


# **CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT**



**HIGHWAYS,  
TRANSIT  
AND THE  
METROPOLITAN  
COUNCIL**

how the twin cities area can develop a planned, balanced transportation system

## ABOUT THE CITIZENS LEAGUE...

The Citizens League, founded in 1952, is an independent, non-partisan educational organization in the Twin Cities Area, with some 3,600 members, specializing in questions of government planning, finance and organization.

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.

Membership is open to the public. 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.

### OFFICERS

President  
Francis M. Boddy  
Vice Presidents  
Greer Lockhart  
John Harrison  
John W. Windhorst  
James L. Hetland, Jr.  
Earl F. Colborn, Jr.  
Secretary  
Fred C. Cady  
Treasurer  
John W. Pulver

### DIRECTORS

Charles Backstrom  
Raymond D. Black  
Bruce W. Blackburn  
Homer A. Childs  
John E. Cummings  
Mrs. Nicholas Duff  
Harold D. Field, Jr.  
John R. Finnegan  
Richard J. FitzGerald  
Mrs. Ralph Forester  
Glen F. Galles  
E. Peter Gillette, Jr.  
David Graven  
Roger Hale  
William Hempel  
Verne C. Johnson  
Charles Lutz  
James Martineau  
Donald W. McCarthy  
John W. Mooty  
Wayne H. Olson  
Leslie C. Park  
Mrs. Joseph Richardson  
Allen I. Saeks  
Peter H. Seed  
Everett J. Swanson  
Paul Van Valkenburg  
James L. Weaver  
Mrs. T. Williams

### PAST PRESIDENTS

Charles S. Bellows  
Charles H. Clay  
Waite D. Durfee  
John F. Finn  
Walter S. Harris, Jr.  
James L. Hetland, Jr.  
Stuart W. Leck, Sr.  
Norman L. Newhall, Jr.  
Leslie C. Park  
Malcolm G. Pfunder  
James R. Pratt  
Leonard F. Ramberg  
Charles T. Silverson  
Archibald Spencer  
John W. Windhorst

### STAFF

Executive Director  
Ted Kolderie  
Research Director  
Paul A. Gilje  
Research Associate  
James J. Carney  
Membership & Finance  
Director  
Neill T. Carter

**CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT**

**Highways, Transit and the Metropolitan Council**

**How the Twin Cities Area Can Develop a Planned, Balanced Transportation System**

Prepared by  
Citizens League Transportation Planning Committee  
John Sullivan, Chairman

Approved  
Citizens League Board of Directors  
December 6, 1968

Citizens League  
84 South 6th Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
Phone: 338-0791

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
SUMMARY . . . . .	4
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	5
I. Action by the Legislature . . . . .	5
II. Position of the Metropolitan Council . . . . .	6
III. Establishment of Transportation Commission (TRANCO) . . . . .	6
IV. Responsibilities of TRANCO . . . . .	7
V. Composition of TRANCO . . . . .	7
VI. TRANCO Staff . . . . .	8
VII. Relationship between TRANCO and the Operating Agencies . . . . .	8
VIII. Relationship between TRANCO and the Metropolitan Council . . . . .	8
IX. Specific Responsibilities of TRANCO . . . . .	9
X. Financing TRANCO . . . . .	13
XI. Availability of Construction Funds . . . . .	13
XII. Constitutional Amendment . . . . .	14
XIII. County Highway Finance . . . . .	14
XIV. Apportionment of State Highway Funds . . . . .	15
XV. Metropolitan Highway District . . . . .	15
XVI. Basic Goals in Metropolitan Area Transportation Planning . . . . .	15
COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT . . . . .	17
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP . . . . .	17
COMMITTEE ACTIVITY . . . . .	17
BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	19
I. Future Transportation Demands and Impact . . . . .	19
II. Transportation Agencies Serving the Metropolitan Area . . . . .	20
III. Transportation Planning in the Metropolitan Area to Date . . . . .	24
IV. Transportation Planning Nationally . . . . .	26
V. Advantages of the TRANCO Approach . . . . .	29
VI. Municipal Approval of Highway Plans . . . . .	36
VII. Priorities and Programming . . . . .	38
VIII. Functional Classification of Roads . . . . .	38
IX. Development of the Urban Design Concept . . . . .	39
X. Traffic Movement, Parking, Right-of-Way Acquisition, Construction Standards . . . . .	41
TRANSPORTATION FINANCE . . . . .	44
I. Federal Financing . . . . .	44
II. State Financing . . . . .	44
III. County Financing . . . . .	46
IV. Municipal Financing . . . . .	47
V. Transit Financing . . . . .	48
VI. Future Dollar Needs for Metropolitan Area Transportation . . . . .	48
APPENDIX . . . . .	53

## INTRODUCTION

The transportation problem in the Twin Cities area today is elusive, partly because it appears as different things to different people.

To a low-income worker: His inability to find a way to get to a new job opportunity in a suburb.

To a downtown businessman: The lack of a high-speed rapid transit system to bring customers downtown.

To a suburban shopping center developer: The need for more roads to give customers access to his stores.

To a real estate developer: Trying to convince highway engineers of the need for an interchange on a new freeway scheduled to pass near his property to raise his property value and increase the return on his investments.

To a highway engineer: Trying to limit the number of interchanges on a freeway to meet safety requirements and assure orderly movement of traffic at minimum cost.

To a motorist driving to work: Traffic tie-ups because an urgently needed freeway cannot get built.

To a one-car family: The lack of public transportation, forcing the wife to remain at home all day while her husband drives the family's one car to work.

To a park board: The seemingly inevitable tendency of a highway department to route its freeways through a park.

To a highway department: The rigid refusal of a park board to give up its land for a freeway.

To a family whose home is taken for a freeway: Disruption of lives because of relocation and, perhaps, lack of adequate compensation for their loss.

To a family whose home is located next to a freeway: Increased traffic on city streets used as frontage roads plus the noise and pollution of freeways which they must now bear without compensation.

To a businessman whose property is near a freeway interchange: Increase of property value with little effort on his part.

To an elderly person without a car: Lack of opportunities for housing, limited choice of shopping locations, and lack of access to churches, art centers, parks, libraries and other places.

To a motorist: How to eliminate compromises on freeway design which produce hazardous driving conditions.

To a central city: The loss of valuable tax base to freeway construction.

To a businessman affected by changes in traffic patterns: Possible loss of business, perhaps forcing him to relocate, leaving a neighborhood without his services readily available.

To a motorist who drives to work: Lack of good parking near his employment.

To a planner concerned about downtown development: Too many parking ramps, producing undesirable land uses and streets clogged with cars.

To a semi-rural county, anxious for its share of metropolitan growth: Lack of funds to build a good bridge across a river to link it with the metropolitan area.

To a resident of a community split by a freeway: Inconvenience in getting to commercial and social services in his neighborhood.

To a motorist competing with buses for space on local streets: How to get rid of those buses which interfere with traffic movement.

To a bus rider: How to get rid of those cars which slow down the bus so much.

Finally, to an average, concerned citizen in this metropolitan area: His inability, through any direct political process, to have an effective voice in the kind of transportation system he would like, and the absence of any policy mechanism for resolving these choices.

These issues suggest the kinds of transportation decisions that have to be made. Together these decisions make what we call transportation policy. What should be the relative emphasis on transit facilities versus highways? What community values should be given greatest protection in transportation planning? Where should our transportation facilities be located and how should they look? What priorities of construction should be established.

