rule, there might well develop greater acceptance to the idea of additional governmental functions being handled by the counties. If counties do not merit confidence in their existing operations, it is debatable whether they should assume additional functions. The legislation recommended by the committee would leave with the Legislature responsibility for the transfer of any additional functions to the county.

County home rule is not incompatible with greater metropolitan area cooperation in areas of governmental service which have or may acquire greater than county-wide significance. On the contrary, the need for cooperation in such areas would be more likely to be realized if there were strong and better coordinated county government. Again, however, county home rule would not lead to "metropolitan government." It is the Legislature which would have to provide for formal inter-governmental relationships or for shifting of functions or services from the County to any possible areawide governmental unit.

LEGISLATION RECOMMENDED

We believe that it is no longer necessary for the State Legislature to exercise a trusteeship over county government, and we urge the Legislature to implement the county home rule provisions of the 1958 "Home Rule Amendment" to the state constitution by passing legislation permitting counties to adopt home rule charters and providing procedures for the drafting and adoption of such charters.

In the Recommendations Section at the beginning of this report, we have included a number of suggestions as to particular points which should be included in such legislation. Most of these points involve legal or procedural requirements and need no discussion; however, one or two of them should be mentioned.

First, we have suggested that governmental powers or functions should not be transferred from the municipal level of government to the county government by means of a county charter. Although we have heard many impressive arguments favoring the transfer of this or that function of government to the county level, we are not prepared at this time to take a position on these issues.

We believe that the need for home rule is so important that other questions should not be allowed to interfere with determination of this fundamental problem. The question of what, if any, functions should be transferred from one level of government to another is complex, involving as it does many functions and many governmental units in Hennepin County. When these questions arise with respect to one or more governmental functions, we will study them on their own merits.

At this time we believe it is essential that the County achieve what might be termed administrative home rule. By this we mean authorizing the County to organize its structure and adopt procedures which are best suited to discharging those powers and responsibilities it now has. We believe that such a step could go a long way toward providing a county government more visible to the voters and a government which could be more responsive to the wishes of the citizen. Also, by permitting the citizens of the county to adopt the governmental structure which they believe will meet their needs, it will be possible to test whether or not county government would actually be capable of discharging additional responsibilities in a manner agreeable to the citizens.

Second, while we have advocated the appointment of charter commission members by judges of the judicial district within which the county is situated, we are not without sympathy for the proposal that such members be elected by the citizens. However, because of the historical precedents with city charter commissions in Minnesota, and because of the state constitution clearly states that the Legislature may provide for their appointment by judges of the district court, we have recommended this method for the selection of charter commission members.

In summary, it may be said that the precise form of the legislation is less important than the central recommendation that the Legislature authorize the adoption of home rule charters by Minnesota counties.

APPENDIX I

A brief summary of a random sample of the 132 special acts pertaining to individual counties, which were passed by the 1961 legislative session, and of some of the many legislative acts pertaining to all counties, illustrates the nature of county legislation. Among the bills passed during the 1961 session were the following:

- An act permitting the Koochiching County of Commissioners to levy a tax of up to 3 mills for library purposes. (Laws of 1961, Chapter 37)
- An act setting a salary of \$6,000-7,500 for the combined office of Register of Deeds and Registrar of Titles in Lake County. (Chapter 92)
- An act increasing the size of Itasca County Welfare Board from 5 members to 7 and providing that 2 members of the Board shall be County Commissioners. (Chapter 114)
- An act permitting the Lincoln County Board of Commissioners to deposit the County's share of the proceeds from the sale of the County Tuberculosis Sanatorium in the County General Fund. (Chapter 125)
- An act permitting the Cottonwood County Board of Commissioners to levy a tax of up to 25 mills for the County Road and Bridge Fund. (Chapter 126)
- An act repealing Hennepin County's right to issue bonds for the County Tuberculosis Sanatorium. (Chapter 132)
- An act setting a salary of \$4,200-6,000 for the Register of Deeds of Cook County and providing that all fees collected by him shall be paid into the County Revenue Fund. (Chapter 141)
- An act permitting the Faribault County Board of Commissioners to increase the County Auditor's annual salary by up to \$2,000. (Chapter 157)
- An act permitting the Dodge County Board of Commissioners to issue bonds for the construction of a grandstand on the Dodge County Fairgrounds. (Chapter 168)
- An act permitting the Anoka County Board of Commissioners to establish parks or playgrounds within the county. (Chapter 209)
- An act permitting the Board of County Commissioners of any county with a population of less than 600,000 people (this excludes Hennepin County) to appropriate money from the general fund to permit the Sheriff to patrol the roads and highways of his county. (Chapter 258)
- An act permitting Freeborn County to require work relief as a condition of receiving relief or public assistance from the County. (Chapter 301)
- An act authorizing the Todd County Board of Commissioners to levy a tax of up to 4 mills for snow removal from town roads. (Chapter 307)
- An act setting the fees to be charged and collected by the St. Louis County Clerk of the District Court. (Chapter 313)
- An act abolishing the St. Louis County Board of Audit. (Chapter 314)

