

# CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 203

## **Current Metropolitan Governmental Problems**

**Summary of comments & proposals**

**November 1966**

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND PROPOSALS ON AREAWIDE GOVERNMENTAL PROBLEMS  
OF THE TWIN CITIES METROPOLITAN AREA

as presented to

The Citizens League Metropolitan Affairs Committee  
during the course of 24 meetings

Distributed to Governmental, Civic, and Business and Labor  
Leaders of the Twin Cities Area for Information and Reaction

\* \* \* \* \*

What governmental functions and services are not being handled adequately in the Twin Cities area today and are clearly area-wide in character? See pages 3-6.

What are the shortcomings of existing single-purpose metropolitan districts? See pages 6-8.

How should government influence the major decisions affecting the future growth of this metropolitan area? See pages 8-9.

Is the metropolitan area adequately organized to meet the increasingly detailed requirements for federal assistance? See pages 9-10.

What are the major points of agreement and disagreement among advocates for various types of metropolitan organization? See pages 11-20.

\* \* \* \* \*

Citizens League  
545 Mobil Oil Building  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

---

November, 1966

## ABOUT THE CITIZENS LEAGUE. . . .

The Citizens League is a non-partisan, independent organization of more than 3,200 members, founded in 1952, and dedicated to the improvement of local government in the Twin Cities area.

Citizens League reports, which provide assistance to public officials and others in finding solutions to complex problems of local government, are developed by volunteer research committees, supported by a fulltime professional staff.

The League's annual budget is financed by annual dues of \$10 (\$15 for family memberships) and contributions from more than 600 businesses, foundations, and other organizations.

### Metropolitan Affairs Committee Membership

Charles H. Clay, Chairman  
Dr. Francis M. Boddy  
Lester Bolstad, Jr.  
Earl F. Colborn, Jr.  
Mrs. Nicholas Duff  
Richard J. FitzGerald  
Gilbert Giebink  
E. Peter Gillette, Jr.  
Mrs. William J. Graham, Jr.  
David Graven  
Roger L. Hale  
John G. Harrison  
James L. Hetland, Jr.  
Kevin P. Howe  
J. Douglas Kelm  
William V. Lahr  
Greer Lockhart  
Daniel Magraw  
James P. Martineau  
Donald W. McCarthy  
Mrs. J. Paul McGee  
Jonathan Morgan  
John W. Mooty  
Wallace E. Neal, Jr.

Roger Newstrum  
Mrs. Stanley G. Peterson  
James R. Pratt  
John W. Pulver  
Leonard F. Ramberg  
Mrs. Joseph Richardson  
Mrs. Michael Richdorf  
Mr. Joseph Robbie  
Dudley J. Russell  
Allen I. Saeks  
Dr. John C. Schwarzwald  
Peter Seed  
Willis F. Shaw  
Lloyd M. Short  
Stephen Solomon  
Archie Spencer  
Clement Springer  
Owen B. Stubben  
Harry L. Sutton, Jr.  
Mrs. Albert D. Thiltgen  
Lucas Van Hilst  
Fred Wall  
James L. Weaver

---

The Citizens League is grateful to the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council for financing publication of this report.

## INTRODUCTION

The Citizens League Metropolitan Affairs Committee was formed in June, 1966, with the assignment from the Citizens League Board of Directors to develop recommendations for the 1967 Legislature on a coordinated approach to solving metropolitan problems.

The 50-member committee was appointed by a special subcommittee of the League's Executive Committee. Many more members of the Citizens League volunteered for service than could be appointed. The committee membership includes 20 members of the League Board of Directors and others who have been active on previous League committees dealing with metropolitan problems. To assure adequate metropolitanwide representation a number of non-Hennepin County residents were appointed.

The committee has held 24 meetings since mid-June. During this time the committee has listened to and questioned public officials, businessmen, educators and others in an attempt to obtain an understanding of various metropolitan problems and proposed solutions.

This report represents an attempt to condense some 170 pages of minutes--based on 48 hours of testimony--to present in one place and in a workable order the essential issues and proposed solutions. The committee will use this report as a working document in developing its proposals for action by the 1967 Legislature. The report also is directed to governmental officials and others throughout the metropolitan area who might wish to give the committee the benefit of their thoughts. Recognizing the importance of this subject, the committee is most anxious to hear the positions and feelings of as broad a spectrum of the metropolitan area as possible.

The report is divided into two sections. The first section presents in an organized form the comments made to the committee on the various types of metropolitan problems and the inadequacies of present governmental structures in the Twin Cities area to handle them. Many speakers were quite detailed in their presentations. Others made general comments, and a few did not discuss the problems but emphasized only the solution or solutions. Although many persons may say that our problems are self-evident, it is important that they be clearly outlined so that we know what specific ills we are attempting to cure. Further, legislators will insist on a presentation of the specific problems if they are to be asked to provide solutions.

The second section attempts to indicate the key areas of agreement and disagreement among the various viewpoints on what action the Legislature should take. It is hoped that by this method we might focus on the key areas where a consensus now exists and those areas where there are differences. It is likely that many persons and groups who have made proposals thus far might regard themselves as being far apart on their basic approaches. Yet a surprising degree of agreement already appears to exist on many points.