We cannot develop a transportation policy without a governmental framework within which the choices can be made. The area significantly suffers from inadequate transportation policy-making and planning. It lacks appropriate control of a process in which decisions have been made for the area, not by the area. There is no unified decision-making process for determining what kind of a transportation system it wants, and under existing governmental framework no effective process can be developed. Continuing conflicts exist over the location and design of freeways

and expressways with no means available for broad area interests to be developed or injected into the process. Highways and transit interests continue to compete for the same travelers.

Such problems have been made abundantly clear to the Citizens League Transportation Planning Committee during its twelve months of deliberations.

The State Legislature has not yet fully faced the question of broad and unified transportation policy-making for this metropolitan area.

For the past six years, stimulated by federal law and federal regulations, various agencies responsible for transportation construction in the Twin Cities area have attempted to establish voluntary coordinating committees to establish transportation policy for this area.

The voluntary coordinating committee approach has not been a success, and it is time for the Legislature--which really should make this decision anyway--to step in and officially define the roles of the various transportation agencies and make it clear where transportation policy-making for this area should rest.

The setting is particularly appropriate for action by the Legislature now. All of the agencies involved in transportation construction are anxious to have their roles clarified.

The various interests which support highway construction in the Twin Cities area want the issues resolved so that roadblocks can be opened and urgently needed construction can be undertaken.

Mass transit advocates recognize that their programs will not move ahead unless transportation policy-making is clear.

The Metropolitan Council, unsure of its own role vis-a-vis the various agencies in transportation, recognizes that the transportation issue is key to almost all aspects of areawide development and that transportation policy control is crucial to influencing the shape of urban growth.

The proposals in this report are intended to provide a framework for the settlement of transportation controversies, so that this area can move ahead.

They are intended to indicate clearly where the policy-making role on metropolitan transportation should lie. They are intended to show that this metropolitan area has a real opportunity for leadership nationally and to be one of the first metropolitan areas in the nation to really take charge of its transportation system and have a truly balanced transportation system -- not balanced in name only, but one which provides a variety of modes satisfactory to all residents. The proposal will resolve the so-called "conflict" between the transit interests and the highway interests at the policy-making level, where it should be resolved.

### SUMMARY

Critical transportation issues remain unresolved in the Twin Cities area today because the area has failed to take the initiative in telling the transportation builders what the area really wants. The metropolitan area must assume responsibility for its own transportation system. This is the only way to assure that highway disputes will be minimized and that a mass transit system this area really wants will be developed. A governmental framework is urgently needed, therefore, whereby the initiative can be taken by the area itself.

- \* Give the Metropolitan Council transportation policy-making authority, as an inseparable part of overall development policy for the Twin Cities area.
- \* Establish a seven-member Metropolitan Transportation Commission (TRANCO), subordinate to the Metropolitan Council, appointed by the chairman of the Metropolitan Council with the advice and consent of the Council.
- \* Involve the administrative heads of the transportation building agencies on a continuing basis through an advisory board, to provide technical assistance in the transportation planning process.
- \* Provide that the Metropolitan Council establish the transportation guidelines and the land use plan for this metropolitan area, within which TRANCO should prepare transportation plans. The Council should approve the TRANCO budget and approve transportation plans prepared by TRANCO. The Metropolitan Council should be the arbiter on route disputes.
- \* Assign TRANCO the responsibility to prepare long-range transportation plans within Metropolitan Council guidelines. The objective should be a truly balanced transportation system consisting of a strong mass transit network and highways. TRANCO should determine the specifics of the relative emphasis on transit and highways. TRANCO should supervise and direct the preparation of alternative routes, and approve location and design of highway and mass transit routes, interchanges and transit station stops. It should designate priorities for scheduling of construction, establish construction standards, classify highways according to function, plan and regulate parking facilities and develop regulations for control of traffic on highways within its jurisdiction.
- \* Provide that TRANCO hire its own staff, including an executive director who has the confidence of both highway and transit supporters.
- \* Support TRANCO's operation with planning funds from the Bureau of Public Roads, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the metropolitan area. On a long-range basis TRANCO's funding should not be limited to such sources.
- \* Divide responsibility between TRANCO and the operating agencies so that it is clear the operating agencies continue to prepare detailed project plans, prepare programming schedules, and build and maintain facilities -- but that they carry out their activities within direction provided by TRANCO.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

### I. Action by the Legislature

The 1969 Legislature should establish a positive framework and designate a specific organization to develop and implement transportation policy-making and planning in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The question is not whether or not such an organization will be set up, because federal regulations require the organization. The question is whether the Legislature will act to determine the organization or whether it will be the product of negotiation between a number of different public agencies, primarily the negotiation of staff personnel of these agencies.

By establishing the appropriate transportation policy-making and planning organization the Legislature should put an end to fragmentation, overlapping of responsibility and lack of overall direction which has characterized policy-making and planning for transportation in the metropolitan area. The new legislation should specify how the various state, county and local agencies should relate to the overall organization, for it is abundantly clear that the question of transportation organization no longer can be left to the agencies themselves. Forced to meet federal requirements, these agencies have attempted limited coordination for the past six years through a voluntary association known as the Joint Program. Under the circumstances at the time of its creation the Joint Program represented a step forward. During the years of its existence it gathered extensive data on the transportation needs for this area, but the Joint Program could not make transportation policy for this area. Fragmentation, overlapping and lack of direction continued. The Legislature should not attempt to perpetuate or breathe new life into the Joint Program, which is an outdated concept for the needs of the Twin Cities area today.

The Legislature, in the preamble to the act creating the Metropolitan Transit Commission in 1967, established as a matter of policy its concern with transportation for the area:

"The Legislature finds and determines that nearly half the people of the state live in the metropolitan transit area hereinafter established. The population of that area is growing faster than in any other area of the state, resulting in a heavy and steadily increasing concentration of resident and transient population and creating serious problems of public transit and public highway traffic in the area...The Legislature therefore declares as the public policy of the state that for the protection and advancement of the public health, safety and welfare of the metropolitan transit area and the entire state, and in order to provide for adequate public transit within the area, reduce the traffic congestion and hazards on the state and other highways and streets therein, and relieve the other harmful conditions aforesaid, there is urgent need for the establishment of that area as herein defined, for the creation of a Metropolitan Transit Commission therefor with the powers and duties herein prescribed, and for the other measures herein provided for." (Section 473A.02, Minnesota Statutes)

But this policy demands implementation beyond mass transit considerations, for it is obvious to the committee that orderly growth and development of the metropolitan area and the serving of transportation needs cannot be accomplished where divisiveness between highway interests, transportation modes and related local concerns prevails.

## II. Position of the Metropolitan Council

The Legislature should designate the Metropolitan Council as the only truly representative body for the Twin Cities area responsible for metropolitan area transportation planning and policy-making. Direct and positive involvement of the Metropolitan Council is essential. As an areawide body, the Metropolitan Council cannot be "just another agency" nor merely play an advisory role, but it must have responsibility for direction. The primary responsibility of the Metropolitan Council should be to develop a broad comprehensive land use plan and to develop major transportation objectives and guidelines to make the plan workable and effective. The Legislature already has assigned the Metropolitan Council the role of speaking on basic transportation policy. Now the Legislature should place the Council in its proper role of making transportation policy.