APPENDIX I (CONT'D)

- An act authorizing St. Louis County to establish the office of Purchasing Agent. (Chapter 319)
- An act permitting Aitkin County to acquire road equipment by means of rental purchase or conditional sales agreements. (Chapter 328)
- An act permitting Sibley County to spend money for the erection of a monument to the war veterans of Sibley County in Winthrop, Minnesota. (Chapter 355)
- An act permitting Traverse County to maintain or replace private bridges or culverts across county ditches. (Chapter 404)
- An act providing for the creation of a central mobile equipment division and the establishment of a mobile equipment revolving fund for Hennepin County. (Chapter 237)
- An Act permitting the Carver County Board of Commissioners to establish parks and playgrounds and public access to waters within Carver County. (Chapter 424)
- An act authorizing the establishment of the office of Purchasing Agent in Anoka County and setting forth his duties, responsibilities, and purchasing procedures. (Chapter 627)
- An act requiring Hennepin County to pay part of the cost incurred by the City of Minneapolis in the distribution of federal surplus commodities and commodity stamps. (Chapter 686)
- An act permitting the Itasca County Welfare Board to pay a share of the salary, clerk hire, and expenses of an Assistant County Attorney. (Chapter 716)
- An act setting an annual salary of up to \$7,000 for the Benton County Auditor. (Chapter 722)
- An act permitting the Blue Earth County Board of Commissioners to regulate the parking of motor vehicles upon any parking lot or facility owned or operated by the County of Blue Earth. (Chapter 729)
- An act setting specific salaries for the elected Hennepin County officials. (Chapter 45, Laws of 1961, Extra Session)
- An act setting salary appropriations for the various departments of Hennepin County. (Chapter 47, Laws of 1961, Extra Session)

APPENDIX
ORGANIZATION OF HENNEPIN COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Elected by Districts of the County

	--Hennepin County General Hospital	
	--Public Works	--Highway --Lake Improvement --Central Mobile Equipment --Noxious Weeds
<u>Board of County Commissioners</u>	-----	
<u>Welfare Board</u>		
	--Budget & Purchasing Director-----	--Data Processing Coordination --Personnel --Property Management --Central Stores and Duplicating Services --Central Telephone Service
	--Supervisor of Assessments	
	--Veterans Service Office	
	--Civil Defense	
	--Book Binder	
	--Surveyor -----	--Remonumentation
	--Chest Clinic	
	--Tax Forfeited Lands	
	--Medical Examiner	

Independent Elected Officials & Judges

<u>Auditor</u> -----	Accounting office	
<u>Clerk of District Court</u>		
<u>Attorney</u>		
<u>Treasurer</u>		
<u>Court Commissioner</u>		
<u>Register of Deeds</u>		
<u>County Superintendent of Schools</u>	--Director of Court-----	--Juvenile Center --Probation Office --Home School for Boys
	Services	
<u>District Court Judges</u> -----	--Examiner of Titles	
<u>Hennepin County Mun. Crt. Judges</u>	--Probation office	
<u>Sheriff</u> -----	--Jail --Radio Station	
<u>Judge of Probate Court</u> -----	Clerk of Probate Court	