Following is a list of the speakers and groups who provided information to the committee on specific plans or reactions to specific plans:

1. The Minneapolis, St. Paul, and suburban Chambers of Commerce (Urban Study and Action Committee).

2. Milton C. Honsey, Mayor of New Hope.
3. Clayton LeFevere, Minneapolis attorney and former president of the League of Minnesota Municipalities.
4. Arthur Naftalin, Mayor of Minneapolis.
5. Thomas Byrne, Mayor of St. Paul.
6. Wheelock Whitney, Mayor of Wayzata.
7. Raymond T. Olsen, former city manager of Bloomington, now State Planning Director.
8. Joseph Robbie, Minneapolis attorney and former chairman of the Minnesota Municipal Commission.
9. State Representative Joseph Graw, Bloomington.
10. State Representative Robert O. Ashbach, Arden Hills.
11. State Representative Howard Albertson, Stillwater, chairman of the House Metropolitan and Urban Affairs Committee.
12. Governor Karl F. Rolvaag.
13. Harold LeVander, GOP nominee for governor.
14. The Minnesota Republican Party.
15. The Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party.
16. Theodore Mitau, chairman, department of political science, Macalester College.
17. Thomas Scott, department of political science, University of Minnesota.
18. Robert Janes, chairman, Hennepin County Board of Commissioners.
19. Albert Kordiak, chairman, Anoka County Board of Commissioners.
20. Ted Kolderie, editorial writer, Minneapolis Star and Tribune.
21. The Metropolitan Planning Commission (represented by C. David Loeks, recently retired as director, and Robert C. Einsweiler, planning director).
22. James J. Dalglish, president, Metropolitan Section, League of Minnesota Municipalities.
23. Robert W. Johnson, chairman, Minnesota Municipal Commission.

In addition to the above, a number of others who are experts in certain specific areawide functions or concerns appeared before the committee. They did not propose or react to any overall approach. But they did provide valuable information in their respective fields. They included Albert W. Buzicky, executive director, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District; John Ebinger, executive director, Metropolitan Transit Commission; State Representative William G. Kirchner; Clifton French, superintendent, Hennepin County Park Reserve District; Reuel Harmon, president, Minnesota Zoological Society; David Forester, open space planner, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Samuel Morgan, president, Council of State Parks; James Solem, former research assistant, Ramsey County League of Municipalities; Robert Ruhe, superintendent, Minneapolis Park Board; Orville Peterson, executive secretary, League of Minnesota Municipalities, and Albert J. Richter, senior analyst, U. S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS IN THE TWIN CITIES AREA AND  
INADEQUACIES OF PRESENT GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURES TO HANDLE THEM

I. Area Functions and Services Currently Being Inadequately Provided

Perhaps the most recurring statement made to us by speakers and groups on the need for legislative action on metropolitan problems is that many area functions and services are not being provided adequately today in the Twin Cities area. There is by no means unanimous agreement on what these functions and services are. Some persons would place only two or three in this category, while others would include ten or more. Following is a list of the specific functions and services mentioned to us which various speakers and groups claimed are not being provided adequately:

1. Sewage Disposal--This function was mentioned more frequently than any other as requiring action by the 1967 Legislature. Practically every speaker and group indicated this is the most pressing of our area problems. Many suburbs, we were told, are in need of central sewage disposal to replace septic tanks but are landlocked and have no way to provide such central sewage disposal unless the Legislature acts. Other suburbs need to expand their present system but expansion is not possible within the present framework. It is also important, we were told, to determine what government agency or agencies should decide who should use the rivers of the metropolitan area for what purposes--sewage effluent or other.

2. Public Transportation--This function was mentioned almost as many times as sewage disposal as requiring action by the 1967 Legislature. Shortcomings of our present transit system, we were told, are that it is underutilized, too slow, and fails to serve many parts of the metropolitan area adequately. Transit fails to offer the metropolitan resident a reasonable alternative to auto travel, and there is no way now provided by which the public may act to strengthen transit.

3. Highways--Highway engineers claim we have a \$100 million backlog worth of immediate highway construction needs in the metropolitan area which, with present financing, cannot begin to be attacked until 1970, and then only at a rate of \$10 million a year. Additional highway financing is needed, they say. Many speakers did not refer to the highway problem in their presentations. A few, including representatives of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, urged the adoption and implementation of a metropolitan transportation plan. The crucial decisions relating to highways, they said, is where they'll be built and in what order. Harold LeVander mentioned the need to have some agency of local government to resolve disputes between the Highway Department and municipalities as to the location of freeways and access roads.

4. Parks and Open Space--Some speakers and groups told us of an urgent need for prompt purchase of large tracts of open space throughout the metropolitan area to reserve for coming years. Unless action is taken soon, they said, private developers will obtain control of much of this land. Some persons emphasized the importance of acquiring park land nearer the centers of population. The Minnesota Republican Party Platform urges action on open space in the metropolitan area by the 1967 Legislature. The Metropolitan Planning Commission calls the acquisition of

adequate open space critical to shaping and directing metropolitan growth. In some cases adequate amounts of land are not available to serve the population in existing political jurisdictions, and there is no mechanism to acquire land in other areas. For example there is not enough open space in Ramsey County to serve the people living there, and there is no way to acquire land elsewhere for them.

5. Area Planning--A few speakers told us that the planning which is taking place on a metropolitan scale today--by the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission--is not bearing its full fruit because it is not possible to direct the plans to any specific policy-making metropolitan agency which could implement the plans. The planning recommendations are directed to some 150 to 200 local government units, each acting independently.