Transportation facilities may well be the singlemost important factor in determining and preserving residential, commercial and industrial development in the metropolitan area. For example, the network of freeways laid out in 1956 and planned for completion by 1975 already has had a major impact, with secondary effects on the tax bases of local communities, demands for sewage facilities, location of educational institutions, development and maintenance of parks and open spaces and even the decline of certain areas.

The governmental agencies which have been responsible for transportation facilities have made decisions affecting these elements without having direct responsibility for the consequences or being responsive to the people or the interests of the area as a whole. It is only through the Metropolitan Council, with broad metropolitan responsibility, that we can rectify this deficiency.

## III. Establishment of Transportation Commission (TRANCO)

In addition, the Legislature should establish a Transportation Commission (TRANCO), making it responsible for specific transportation policy-making and planning and with authority to direct the implementation of the program.

Such a commission would achieve goals which the committee believes necessary. The Metropolitan Council should and does have responsibility for directing and controlling major metropolitan developments in a coherent program, in keeping with agreed-upon objectives and policies. This responsibility extends over many fields of metropolitan concern of which transportation is but one. It is obvious that the Council should have the principal responsibility for establishing transportation policy and guidelines within the framework of the comprehensive metropolitan development program. But the implementation of transportation policy-making and planning also requires the involvement of policy considerations at every step in the major planning process. This involvement would be carried out through TRANCO.

It is apparent to the committee that the present system of overlapping responsibility, lack of overall direction, fragmentation between different agencies of different goals, and the hodgepodge of purely local concerns--injected indiscriminately into the planning process--contributes to the present status of transportation development for the area. Moreover, whatever capabilities and proficiency are possessed by technical staffs, utilization of such staffs alone does not bring about a sufficiently early or broad enough injection of major metropolitan goals or local community interests into the planning process.

These deficiencies can be overcome by requiring that planning and policy-making be carried out at an early stage by TRANCO. Further, this approach will serve to insulate the Council from the many details of transportation planning and policy-making and from the inevitable day-to-day transportation decisions, leaving the Council free to concentrate on the major overall questions of metropolitan growth.

#### IV. Responsibilities of TRANCO

TRANCO's first duty should be to assume responsibility for continuing the planning for transportation already under way and proceed to complete a transportation plan for the Twin Cities area in accord with transportation objectives and guidelines of the Metropolitan Council.

TRANCO should undertake, on a continuing basis, further preparation and updating of metropolitan transportation plans, establishment of construction standards, development of criteria for esthetics, safety, relative costs and benefits, approval of route design and location, designation of priorities of construction, preparation of a functional classification system for metropolitan roads, planning for parking, and other responsibilities dealing with an effective movement of people and goods within the metropolitan area. TRANCO would not involve itself with streets serving only a local municipality. Proposals for rapid transit, rail service or even air transport to improve movement within the metropolitan area would come under TRANCO's jurisdiction. Existing transportation agencies would provide technical assistance to TRANCO, undertake detailed engineering and build and operate transportation facilities as needed.

The objective of TRANCO should be to develop a balanced transportation system for the metropolitan area. A balanced system would (a) assure an adequate system of highways of both primary and secondary character, and (b) provide for the development of mass transit facilities so that the population of the area shall have ready access between living areas, employment areas, business and economic centers, educational, cultural and recreational centers, and community service centers such as hospitals and medical complexes. The achievement of such balance may require strenuous efforts to encourage and foster transit development and to avoid the specter of creating an overwhelming concrete or asphalt mass of highways, parking ramps and related facilities.

#### V. Composition of TRANCO

TRANCO should be composed of seven residents of the Twin Cities area appointed at-large by the chairman of the Metropolitan Council with the advice and consent of the Council. The chairman of TRANCO should be so designated in the appointments. TRANCO members should not hold any other public office. They should not be regarded as representing any specific segment of the transportation industry or any other public agency, but members should be chosen with a view to their individual capabilities and their broad metropolitan interests as distinguished from narrow parochialism. Membership should not be exclusively from one segment of the community, such as businessmen or professional people. Every attempt should be made to appoint a broad range of persons familiar with or concerned about different aspects of the transportation problem. For example, it would be desirable that someone intimately familiar with the particular transportation problems of lower-income people or the elderly be appointed.

#### VI. TRANCO Staff

TRANCO should be empowered to hire its own executive director and staff and hire consultants as needed. The executive director should be chosen on the basis of his having the respect and confidence of both transit and highway interests. TRANCO should enlist the assistance of staff of existing agencies concerned with transportation, as needed, as has been the practice in the Joint Program and compensate the agencies for the use of their staff.

#### VII. Relationship between TRANCO and the Operating Agencies

The Legislature should clearly assign responsibility for decision-making to TRANCO and provide for involvement in the planning process by the various public agencies, such as the Minnesota Highway Department, the Metropolitan Transit Commission, metropolitan area county highway departments, and similar municipal departments. The Legislature can thereby indicate that the participation of these agencies in the transportation planning and policy-making process should and must be accomplished. To give adequate assurance that these agencies will be properly represented, the Legislature should provide that TRANCO be assisted by a technical assistance board made up of the top administrative personnel in these agencies. But the Legislature also should make it clear that policy-making will reside in TRANCO. TRANCO itself should not build or own transportation facilities. The operating agencies should be responsible for preparation of their own detailed programming schedules, design, construction and maintenance, consistent with TRANCO plans. TRANCO should determine the overall transportation network for the metropolitan area, the relative emphasis on highways and mass transit in various locations, and priorities. It also should see that certain steps are followed in determining the design and location of transportation facilities. From a policy standpoint, TRANCO should approve these designs and locations on behalf of the metropolitan area.

#### VIII. Relationship between TRANCO and the Metropolitan Council

The Metropolitan Council should be responsible for the development of the land use plan for the metropolitan area which should form the basis for a transportation plan. The Council should set forth the transportation guidelines which TRANCO would follow. These guidelines would be general statements about the kind of transportation system this metropolitan area should have. For example, the guidelines could well indicate that far greater emphasis on a public transportation system is necessary than has taken place to date. The guidelines also might state that this metropolitan area will be willing to assume extra costs in freeway construction to preserve valuable park land. Other guidelines could deal with accomplishing certain urban growth objectives of the Metropolitan Council. The guidelines would be the framework within which TRANCO would operate. TRANCO itself should prepare the long-range transportation plans, but they would be submitted to the Metropolitan Council for approval. If the Metropolitan Council disagreed with aspects of these plans, it should remand the plans to TRANCO stating that they failed to meet certain criteria. TRANCO should have the option of revising the plans or resubmitting them, offering reasons and arguments why its plans do meet the criteria. If the Metropolitan Council then still did not agree with TRANCO's plans, it should remand with specific direction that the plans be revised to conform to specific requirements.

TRANCO then should be required to revise its plans, after which the Council would approve and adopt. This would then mean that the official long-range transportation plans for this area would be established by the Council. It would be a clear indication that these are the plans within which the operating agencies must work.

The Metropolitan Council should approve the operating budget for TRANCO and provide the necessary local revenue. (See appendix, page 53, for fuller discussion of the TRANCO-Council relationship.)

Although TRANCO should have responsibility to approve exact locations and design of major facilities, a local municipality, if dissatisfied, should have the opportunity to appeal by appropriate procedures to the Metropolitan Council for review and decision on the specific matter at issue. (Under current procedures a municipality has veto power over trunk highway plans.)

#### IX. Specific Responsibilities of TRANCO

A. Long-Range Plans -- TRANCO should prepare and adopt long-range (20 years or so) transportation plans for the metropolitan area, sufficiently detailed to give direction to the various transportation agencies as to the type of transportation facilities to be built and the priorities to be followed. These long-range plans are a key element in the overall transportation planning process. They will not specify the exact location, for example, of a transit line or a freeway; they would identify general corridors, perhaps one-half mile wide, within which the exact location later will be determined. Transportation plans to date under the Joint Program have concentrated also on corridors, but these plans have included on maps specific alignments of new facilities planned 20 years or more in the future. This gives the incorrect impression that the exact alignment has been determined.

When long-range plans have been prepared and approved by TRANCO, they should be submitted to the Metropolitan Council for official adoption. The Council should have authority to direct changes in the plans of TRANCO. After this action, the metropolitan area's transportation plans would be official and thereby could be followed. Currently there is no mechanism available for official adoption of plans.

As we discuss later, it is very important to distinguish between the corridor within which a route will be located and the exact location of the route.

The preparation and approval of long-range transportation plans for this area is very urgent. The Joint Program, after six years of effort, was unable to produce an agreeable transportation plan for this metropolitan area. It concentrated principally on a thoroughfare plan and obtained the agreement of most of the highway building agencies on this plan, but it has not been approved by the Metropolitan Council.

B. Bringing Order to the Road System -- The first step in bringing order to the road system in the Twin Cities area--and a responsibility which the highway building agencies by themselves cannot carry out--is to prepare a functional classification of the various roads in the metropolitan area. A functional classification will indicate which roads now and in the future are freeways, expressways, major arterials, and so forth.

With the completion of the functional classification, TRANCO should be in a position to make recommendations to the State Legislature on the appropriate jurisdiction for different roads on the basis of resources likely to be available and the capability of agencies to develop the desired types of roads. TRANCO should also make recommendations about the total cost of the plan, the way this should be shared by different agencies and the funding to be used. The Minnesota Highway Department, county highway departments and municipalities all have different sources of funding. Yet it is common knowledge that in some cases they all are building roads with similar functions with the only exception being that certain agencies are building more roads of one type than another.

The functional classification by TRANCO and its subsequent recommendation to the Legislature on appropriate jurisdiction and financing should go beyond the traditional areas of responsibility. This is particularly urgent because of the outlook of federal transportation aid following the completion of the interstate highway program in 1975. The most influential agencies with Congress on transportation, namely the American Association of State Highway Officials, the National Association of Counties, and the National League of Cities, are in basic agreement already that at least one part of the post-1975 program will be a new metropolitan federal aid category. This aid would be designated for those roads, regardless of jurisdiction, which serve certain similar functions in metropolitan areas. Federal aid metropolitan highways in the Twin Cities area undoubtedly would include county highways, state highways and municipal highways, assuming jurisdictions are not changed. TRANCO can exercise a great deal of leadership on the post-1975 program by identifying those roads which should be part of the metropolitan federal aid system. Roads on the metropolitan federal aid system then could be planned, programmed and financed as part of one overall system, with TRANCO providing the coordination and the operating agencies carrying out their responsibilities.

C. Approval of Route Locations and Design of Transportation Facilities -- TRANCO should be the official body which, on behalf of the metropolitan area, approves specific route locations and design of major transportation facilities, such as freeways, expressways, mass transit facilities, and state aid roads. TRANCO itself should not do the engineering on proposed locations or designs. That should rest with the specific agencies. Instead of final route approval resting with each individual municipality, as it now does, the approval should rest with TRANCO. When location and design is approved by TRANCO the appropriate agency would carry out the plan. If a municipal government does not agree with the route approved by TRANCO, even after detailed steps have been taken to involve the local citizenry in the issues of location and design, the municipal government should have the right to appeal to the Metropolitan Council for a final decision. The Metropolitan Council should appoint a hearing examiner to take the facts in the issue, and make a recommendation, with the Metropolitan Council then making a decision.

Prior to the submission of a proposed route and design to TRANCO for its approval, TRANCO should assure that appropriate steps have been taken so that a route, when finally presented to TRANCO, is acceptable as the best possible route, both to the local government involved and to citizens and others directly affected by the location.

The Legislature should require that, under TRANCO's overall supervision, the following steps are taken in determining the location and design of a route:

- Alternative routes with costs and benefits of each should be prepared. TRANCO would review these alternative routes to see that they, in fact, are meaningful alternatives.
- Technical personnel from several disciplines, such as architects and sociologists, not just engineers, should be participants in the preparation of the design and location alternatives and in the selection of the final alternative.
- Local citizens in the vicinity of the proposed route must be involved in the analysis of the alternatives. This should be in addition to the involvement of official representatives of the local government. TRANCO should be required to establish appropriate procedures whereby citizens would be able to voice their concerns regarding routes and decisions affecting their neighborhoods at an early stage of planning.

In effect, the above procedures should assure that the design concept approach on the location of transportation facilities would be followed in every case. These steps can be carried out in a variety of ways, depending upon the route involved and the participants affected. The key departure from current policy is that a highway building agency by itself will not be preparing route location proposals in a vacuum. It must be acknowledged that highway building agencies recognize the urgency to change past procedures. The Minnesota Highway Department inaugurated a two-hearing procedure last May. The Federal Highway Administration is now proposing a two-hearing procedure on all routes, with the first hearing to be conducted before the affected highway building agency has determined its recommendation for the final route.

If the above steps are followed, then the likelihood of opposition by a local government at the time the final selection is made should be greatly diminished. Appeals to the Metropolitan Council would be expected to occur only in the most extraordinary cases.

As specified earlier, TRANCO's long-range plans should show only general corridors, not specific locations. TRANCO should see that appropriate steps are taken to refine these corridors to final right-of-way limits as soon as possible even though construction is not planned for several years in the future. This will enable right-of-way to be reserved and not built upon, thereby holding down the cost. One approach would be for the final right-of-way limits to be set by TRANCO and then for these to be filed with each county courthouse. If any construction were proposed within these right-of-way limits the opportunity would be immediately available for purchase to be made. This is the "official map" approach being followed in the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

If a corridor is officially identified through a large city, say Minneapolis or St. Paul, that city should take the initiative in proposing the specific location and design of, for example, a freeway. The city should be given every opportunity to integrate the facility into its own comprehensive planning. For example, some transportation plans show a new freeway paralleling Lake Street generally along 28th Street in Minneapolis. This would go through the Model Neighborhoods area. If it were established officially that a freeway would go in a general location in this area, then the city of Minneapolis could propose the specific location. The location would not be "imposed" from the outside.

If a locality does not take the initiative, then TRANCO would see that appropriate steps are taken to determine the location in accord with steps outlined above.

D. Continuous Data Gathering and Forecasting - The Metropolitan Council should take charge of the specific forecasts of population and employment, in accord with its land use plan, for future years. These forecasts should be made to meet transportation planning needs, that is, by traffic assignment zones. These forecasts, along with the Council's general guidelines on the relative highway-transit emphasis, will be the basic data for TRANCO to use in determining travel demands and the distribution of travel between highways and transit in the future. TRANCO should be charged with coordinating data-gathering dealing with transportation throughout the metropolitan area. This would assure, for example, that the data already developed by extensive research by the Minnesota Highway Department on current travel as well as growth of the area could be effectively utilized by TRANCO and would encourage the use of data developed by the Metropolitan Transit Commission and other local or national agencies.