6. Tax Assessments--Several speakers and groups, among them Clayton LeFevere, Milton C. Honsey, Raymond Olsen, the DFL Party, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and Ted Kolderie, pointed out that methods of tax assessment vary widely between municipalities and counties in the metropolitan area, producing inequalities in tax burdens from place to place.

7. Inequitable Distribution of Business and Industrial Properties--Some speakers told us that municipalities of the Twin Cities area should not be forced to compete with each other for businesses and industries solely on the basis that businesses and industries are rich property-tax producers. A way must be found, they said, to equalize the distribution of tax revenues from business and industry. Then we can compete as one metropolitan area with other metropolitan areas throughout the nation, rather than have competition within our own area.

8. Metropolitan Zoo--Representatives of the Minnesota Zoological Society stressed that the Twin Cities metropolitan area will benefit economically, educationally, culturally and otherwise from a first-class zoological garden. But there is no legal authority in existence today by which the Twin Cities metropolitan area can unite in financing the effort. Support for a metropolitan zoo came from many speakers, including Clayton LeFevere, Harold LeVander, Thomas Byrne, the Chambers of Commerce, Milton Honsey, and Wheelock Whitney.

9. Refuse Disposal--We were informed that because of inadequate regulation, enforcement, planning and governmental responsibility the Twin Cities area soon may find itself without adequate means of disposing of refuse (garbage, tin cans, glass bottles, waste paper and other rubbish). Among persons who believe refuse disposal requires an areawide approach are Clayton LeFevere, Milton Honsey, Arthur Naftalin and Wheelock Whitney.

10. Area Zoning--A large number of speakers and groups said that adequate land use controls are sorely lacking in the undeveloped portions of the metropolitan area which will handle the bulk of our growth to the end of this century. They urged limited areawide control of land use in these areas. The precise nature of these limitations was not fully spelled out. The Metropolitan Planning Commission sees a need for regulating the location of major commercial and industrial sites. Joseph Robbie sees an equal need to control the location of new residential subdivisions to eliminate costly "leap-frogging". Residential developers, he said, have

arrogated to themselves the power of directing our area's growth. These undeveloped portions of the metropolitan area must be planned so that the public will not have to pay unreasonable amounts for major public facilities, such as sewage disposal and highways. Another speaker mentioned that much existing zoning in undeveloped areas is unrealistic. For example, according to one estimate some municipalities have over-zoned for industry to the extent that there is more land zoned for industry today than will be needed in the next 200 years in this metropolitan area. Among others who urged an areawide approach for zoning in certain cases were the Chambers of Commerce, Robert O. Ashbach, Howard Albertson, Milton C. Honsey, and Ted Kolderie.

11. Water Supply--The need for some form of areawide water management was stressed by Clayton LeFevere, Milton Honsey, the DFL Party and Raymond Olsen. According to a report by the Division of Waters of the Minnesota Department of Conservation, we need areawide management of our water resources in the metropolitan area to give maximum assurances that our ground and surface water supplies will be adequate to meet the long-range needs of this growing metropolitan area. There is no mechanism provided today for such areawide management, nor are the existing structures of government adequate to provide such management.

12. Air Pollution--About four or five speakers and groups, including Milton Honsey, Karl Rolvaag, the DFL Party, James J. Dalglish and the Metropolitan Planning Commission, indicated they feel an areawide approach to the problems of air pollution is necessary, but they did not go into detail on the precise nature of the problems. The latest study on air pollution in the metropolitan area, to be published soon by a governor's committee, is expected to recommend an areawide approach because the controls required in a metropolitan area cannot be imposed adequately by each individual municipality.

13. Police--A few speakers indicated that certain aspects of police work need an area approach. Robert W. Johnson, who is Anoka County Attorney, said that in his capacity as a public prosecutor he is acutely aware of inadequacies in local police work in many cases. He said that the existing pattern of many small municipal police departments, each operating on its own, is clearly insufficient to provide today's public with any kind of required degree of police protection. Inadequate police work, he claimed, has tended to result in the inability to convict certain persons of crimes which they probably were guilty of having committed. Joseph Robbie pointed to a lack of uniform training of police officers enforcing the law locally and lack of adequate criminal detection and laboratory facilities for police. A police academy is badly needed in the area, according to Arthur Naftalin, to service all of the many municipalities. Raymond Olsen sees a need to maintain all criminal records in the metropolitan area at one place with instant access by local police departments. This would tremendously raise the effectiveness of local police, he believes.

14. Annexation and Incorporation--Wheelock Whitney called for greater controls to minimize the number of small, inefficient units of local government as this metropolitan area grows. Powers of the Minnesota Municipal



Commission need to be broadened, specifically in the area of ordering annexations without the right of the areas affected to veto annexations by a public vote. Whitney also proposed mergers of small municipalities and that the Municipal Commission be given certain limited powers in this field.

15. Dutch Elm Disease--The committee was informed that efforts at the municipal level in the Twin Cities area to control Dutch Elm disease are insufficient. Dutch Elm disease needs to be attacked on an areawide level if the entire area is to be protected, the committee was told. But there is no legal authority provided today by which an areawide attack on the disease could be undertaken.

16. Libraries--None of the speakers or groups mentioned libraries among the areawide problems. However, it was pointed out that a report is expected soon from Dr. Herbert Goldhor of the University of Illinois who, under a state grant, has been studying the needs for library service in the metropolitan area. It is understood he will not recommend a single library system in the metropolitan area or even necessarily the merger of existing separate library systems in the area, but the implications of some of his major findings and recommendations indicate the imperative need for cooperation and coordination in the provision of library service for the area in the future. Coordination will be needed specifically in the fields of uniform cataloging and record-keeping techniques.