E. Section 204 Reviews - The Metropolitan Council currently is designated as the agency to review all proposed federally aided highway projects on the extent to which the projects are consistent with metropolitan plans, before requests for federal aid are submitted to Washington. This is under Section 204 of the 1966 Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act. The Metropolitan Council should establish procedures for TRANCO to review and comment upon all transportation-related projects. In the vast majority of the cases it is likely the Council would approve routinely the TRANCO review as its own. The Council would retain authority to review and comment on all transportation-related projects but would be expected to confine itself only to those projects affecting its comprehensive development plans.

F. Construction Standards - Considerable concern has been indicated in many cases where highway building agencies have been forced to adopt lower construction standards on specific routes than they would prefer because of local pressures for certain changes. There is no way now available whereby this metropolitan area could, if it desired, indicate that certain standards are not to be violated, in the interests of safety, and are to be regarded as minimum, even though federal requirements would permit lower standards. TRANCO should have the authority to set these standards for this metropolitan area.

G. Parking Regulation - The rapid construction of large parking ramps in the downtown areas has pointed up recently the acknowledgement that parking facilities are an integral part of transportation planning for this metropolitan area. TRANCO should be specifically charged with including planning for parking as an integral part of overall transportation planning. This would include a determination of generally where parking facilities should be located and their extent. Should, for example, parking to serve downtown workers be located adjacent to these workers' job locations? Should it instead be on the fringe of the downtown, or perhaps at suburban park-and-ride locations, or even above freeways? It is folly to build highways leading somewhere if parking will not be available. Further, it will not be possible to assure a certain level of transit ridership without some influence over parking. We have not reviewed in detail the question of controlling the establishment of parking facilities



or the implications of such control, but it appears that all requests for permits for parking ramps, not only those involving public funds, should be submitted to TRANCO for review for conformance to its plan before they are approved. TRANCO also should be directed to make whatever recommendations it deems necessary to the State Legislature on the regulation of parking.

H. Traffic Regulation - Monitoring of traffic on freeways to assure their most effective use appears to be a desirable improvement in the near future. TRANCO should be given specific responsibilities in this area. Overall planning for the movement of traffic in the metropolitan area cannot be left to each individual municipality, nor to each highway building agency.

I. Review of Programming Schedules - TRANCO itself will not prepare the detailed programming schedules for each agency. In many cases these details can well be left to the operating agency, with no concern as to overall metropolitan impact. They will relate to whether one contract is let before another on a project, for example. But TRANCO should be given authority to review these schedules prior to their adoption and comment on the extent to which they conform to priorities already established by TRANCO. If such procedures are followed, the operating agencies would be strongly inclined to seriously consider TRANCO's comments, knowing that the availability of funding may be affected.

#### X. Financing TRANCO

A major source of funds for the Joint Program, and one which must be continued under TRANCO, is the planning and research money available from the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. The Legislature should specify that the metropolitan area's share of federal planning funds from the Bureau of Public Roads be allocated to TRANCO. In addition, the Metropolitan Council would be expected, as it has in the past, to provide funding through "701" planning funds from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. These two sources of federal funds will finance a considerable portion of TRANCO's operating budget. In addition, the Metropolitan Council should provide additional local funds as necessary to carry out TRANCO's responsibilities. We are not equipped to suggest a specific figure, but believe that the Metropolitan Council will be deeply concerned about assuring that TRANCO's responsibilities be carried out. We would support additional financing for the Metropolitan Council as needed to carry out its responsibilities.

#### XI. Availability of Construction Funds

Existing sources of revenue are not sufficient to provide the transportation facilities so urgently needed in the Twin Cities area. Areawide bonding authority should be granted to the Metropolitan Council to assist in accelerated construction.

A new, flexible source of revenue for urban transportation needs should be made available. This revenue could finance projects such as the following:

A. Special Highway Design Considerations -- In many cases the question of whether a certain highway design in a metropolitan area is accepted or not depends upon whether federal funds would be allowed for certain aspects of construction. This metropolitan area may wish to apply special design considerations in building certain freeways where federal agencies will not permit highway funds to be used. This could well include, for example, tunneling under Minnehaha Park or tunneling between Lake Calhoun and Lake of the Isles for a possible freeway in the future.

B. Accelerated Highway Construction -- Severe backlogs exist on certain urgently needed highway projects both for counties and for state highway needs in the metropolitan area. For example, expensive bridges are needed to connect the semi-rural counties in the southern part of the metropolitan area with the urbanized counties. Existing funding sources are totally inadequate for these projects. Also, a backlog of highway projects exists throughout the metropolitan area.

C. Transit Improvement -- Major capital expenditures are expected to be recommended by studies now under way in the Metropolitan Transit Commission. Current funding sources would not be sufficient.

D. Safety Considerations -- If this metropolitan area wishes to impose certain special considerations for safety purposes on its freeways beyond those which are applicable by current dedicated funds, then a source of revenue should be made available for this purpose.

The practice of financing transportation in the metropolitan area to date has been to dedicate certain types of funds exclusively to certain types of transportation. This practice should not be continued with any sort of additional revenue that could be made available for a variety of projects.

## XII. Constitutional Amendment

Currently the Minnesota Constitution severely restricts the use of transportation funds by requiring that revenue from gasoline taxes and vehicle license fees be used exclusively for highway purposes. Because of the working of the amendment, it is not clear whether these funds could be used for transit purposes, including such highway-related transit purposes as bus lanes on freeways. The Constitution should be amended to give the Legislature greater flexibility in using the transportation funds.

## XIII. County Highway Finance

State law currently is very specific on the apportionment of county highway user funds to the various counties. A particularly discriminatory part of this law is that which does not permit the total cost of certain county highways in the metropolitan area to be included in the determination of money needs, which is a major part of the overall apportionment formula. As a result, metropolitan area counties receive less from this fund than they would be entitled to. State law should be changed to improve the equity of apportionment of highway user funds to counties by including in "needs" the actual costs of construction.

#### XIV. Apportionment of State Highway Funds

Several questions have been raised about the current equity of the distribution of state highway funds to the various construction districts throughout the state. A key component of the distribution formula is the dollar "needs" which exist in each construction district. A statewide analysis of highway "needs" should be undertaken, with the analysis to include impact on state development goals and on local communities, in addition to traditional cost-benefit-to-highway-user analysis. There is a question whether the State Highway Department should handle analysis alone and whether the State Planning Agency should have a role.

#### XV. Metropolitan Highway District

Currently the State Highway Department divides the metropolitan area into two construction districts. If the metropolitan area is to be regarded as one unit for planning purposes, it seems logical to have the Highway Department merge the two districts, at least to the extent of having an overall coordinator for the two districts for the metropolitan area.

#### XVI. Basic Goals in Metropolitan Area Transportation Planning

Transportation facilities are inseparably linked to selection and achievement of overall metropolitan goals. Although the Twin Cities area has lacked a definitive determination of its goals in the past, the Metropolitan Council now is required by law to determine goals for the area by adoption of a metropolitan development guide.