17. Debt Financing--Many local units of government today must pay high interest rates in floating bonds for local services. James Solem believes that very demonstrable tax savings could be achieved through savings on interest costs alone if there were one bond-issuing agency which could enjoy the full faith and credit of the tax base of the entire metropolitan area.

## II. Existing Metropolitan Structures and Their Inadequacies

The existing single-purpose metropolitan districts and the prospect of additional such districts were attacked by some speakers and groups and defended by others. According to Raymond Olsen, a critic of the single-purpose districts, no format of government is so unresponsive to the public or so undemocratic. Special districts, he claims, have no built-in incentive to recognize the needs of other governmental units or their effect upon them. With the present practice of establishing a new independent district to handle each problem, it is very difficult to take advantage of advancing technology and the full range of modern managerial techniques, including computers for information-gathering, storage and dissemination, Olsen believes. He said we should have a well-integrated system with a scale operation of finance, data processing, personnel, purchasing, engineering and other staff services essential to low operating costs.

Other speakers, such as James Dalglish, pointed out that some of the single-purpose districts have performed excellent services and must not be condemned solely on the basis that they do not fit into a general purpose level of government. Some proponents of the single-purpose district approach contend

that the accomplishments of these districts never would have taken place had they not been independent.

Following is a discussion of the single-purpose districts:

1. Mosquito Control District--Shortcomings of this district were documented in a Citizens League report earlier this year. In a discussion of this report, the Metropolitan Affairs Committee was told that the District is a loose association of six counties, from which any county may withdraw after due notice. Although the District's operations are highly seasonal, a substantial number of the staff are year-round employees. Further, the personnel system is subject to patronage on the part of county commissioners. Representation on the District's governing board is on a basis of two county commissioners per county, without regard to population. The most heavily populated counties are under-represented on the District Board, even though the vast majority of the District's funds come from these counties. The District has a \$750,000 annual budget, yet it has developed no long-range standard or goal for control of mosquitoes. Several speakers and groups, including the Chambers of Commerce, Milton Honsey, Raymond Olsen, Wheelock Whitney and Howard Albertson, urged that the District be made part of an areawide body more responsive to the voters. A few speakers and groups indicated that the influence of the District on overall metropolitan development is slight, and therefore there is no crucial need to alter its present structure.
2. Metropolitan Airports Commission--The Airports Commission frequently was singled out as an example of a single-purpose district which has functioned effectively in the metropolitan area. The Commission has extensive powers in connection with metropolitan development, particularly with regard to the location of new airports in the metropolitan area, zoning around these airports and control over heights of structures in the metropolitan area. The Commission has no suburban representation, even though all but one of the Commission's six airports are located in suburbs, and in all likelihood all future airports will be located in suburbs. It should be acknowledged, though, that the Commission's power to tax is limited to Minneapolis and St. Paul. The Metropolitan Planning Commission and some speakers and other groups believe that the Airports Commission's influence on metropolitan development is so extensive that it should be integrated with some overall metropolitan agency. Others, including the Chambers of Commerce, believed it would be unwise to attempt to change the structure of the Airports Commission since by and large it has functioned effectively.
3. Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District--Several inadequacies of the District as presently structured were pointed out to the committee. Its present legal limits are only Minneapolis and St. Paul, although 37 suburbs contract for sewage disposal by the District. Suburbs have no representation on the District's governing board. The District has proposed an areawide plan to handle disposal needs for the vast majority of the urbanized portion of the metropolitan area through the year 2000 but it has no authority to carry this plan out. The District's plan is not subject to review by any areawide planning or decision-making agency.

despite the fact that the construction and timing of interceptor sewers has a substantial effect on directing growth of the metropolitan area.

4. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission--The principal shortcoming of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, the committee was told, is that it functions outside the governmental stream. It makes recommendations in a general way to all governments in the area, but there is no responsible body to carry out its recommendations. Some persons have claimed the Planning Commission's board, 30 members, is too large and hinders the efficient operation of the Commission. Others, though, point out that the board as presently constituted is broadly representative of the various interests in the metropolitan area. One generally accepted problem with the makeup of the Commission is the apparent open-ended nature of its membership. As state law now reads, it would be possible for additional single-purpose boards, besides the Airports Commission and the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District, which already have representatives, to name persons to the Planning Commission. Supposedly even watershed districts could appoint representatives. The effectiveness of the 30-member body as a policy-making group has been questioned by some persons who wonder whether the Commission could be staff-dominated. The Commission has an annual budget in excess of \$600,000, about 60 per cent federally financed. Its budget is not submitted for review to any outside agency other than the Legislature, every two years.

5. Metropolitan Transit Commission--The Transit Commission, organized this year voluntarily by some 20 municipalities in the Twin Cities area, is purely advisory. Members may withdraw from membership, and there is no way to require municipalities to belong. Bloomington and Richfield, two key suburbs, for example, have chosen not to join. Officials of the Transit Commission said the Legislature must grant the Commission powers if it is to be effective.

6. Metropolitan Sports Area Commission--A few speakers, including Clayton LeFevere, urged that sports stadiums eventually be part of an areawide body. The Sports Area Commission was not discussed in detail by the committee. The Commission includes Minneapolis, Richfield and Bloomington and limits its functions exclusively to the operation of the property at Highway 494 and Cedar Avenue in Bloomington, where Metropolitan Stadium is located. The three communities jointly own the property.