As we reviewed the problems of transportation planning in the Twin Cities area we developed four general conclusions about the nature of good transportation planning. They are as follows:

A. Integration of transportation planning with total community development -- As this metropolitan area builds its transportation system, careful planning will be required to integrate that transportation system into the entire development of the Twin Cities area community. Decisions on urban transportation cannot be made without giving first and full consideration to the impact that these systems will have on future development and on the total human environment in which they might operate. "In today's world and even more in tomorrow's world, any urban transportation device which is designed to do no more than move people and products from place to place is a failure, no matter how magnificently it performs that function," said Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, in a recent speech.

In the integration of transportation into the community it is most urgent that detailed data on the costs and benefits of alternate possibilities be prepared. This data should encompass not only the elements usually measurable in dollars, such as the actual cost of construction, but should include reasonable means for injecting the intangible elements. These include the off right-of-way impact of noise, dirt, and frontage road traffic for which a measurement in terms of dollars may be quite difficult. These also include balancing metropolitan needs with local community concerns.

- B. Coordinated planning of all segments of the transportation system -- The assessment of the role of any segment of the transportation system, whether it be transit or highways, cannot be made independently. Our various transportation modes must not be mutually exclusive. We have to stop thinking of alternatives in the sense of one mode or another and start thinking of alternatives in terms of varying combinations of modes to meet overall transportation needs.
- C. Decisions by the metropolitan area -- The transportation plan adopted for the Twin Cities metropolitan area should be approved by policy-makers responsible to the public in the Twin Cities metropolitan area itself, since the transportation plan will serve this area.
- D. Ease of movement for all people -- An effective transportation system for the metropolitan area will not be one which makes it easy for only those people who have ready access to automobile transportation. The mobility of thousands of residents of this area -- in terms of opportunities for jobs, housing, education, recreation and cultural attractions -- is now severely restricted. These residents either have incomes which are too low, are too young or too old, or have physical health problems which deny them the mobility available to others by automobiles.

### COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

The Citizens League, concerned with the provision of additional transportation facilities to meet the demand of increased growth of the Twin Cities metropolitan area, assigned its Transportation Planning Committee the task of reviewing and studying the overall transportation planning activities in the metropolitan area.

The committee undertook the following:

- . To ascertain how and where decisions on location and timing of construction of highways are being made.
- . To examine the role of the state, metropolitan area, counties and localities in the process.
- . To consider whether the system of financing state, county or municipal highways is appropriate or adequate.
- . To review conflicting interests of communities between themselves and highway planners and to consider the scope and impact of social, cultural and other general community values in comparison with factors of an engineering or technical nature.
- . To study and formulate the kinds and nature of programs it may be advisable to undertake with funds that may be available following completion of the interstate highway program.
- . To review the relationship between highways and mass transit.

### COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

A total of 20 members participated in the deliberations of the Citizens League Transportation Planning Committee. Chairman was John Sullivan, a St. Paul lawyer. Other members were Bruce Blackburn, Roger Forbord, R. W. Henry, K. A. Hirschey, Warren Ibele, Jerome Julius, Raymond S. Lammers, Kenneth Lee, James Lindsey, Waldo Mareck, State Rep. Robert McFarlin, State Sen. Dean Nyquist, Robert P. Provost, E. P. Robertson, Frank Roubik, Allen I. Saeks, Daniel B. Ventres, Jr., George F. Weikert and G. Marc Whitehead. The committee was assisted by Paul A. Gilje, Citizens League research director.

### COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

The committee held its first meeting November 21, 1967. A total of 29 meetings of the full committee were held, most of them evening sessions. The committee first concentrated on obtaining extensive background information on transportation planning in the Twin Cities area. Lengthy meetings were held with officials of the Minnesota Highway Department, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Transit Commission, County Highway Departments in the metropolitan area, and municipalities. Among the resource people who met with the committee were:

John R. Jamieson, Minnesota Commissioner of Highways (now serving as deputy Federal Highway Administrator)  
James L. Hetland, Jr., chairman, Metropolitan Council  
Lester M. Bolstad, Jr., chairman, Metropolitan Transit Commission  
Charles E. Burrill, district 5 engineer, Minnesota Highway Department  
A. J. Lee, Director of Public Works, Hennepin County  
Eugene Avery, city engineer, St. Paul  
John T. Doolittle, Jr., executive director, Metropolitan Transit Commission  
Robert T. Jorvig, executive director, Metropolitan Council  
Robert C. Einsweiler, director of planning, Metropolitan Council  
Lynn M. Carlson, assistant commissioner, planning and programming, Minnesota Highway Department  
R. P. Braun, assistant commissioner, government and community relations, Minnesota Highway Department  
Deane Ankla, Ramsey County Engineer  
Carl Erickson, Washington County Engineer  
James Gabiou, Dakota County Engineer  
Erling J. Lundheim, Anoka County Engineer  
W. W. Fryhofer, Division Engineer, U. S. Bureau of Public Roads  
Herbert Mohring, transportation economist, University of Minnesota

In addition, several other resource people from many agencies provided assistance from time to time. They included Robert D. Owens, Donald Carroll, Lyle Hansen, F. C. Marshall, J. M. (Mac) Evans, Norman Osterby, Ralph Kipp, Ellsworth Johnson, Minnesota Highway Department; David Rubin, Metropolitan Council; Joe Klemenhausen, Hennepin County Highway Department.

At all times the committee received excellent cooperation from the staff personnel in the various agencies. Information requests were handled promptly and completely. The committee is deeply grateful for this assistance.

The committee also obtained the assistance of transportation officials in the Milwaukee metropolitan area -- Robert W. Brannan, executive director of the Milwaukee County Expressway and Transportation Commission, and Kurt Bauer, executive director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. Both Brannan and Bauer came to the Twin Cities to visit with the committee. The Expressway and Transportation Commission is charged with building all the freeways and bus transit facilities in Milwaukee County. The Regional Planning Commission is the official transportation policy body for the seven-county Milwaukee metropolitan area.

Committee members were regularly supplied with policy statements by the U. S. Department of Transportation in Washington, D. C. Members also received copies of testimony at Congressional hearings on urban highway planning, location and design. A member of the League staff spent two days in Washington last August talking with a number of transportation officials, including personnel in the Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Bureau of Public Roads, Urban Mass Transit Administration, and Bureau of the Budget.

During the summer a subcommittee of the full committee, made up of John Sullivan, Roger Forbord, Robert McFarlin, Allen Saeks and G. Marc Whitehead, met 11 times and prepared a 17-page draft of findings and conclusions which formed the basis for full committee discussion on recommendations.

## BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

### I. Future Transportation Demands and Impact

We have reviewed population growth forecasts in the Twin Cities area to the end of this century, slightly more than 30 years from now. We have reviewed the current transportation network, the projection of transportation demands in the future, and the importance of transportation facilities in the growth process of the metropolitan area.