### III. Inadequate Structures To Direct Growth of the Metropolitan Area

Officials of the Metropolitan Planning Commission and others told us that if separate, uncoordinated and often locally controlled patterns of decision-making are allowed to continue, needs of this metropolitan area will be met on a piecemeal, "first come, first served" basis. This often may mean that major decisions of areawide import really will be made on the basis of serving just one local or seemingly immediate interest. For example, sewage effluent may be placed in the closest available waterway without regard for existing or potential other uses of the river. Such decisions are made because there is no agency at the metropolitan level which is in a position to balance the various interests involved.

Existing structures of government and their powers are inadequate to guide the growth of this metropolitan area in the future, we were told. We must establish the proper structure to consider the long-range overall needs of the area and what type of physical environment we envision or hope for. The problem of government structure is key because now hundreds of separate and largely unrelated governmental units divide decision-making authority in such a manner that it is impossible to plan adequately for the future of the region as a whole. Growth already is being guided--but in an uncoordinated and unrelated manner--by state and metropolitan agencies and by decisions on federal grants.

Unless some framework of government is created within which decisions can be made to guide our overall growth, there will be a smaller scope of possible choices available to individuals with regard to all kinds of questions, such as where people choose to live, work, play, etc. But if we are able to guide growth of this area, there will be a wide range of possible choices available. Location of transportation facilities, major centers, trunk sewers and open space are basic to controlling development. It must be emphasized, though, that existing local units of government would retain most of their authority in specific zoning.

#### IV. Inadequate Areawide Agency To Deal with the Federal Government on Our Own Terms.

The committee was informed that the growing importance of the federal government in metropolitan affairs is one of the most important--if not the most important--developments insofar as structure of government in the metropolitan area is concerned. Legislation passed by Congress only last month underlines this growing importance more than ever. This legislation sets forth the following requirements:

(1) Applications for federal aid in the metropolitan area for a broad range of urban services must be submitted to a metropolitanwide agency for review. The areawide agency (now the Metropolitan Planning Commission in our area) will be required to comment and recommend to the federal government regarding whether each proposed project is consistent with comprehensive planning already developed or in the process of development in the area for which the grant is requested and the extent to which such project contributes to the fulfillment of such planning.

Comprehensive planning, as defined in the legislation, includes the following:

--Preparation of general physical plans with respect to the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, including transportation facilities, as a guide for long-range development.

--Programming of capital improvements based on a determination of relative urgency.

--Long-range fiscal plans for implementing development plans and programs.

--Proposed regulatory and administrative measures which aid in achieving coordination of all related plans of the departments or subdivisions of the governments concerned and intergovernmental coordination of related planning activities among the state and local governmental agencies concerned.

The full significance of the legislation can only be realized, the committee was told, when one considers that the requests for federal dollars will far exceed the amounts available. The federal government needs a basis for determining which requests should be granted and which should be denied. Stiff enforcement of the requirements in this legislation is therefore likely.

Projects will include open space, hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities and water development and land conservation. Urban renewal and public housing grants are excluded from these provisions.

(2) Additional "bonus" federal grants will be available if proposed projects are in accord with a comprehensive metropolitan plan, and if it is adequately assured that public facility projects and other land development or uses of public metropolitan or interjurisdictional significance are and will be carried out in accord with metropolitan planning and programming. (What this means is that the federal government will give extra money to a metropolitan area which has developed and is implementing a comprehensive metropolitan plan.) The size of a given bonus cannot exceed 20 per cent of the cost of a project, nor can the overall federal contribution, including the bonus, exceed 80 per cent of the cost.

Unless the 1967 Legislature acts, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, which was not intended to be a policy-making governmental agency but only an advisory planning body, will increasingly assume broad powers over the development of this metropolitan area by default.

The committee was told that the Legislature must review whether the Metropolitan Planning Commission is properly structured and is adequately representative of the metropolitan area to assume additional powers, whether changes should be made in the Commission, or whether the Commission should be brought under some new areawide planning and coordinating policy body.

## PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE FACING THE TWIN CITIES AREA

This section is more than a condensed report of each proposal on government structure as presented to the Citizens League Metropolitan Affairs Committee. It is an attempt to present the proposals showing the major areas of agreement and disagreement in an orderly manner. Thus, rather than stress how many speakers or groups did or did not support a specific approach, this report attempts to find the common threads running through all the various approaches.

It should be emphasized that none of the proposed solutions to metropolitan problems covers all the problems outlined in the first section. A large number of individuals and groups throughout the metropolitan area have outlined specific proposals for a coordinated approach to solving metropolitan problems. Frequently the proposals tend to reflect what the speakers believe to be politically attainable. The committee is making every effort to obtain information on all these proposals and to hear from others who wish to comment.

### I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

#### *Agreement*

1. An areawide approach--There was no dissent on the need to look at the Twin Cities metropolitan area as one economic and social unit and seek solutions to areawide problems on an overall basis. Some speakers said this is extremely important if the Twin Cities metropolitan area is to be properly equipped for economic competition with other metropolitan areas throughout the nation. No one indicated that the status quo is satisfactory.

#### *Agreement*

2. Need for a legislatively created areawide metropolitan organization in 1967--There was no dissent on the need for the 1967 Legislature to establish a metropolitanwide governmental organization. In fact, the need was stressed by practically every speaker and group. The powers envisioned differed widely, indicating that there are many different concepts as to what the organization should accomplish. Perhaps the greatest difference in powers envisioned was whether the organization should have operating powers for metropolitan functions as well as coordinating powers. It should also be stressed that however strong its powers, all agreed on the need for the organization to be established by the Legislature. No speaker or group indicated that the needed organization could be established without an act of the Legislature. This includes the Inter-County Council approach, which will require legislation to enable counties of the state to form regional organizations.

### II. AREA AND REPRESENTATION

#### *Substantial Agreement*

1. Area of jurisdiction--Without dissent the speakers and groups urged that the area of jurisdiction for the legislatively created organization

should be at least five counties--Hennepin, Ramsey, Anoka, Dakota and Washington. These are the five counties identified by the U. S. Census Bureau as the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Many speakers and groups said the area of jurisdiction should be seven counties. This means adding Carver and Scott Counties as well. This is the planning area of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. Two speakers, Robert Janes and Albert Kordiak, urged that the area be eight counties, adding Wright County. This is the area of jurisdiction of the now-forming Metropolitan Inter-County Council, a voluntary association of counties.

#### *Agreement*

2. Broadly representative policy board--There was no dissent among all speakers and groups on the need for a broadly representative policy-making governing board to guide the new metropolitan organization. The vast majority of proposals envision a fairly large governing board, with 20 or 30 members. One speaker, Joseph Robbie, said the governing board should have no more than 11 members. Most advocates of a large governing board said that such a number would be necessary to guarantee adequate representation for all parts of the metropolitan area. Robbie said there is no special reason for an 11-member board except that he believes a 30-member board is too large to function properly.

Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis suggested the possibility of a bicameral structure, with a small upper house of not more than 12 persons, all elected at large, and a lower house of 30 or so members elected by districts. Theodore Mitau and Thomas Scott said they would not oppose a bicameral structure.

#### *Substantial Agreement*

3. Proportional representation according to population--There was broad agreement on the need to follow the "one man, one vote" principle in membership on the governing board by providing for proportional representation according to population. Only three speakers dissented from this approach--Robert Ashbach, Robert Janes and Albert Kordiak. Ashbach suggests a 20-member council, two each from Anoka, Dakota, Washington, Carver and Scott Counties, five from Hennepin County, four from Ramsey County, and one representing the areawide school board association. Ashbach acknowledges that on a one man, one vote basis his plan slights Hennepin and Ramsey as the most populous counties, but to his mind the plan is the most practically achievable. Janes and Kordiak support the representation plan now existing with the Mosquito Control District--two representatives from each county. Janes said that although representation is by area, the plan is equitable because financing is based on population.

#### *Substantial Agreement*

4. Senatorial districts for proportional representation--All but two of the speakers who set forth specific plans for proportional representation based on population suggested using senatorial districts, with one representative on the governing board from each district. Advocates of this approach point out that it is the most practical method for guaranteeing equitable representation based on population, since the State Legislature itself is required to set up senatorial districts according to population. No new district boundaries would have to be determined. There would not be any need to apportion representation

between cities and suburbs and between counties. By using senatorial districts there would be no threat that any area would be under-represented, except to the extent that a rapidly growing suburban district may have had recent population gains which cannot be reflected accurately in the size of the districts. Persons who suggested using senatorial districts included Clayton LeFevere, the Chambers of Commerce, Milton Honsey, Arthur Naftalin, Theodore Mitau, Ted Kolderie and Wheelock Whitney. Governor Karl F. Rolvaag said he supports a truly representative governing board, but based on his experience with reapportionment he believes it would be unwise to base representation on senatorial districts. Representative Joseph Graw, who favors proportional representation based on population, suggested a coalition of counties somewhat along the lines proposed by Janes and Kordiak. But Graw believes that the one man, one vote principle should apply, which, he said, would mean there would be weighted voting for each county representative based on the population of his county in comparison with the population of the others.

### *Disagreement*

5. Selection of members of governing board--There were two major divisions on how members of the governing board would be chosen: (a) Direct election of citizens by voters, and (b) Appointment of local public officials or citizens. About seven favored the first approach and seven others the second approach. Another seven or eight either did not offer an opinion, said either approach is acceptable, or made some other suggestion such as "responsible to the voters". Following is a discussion of the relative merits of the two approaches, as presented by the speakers and groups:

(a) Direct Election of Citizens by Voters--Representatives of the Chambers of Commerce, advocates of direct election, said that it is most important that the policy board be directly responsible to the voters. Members of the policy board must not feel that they have to represent any city, village or other governmental subdivision or group in the metropolitan area. They must be free to think in terms of the interests of the metropolitan area as a whole. It is also claimed that municipal and county officials have enough responsibilities to keep them busy and could not put in the time necessary to serve on the metropolitan council. The Chamber representatives wondered whether such municipal and county officials could, in effect, serve two masters--their own local constituency and the metropolitan constituency.

Theodore Mitau, favoring direct election, emphasized that persons serving on the body would be required to spend much time on the job. Elected municipal and county officials would find that not only their time but their commitment to particular local interests would conflict with service on the governing board.

Some speakers said they envision that members of the governing board eventually will be working full time and be salaried. Such positions should be elective, they contend.

Clayton LeFevere said that it would not matter if initially the governing board were made up of municipal officials. He believes that



they soon would find they would not have time to handle the duties and would come around to suggesting direct representation rather than appointment of municipal officials.