In general, we find that the Twin Cities area is, in effect, only in the beginning stages of building an effective transportation system to move people and goods around this area in the future. The dollar investment required for good ground transportation facilities--transit and highways--is likely to exceed by a substantial margin the investment required for any other metropolitan services, including sewers, airports, parks and open space, and water supply. In fact, the transportation investment alone may exceed total investment in all other metropolitan services. In addition, the location and scheduling of construction of metropolitan transportation facilities may well be the most important factor in determining where in the Twin Cities area growth will take place. Specifically we find as follows:

A. Rapidly increasing number of trips (movement of people and goods) in the Twin Cities area--Between now and the year 2000 the number of trips taken on various modes of transportation in the Twin Cities area will increase from about 4 million a day to 11 million a day, according to transportation planners. These trip forecasts are influenced by:

1. Population--Population of the Twin Cities area is estimated to increase from 1.8 million to 4 million.

2. Increase in number of trips per person--The average number of trips taken daily by each person in the metropolitan area is expected to increase from 2.25 per day to 2.82 per day by the year 2000. This increase will be the product of two factors. First is income. Median family income in the Twin Cities area is expected to increase from \$5,800 in 1960 to \$15,000 in the year 2000. With the increase in income, people are expected to take more trips.

Second is the average space per dwelling. Under all possible growth alternatives metropolitan planners predict an increase in the average space per dwelling. Today the average is 7,200 sq. ft. in the central cities and 12,100 sq. ft. in the suburbs. In the absence of policy changes to the contrary the average for the entire area including the central cities is expected to be 12,200 sq. ft. in the year 2000. Under certain types of growth this average conceivably could jump to as high as 18,000 sq. ft. per dwelling. This increase in the lot size or, put another way, a decrease in the density of population, will also affect the number of trips. As dwellings are not concentrated close together, more trips will be required.

It is sometimes assumed that Los Angeles is more spread out than is the Twin Cities area. However, Los Angeles now has 7.5 million people in the same area that the Twin Cities expects to have in the year 2000 with 4 million people. So we are moving in the direction of having a far more

dispersed population than even Los Angeles.

B. Change in the nature of trips--Transportation planners forecast that demands on highways will increase faster than the increase in number of trips because of the following factors:

1. Longer trips--As the Twin Cities area grows, the average length of each trip will be longer. In 1958 the average trip was 5 miles. In the year 2000 the average trip length may be 8.38 miles, more than a 60 per cent increase in average trip length.

2. Fewer persons per car--With higher incomes, more vehicles per household, and a greater variety of places for a person to go, it is estimated that the number of persons per car on each trip will decrease from 1.6 persons per car in 1958 to 1.38 persons per car in the year 2000.

C. Massive expenditures of dollars for public transportation facilities--Meeting the demand for future trips will require expenditures of more than \$2 billion by the year 2000 in the Twin Cities area. This is for major transportation facilities such as transit, freeways, expressways and arterials. It does not include any expenditures for local residential streets or collectors. The magnitude of these expenditures can be seen when the \$2 billion is compared to about \$200 million for major sewage construction. Transportation will be about ten times as great in expenditures.

Although costs of public transportation facilities appear large when compared to expenditures for other public services, they make up a relatively small portion of total transportation costs. For example, there are about 900,000 cars in the seven-county metropolitan area. The annual cost of buying and operating a car is about \$1,100, according to the Bureau of Public Roads. Thus the total cost of buying and operating cars in this metropolitan area for one year only is almost \$1 billion.

## II. Transportation Agencies Serving the Metropolitan Area

A. Minnesota Highway Department--The Minnesota Highway Department has dominated the transportation planning and construction process in the Twin Cities area to date. The Highway Department is headed by a full-time commissioner appointed by the governor for a four-year term. The Commissioner of Highways legally is the individual who determines the exact location for all state highways. State law gives the Commissioner of Highways broad powers in planning, construction and use of funds. Construction funds which are made available to the state from the federal government and from Minnesota highway user taxes are given directly to the Highway Department without direct legislative appropriation. The use of these funds rests with the Commissioner of Highways. The Highway Department is responsible for those roads, and only those roads, which are specifically identified as state trunk highways by the State Legislature or the State Constitution.

Because the Minnesota Highway Department is responsible for most of the major thoroughfares in the Twin Cities area, we paid particular attention to the planning process for highways under its jurisdiction.



We found that in a very real sense the Minnesota Highway Department has "metropolitan divisions", within which the major proposals affecting the metropolitan area originate. The highway planning process in the metropolitan area is carried on largely through two district offices of the Highway Department, one in Golden Valley, which handles the western half of the metropolitan area, and one in St. Paul, which handles the eastern half. The key proposals on route location, design and programming are made by the chief engineers in each of these offices, with approval by the central office of the Highway Department. The district offices of the Highway Department maintain close liaison with municipal governments.

It is our understanding that a year ago a new position of metropolitan coordinator for the Twin Cities area, with responsibility for both Twin Cities area districts, was contemplated by the Highway Department. But this position has not yet been filled.

Although the decisions on route location, design and programming are decentralized, the Minnesota Highway Department central office has not decentralized its long-range comprehensive planning for the Twin Cities area. This has continued to take place in the central office. In effect, the Highway Department has not established a metropolitan division for this purpose. This has meant that the Highway Department's participation in the Joint Program has involved principally its central office staff responsible for long-range planning. The district engineers in the Highway Department have not been involved, at least officially.

In attempting to better understand the process of planning state highways in the metropolitan area, we prepared a chart listing the various steps in the process. In analyzing this chart we found a very unclear relationship between the comprehensive planning process, which is under the jurisdiction of the planning and programming division of the Highway Department, and the actual selection of routes and the timing of construction of specific projects, which is under the jurisdiction of the operations division.

We also found it difficult to find a common pattern of planning from project to project. For example, highway officials told us that the factors which are considered in determining construction (also called programming) differ from project to project, depending upon the nature of the situation.

One of the most difficult aspects in understanding the planning process is to ascertain at what times, formally and informally, the interests and concerns of other public agencies and private organizations is brought to bear. There are a number of required legal steps the Highway Department must follow, but a good deal of the influence on location, design and programming takes place outside of the formal public hearing channels. What this indicates is that highway officials are most receptive to ideas of interested parties in highway construction and that these interested parties can have a real impact on the final product. A problem exists because of the variety of ways in which this influence is exercised and the lack of formal procedures.

**B. County Highway Departments**--All counties in Minnesota have highway departments. In the Twin Cities metropolitan area the Hennepin County Highway Department is by far the largest. The Hennepin County Highway Department prepares

long-range plans as to its needs and also has evolved a highly sophisticated method of establishing priorities for construction. The Hennepin County Highway Department is the only county highway department in the metropolitan area building freeways. It is building county road 62 and county road 18 to freeway standards, and is planning a third freeway across the northern part of the county. County highway departments are responsible directly to their county boards of commissioners. County highways are divided into two categories -- the county state aid system and other county highways. State aid is given to each county based on a number of factors including the needs on its state aid roads. The State Highway Department approves county state aid projects before construction can proceed.

Many of the outlying counties in the metropolitan area have county highway departments with very important functions, but the degree of long-range planning and priority setting is not too advanced. We were unable to get specific information on long-range cost estimates for county projects in outlying counties. We also found in some cases that establishment of priorities still is based on the old idea of giving a certain amount of construction to each county commissioner in "his district".

Following are construction expenditures for county highway departments in the metropolitan area for the calendar year 1966:

Anoka:	\$ 950,603
Carver:	329,525
Dakota:	994,469
Hennepin:	7,149,390
Ramsey:	1,423,566
Scott:	237,732
Washington:	852,316

C. Municipalities -- It would be expected that municipalities within the metropolitan area would not be constructing routes which would carry large amounts of traffic from one locality to the next, but would concentrate on serving their own citizens. By and large this has been the case. Municipalities over 5,000 population receive municipal state aid funds for highways. These funds must be used on streets that are identified as the municipality's state aid system. The State Highway Department approves municipal state aid projects before construction can proceed.