(b) Appointment of Local Public Officials or Citizens--Milton Honsey and others urged the appointment of responsible public officials, such as mayors of the major cities and suburban officials, to the governing board. The most compelling reason for utilizing municipal officials is to provide a power base for implementation of programs, they said. The ability to implement programs of the governing board will depend in great measure on the receptivity of municipal officials, they said. If municipal officials are members of the governing board, the likelihood of implementation will increase. Robert Ashbach said he favors appointment of local public officials because, initially at least, the expertise of knowledgeable elected officials will be valuable on the governing board. Also, utilizing local public officials makes the plan more politically acceptable. Governor Karl Rolvaag said the board should consist of municipal or county officials who are already directly elected. Some speakers said that by using municipal officials who are already locally elected a new level of government would not be established.

Generally persons favoring appointment of municipal officials urged a plan whereby the municipal officials in a certain area, say a legislative district, would jointly elect their appointee to the governing board. An exception to this idea was proposed by Ted Kolderie, who suggested the state senator and state representatives in each legislative district would jointly make the appointment for the representative from their district. The appointee could be a private citizen or a local public official.

A problem which must be faced in any plan which involves the appointment of elected public officials by senatorial district occurs in the selection of appointees in the central cities. For example, would the City Council of Minneapolis name a public official from each of the city's eight senatorial districts? If so, would not the public official chosen be, in each case, of the same political party as the controlling group on the Council? How, then, can the principle of proper representation on the governing board be maintained? Also, would it be possible to find a local public official in each senatorial district?

Thomas Scott, who did not suggest which plan is the better, said that the problem of representation on the governing board is basic. If this can be worked out, the solution of the functional and administrative problems will follow. In terms of representation he is convinced that "people want their man there", and they are much more interested in that than in concerning themselves with what their man might do after he is named to the governing board.

### III. POWERS AND FUNCTIONS

#### *Agreement*

1. Metropolitan Planning--Without exception it was clear that speakers and groups agreed that the function of metropolitan planning should come within the purview of the legislatively created metropolitan organization. Some, for example the Chambers of Commerce, urged that metropolitan planning be a department of the organization. Others urged that metropolitan planning be part of its responsibilities but that the Metropolitan Planning Commission be continued within the overall structure as an advocate of change and direction. Implicit in all the statements, though, is the fact that the Metropolitan Planning Commission no longer will remain independent, as presently structured. This recommendation comes also from the existing governing board of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, which is urging a multi-functional metropolitan organization with comprehensive planning and programming an integral part.

#### *Agreement*

2. Review of Requests for Federal Aid--Implicit in the broad agreement that metropolitan planning should be a function of the legislatively created metropolitan organization is that the organization will be responsible for review of requests by governments in the Twin Cities area for federal funds. This also means the organization will adopt a long-range guide for development in the area, which is necessary in connection with reviewing requests for federal funds. Theodore Mitau envisions that the reviewing of requests for federal grants and passing on them in the light of federal requirements and conformity to the metropolitan area plan will be a key responsibility of the metropolitan organization.

It should be acknowledged that many speakers did not specifically mention the federal aid review function. Nevertheless, newly passed federal legislation, discussed in detail in the first section of this report, has the effect of requiring that overall metropolitan development be coordinated. Certain speakers and groups who provided us with information recommended, in effect, federal-projects review by the organization when they made metropolitan planning one of its responsibilities.

#### *Agreement*

3. Forum for Development of a "Metropolitan Consensus"--Several speakers and groups agreed--and there was no dissent--that the legislatively created metropolitan organization should and will be the vehicle by which a metropolitan consensus can be obtained for pertinent issues requiring legislative action every two years. Ted Kolderie suggested the metropolitan organization would regularly develop a legislative program. Theodore Mitau emphasized that the organization should be equipped to undertake detailed studies on metropolitan problems and make recommendations to the Legislature. He believes this is a major role for the organization. He believes that such studies could themselves have a great deal of influence with the Legislature. In effect, this would be the metropolitan area speaking to the Legislature.

Critics of the handling of proposals for metropolitan action in the past have claimed that the metropolitan area is always bickering within itself and never is able to present a united front to the Legislature.

*Apparent Agreement*

4. Budget Review over Various Metropolitan Functions--There was no dissent among all speakers and groups that the legislatively created metropolitan organization should review budgets of various metropolitan functions. Such an activity is assumed, of course, in the various proposals which envision that the organization would be a metropolitan agency which actually would operate the various functions. Budget review was also mentioned by those advocates of a metropolitan organization which would have coordinative, but not operating, powers over various metropolitan functions. It was not clear from the various statements whether budget review was intended to be more than advisory. This question arises in the case of a non-operating organization and in the case of those functions which are not taken over by an operating agency. For example, the Chambers' proposal would leave the Metropolitan Airports Commission independent. It is not clear whether the Airports Commission would submit its budget for review to the operating agency which the Chambers are proposing. It also is not clear whether an organization such as proposed by the Chambers would have budget review over any new single-purpose operating agencies, such as a parks and open space authority, which might be created.

*Apparent Agreement*

5. Coordinating Activities of Various Metropolitan Functions--There was no dissent with the suggestion by many speakers and groups that the legislatively created metropolitan organization would have coordinative powers over metropolitan functions. Exactly how extensive these coordinative powers would be was not spelled out in many cases. As with the case of (4) and (5) above, an operating agency would have full control over coordinating the activities of various functions. A non-operating organization, through policy control, also would coordinate activities of the various functions.

*Apparent Agreement*

6. Policy Control over Major Decisions Relating to Metropolitan Functions--As with budget review, it is self-evident that any operating metropolitan agency would exercise full policy control over major decisions in those fields in which it has operating responsibilities. There was widespread agreement, too, among proposals for a non-operating metropolitan organization that the organization would exercise extensive influence over the major decisions affecting several metropolitan functions. The extent of this influence was not completely spelled out, but some speakers mentioned the need to have long-range capital plans for various functions submitted to the metropolitan organization for approval even though the organization itself were not operating the functions. As was pointed out earlier, it is generally agreed that the legislatively created organization would review requests for federal grants and approve a comprehensive metropolitan plan. This, in itself, will mean that the organization will be able to influence many of the major decisions affecting the various functions.

Following is a discussion of each approach and the supporters of each:

(a) Operating Powers--This approach is supported by Clayton LeFevere, the Chambers of Commerce, Milton Honsey, Arthur Naftalin, Raymond T. Olsen, Joseph Robbie, Karl F. Rolvaag, the Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, Robert Janes, Albert Kordiak, the Metropolitan Planning Commission and Wheelock Whitney.

There were wide differences of opinion among these speakers and groups as to how many functions would be included, but the common thread of actual operation of functions was present. All of the above, except Olsen, Janes and Kordiak, advocated some form of a multi-purpose metropolitan district. Olsen advocated the gradual formation of a metropolitan county to replace Hennepin, Anoka, Ramsey, Dakota and Washington Counties. Janes and Kordiak urged greater powers and responsibilities to the Metropolitan Inter-County Council, including operating powers for a number of functions.

Advocates of the operating approach stress that this is the only way maximum efficiencies can be realized in all managerial techniques. Only one personnel system, one purchasing office, one data processing center, and one finance office, for example, will be needed, rather than having separate arrangements for each single-purpose district handling a given function.

They also contend that only by controlling fully the day-to-day operations of these functions can true coordination and policy control be realized.

(b) Non-Operating Powers--This approach is supported by State Representative Robert Ashbach, Thomas Scott, Ted Kolderie, Theodore Mitau and Joseph Graw.

Advocates of this approach say they are not overly concerned about special-purpose boards and separate administration of areawide functions so long as these boards and the administration of functions are tied to a positive overall coordinated development plan. Then the key decisions with regard to area development, for example, locations of new airports or large tracts of open space, can be made within the context of such a plan. Another advantage, they say, is that the governing board of the metropolitan organization would not be burdened with the day-to-day functional decisions. These could remain with the various single-purpose boards. Also, there would be minimal dislocation of existing units of government. The prodigious problem of differing physical boundaries relative to different problems and functions would not be present. The non-operating approach, they say, avoids the problem of "buy-out" of financial equities in existing metropolitan agencies which would, under the operating approach, be taken over by a new multi-purpose agency.

It should be pointed out that the non-operating approach does not necessarily mean a continued proliferation of single-purpose metropolitan districts. Existing districts might be assigned additional functions or

a new multi-purpose district could be formed--with major policy decisions resting with the non-operating metropolitan coordinating board.

Some of the speakers and groups which presented proposals to the Committee said that either the operating or the non-operating approach would be acceptable to them. Thomas Byrne envisioned that the non-operating agency could eventually evolve into an overall operating agency. Others who indicated either approach would be acceptable were State Representative Howard Albertson (who said he would prefer a full-blown operating agency), the Minnesota Republican Party, Harold LeVander, and James J. Dalglish.

#### AREAWIDE TAXATION

Speakers and groups which provided information to the Committee touched only briefly or not at all on the subject of areawide taxation for the various metropolitan functions. Many of them said that any proposals in this area must await the detailed tax information expected towards the end of this year from the Metropolitan Mayors' Tax Study being conducted under the direction of Oscar F. Litterer of the Federal Reserve Bank. A few speakers suggested that the financing of the metropolitan agency be from non-property taxes. Ted Kolderie urged that the metropolitan area be established as a single taxing district and that an areawide non-property tax be imposed. He contends that no reorganization of local government in the Twin Cities metropolitan area can hope to succeed in its broad objective of unifying the area without an accompanying change in the system of public finance. Thomas Byrne favors the concept of a system whereby new taxes, and possibly old, are collected at the metropolitan level with a formula worked out as to how some of these taxes are to be returned to local governments and some retained at the metropolitan level for areawide services.

#### LOCAL CONSENT

Overshadowing almost all proposals for action at the metropolitan level in the 1967 Legislature is the problem of resolving the "local consent" requirement to special laws. Special laws are designed to apply to only a certain section of the state. Under present requirements, special laws can become effective only when the voters or the governing body of affected local units of government approve. Conceivably, a bill applying to the entire Twin Cities metropolitan area would need unanimous ratification by some 130 municipalities and 82 townships, which has the effect of stymieing action on metropolitan bills.

Many speakers and groups urged modification of the local consent requirement so that metropolitan legislation can be passed. This question was not addressed in detail, though, so it is not possible to know whether a consensus exists on this point. There are three major suggestions for revision of the present requirement: (a) Senator Gordon Rosenmeier of Little Falls believes that local consent should be abolished for all special laws unless the Legislature decides otherwise for a certain law. (b) The Citizens League has urged

that local consent be abolished for all special laws, except those which apply to one municipality, township or school district. (c) The League of Minnesota Municipalities has recommended that local consent be abolished when a special law applies to two or more local governmental units with a combined population of more than one million people.