The City of Saint Paul is a general exception to the rule of using the municipal state aid funds for basically local collectors and arterials. Using its state aid funds, the City of Saint Paul has built a freeway, Shepard Road, from the Mendota Bridge to downtown Saint Paul. It also has another controlled access highway, the Short Line, that is intended to connect Interstate 35E with Snelling Avenue in the future. Further, it has a number of other streets in the city that have been regarded as more serving an inter-municipal function rather than an intra-municipal function. Naturally, the extent to which a community like Saint Paul undertakes to provide major thoroughfares like this has an effect upon the overall thoroughfare needs for both county government and state government.

D. Metropolitan Transit Commission--The 1967 Legislature established the Metropolitan Transit Commission. It consists of nine commissioners, one of

whom is the chairman appointed by the governor. The other eight members are appointed by various political jurisdictions within the metropolitan area under a complex system of appointments. The result of this appointment process is that two are from the city of Minneapolis, two from suburban Hennepin County, one from Saint Paul, one from Ramsey County, one from Anoka and Washington counties, and one from Dakota, Scott and Carver Counties. The Transit Commission was established primarily for the purpose of creating and implementing a mass transit plan for the metropolitan area. Following is an excerpt from the law:

"The Commission, with the cooperation of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission or its successor in authority and the Department of Highways, shall develop a plan for a complete integrated mass transit system for the metropolitan transit area so designed as in the judgment of the Commission to best fit the needs of the area to be submitted to the Legislature at its next regular session after July 1, 1967. Such plan shall provide for and include the coordination of routes and operations of all publicly and privately owned mass transit facilities within the area to the end that combined, efficient and rapid mass transit service may be provided for the use of the public in the entire area. The Commission may designate a segment of the system planned as a pilot or demonstration mass transit project using, without limitation, new technology including airborne systems or traditional systems of evolved or modern form."

The Commission is empowered to acquire terminal facilities, maintenance and garage facilities, ramps, parking areas, or other uses related to a public transit system. It may use eminent domain except in the acquisition of privately owned transit companies. It can acquire privately owned transit companies but must use negotiation.

The Legislature noted in its creation of the Transit Commission the urgent need to relate mass transit and highway systems. A provision of the law states that the transit plan shall be designed, as far as practicable, to provide in combination with state highways adequate means and facilities of maximum attainable efficiency for public transportation to, from and within the metropolitan transit area and to relieve the congestion, traffic hazards and other objectionable conditions on state highways caused by a lack of adequate provisions for public transit. The Commission is instructed to use the engineering capabilities of the State Highway Department wherever possible.

Two major federally-assisted research studies are under way with Transit Commission consultants. One, a total cost of \$195,700, of which \$130,467 is in federal funds, is designed to suggest ways to improve the existing bus system in the Twin Cities area. This has been called the "Phase I" study. The other, a total cost of \$324,200, of which \$216,133 is in federal funds, is designed to explore the alternatives for a new system of mass transit for the Twin Cities area. This has been called the "Phase II" study.

The Transit Commission has purchased buses from two small financially-distressed suburban transit firms and is leasing them back to private operators. It currently is subsidizing express bus service from the downtowns of Minneapolis and St. Paul to the airport. The Commission is analyzing the financial procedures and condition of Twin City Lines, Inc., the major bus company serving the Twin

Cities area. Some informed persons close to Transit Commission activities believe the Commission will acquire Twin City Lines in the near future.

E. Metropolitan Council--The Metropolitan Council was established by the 1967 Legislature as successor to the Metropolitan Planning Commission. The Council is made up of 15 members, fourteen of whom are appointed by the governor from districts of approximately equal population and the fifteenth, who serves as chairman, appointed at-large in the metropolitan area by the governor. The Council is charged with the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive development guide for the metropolitan area which is to encompass, among other things, highways and transit facilities. The Council's predecessor, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, was a principal party in the Joint Program study with the Minnesota Highway Department and several other agencies. The Council is designated as the review body for federally-aided projects, where such review by a regional body is required by the federal government. This includes highways and transit. The Council also can suspend plans of special purpose districts, pending legislative action, if it finds the plans in conflict with its own.

In establishing the Metropolitan Council, the Legislature indicated it wanted more than just a regional planning commission. Further, the Legislature did not take the "council of governments" approach in setting up a regional body, but instead laid the framework for a truly areawide governmental organization. A proposal to make the Council directly elective by popular vote of the people was narrowly defeated in the House and Senate and is expected to be proposed again in the 1969 Legislature. The Citizens League and several other organizations support a directly elected Council.

### III. Transportation Planning in the Metropolitan Area to Date

Prior to 1962 the Minnesota Highway Department was, for all practical purposes, the agency responsible for transportation planning in the Twin Cities area. And until that time, transportation planning meant highway planning.

The Highway Department had recognized the Twin Cities area as a distinct planning entity for several years prior to 1962. In 1949 the first detailed study of traffic in the Twin Cities area was undertaken. This was superseded by a much more advanced study in 1958, the Twin Cities Area Transportation Study (TCATS). The studies of the origins and destinations of individuals in the metropolitan area undertaken in 1958 still form the basis of transportation forecasts today.

The federal aid highway act of 1962 approved October 23, 1962, included a requirement for continuing, comprehensive and cooperative transportation planning in metropolitan areas if federal aid for highways in these areas was to be granted. The specific language of that section is as follows:

"It is declared to be in the national interest to encourage and promote the development of transportation systems embracing various modes of transport in a manner that will serve the states and local communities efficiently and effectively. To accomplish this objective the Secretary shall cooperate with the states, as authorized in this title, in the development of long-range highway

plans and programs which are properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation, and which are formulated with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development of urban areas of more than fifty thousand population.

After July 1, 1965, the Secretary shall not approve under section 105 of this Title any program for projects in any urban area of more than fifty thousand population unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing, comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by states and local communities in conformance with the objectives stated in this section."

In the Twin Cities area, the Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Minnesota Highway Department in anticipation of this act had established earlier in 1962 the Joint Land-Use Transportation Planning Program. Other participants were the county engineers of the seven metropolitan counties, the planning departments of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and the engineering departments of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Personnel from the Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Housing and Urban Development assisted in coordination. The Joint Program was a voluntary advisory association.

The Joint Program represented one of the first attempts in the nation to involve the metropolitan planning agency and the highway building agencies in a common planning effort. There was no transit agency at this time, although in later years a representative of Twin City Lines participated. Joint Program technicians (principally the staffs of the Minnesota Highway Department and the metropolitan planning agency) developed sophisticated methods of forecasting growth and future transportation patterns. Generally, the Joint Program has served an invaluable function in gathering data about the transportation needs of the Twin Cities area and in testing alternative systems to meet these needs. The Joint Program has made a significant contribution to transportation planning in the Twin Cities area, and, despite some limitations, its importance and influence must not be under-rated.

Progress has been realized in transportation planning for the metropolitan area through the Joint Program. While the Joint Program has not solved the area's transportation problems, it has significantly contributed to raising the level of discussion on the crucial transportation issues this area faces.

In the summer of 1967, the Joint Program participants completed work on a Metropolitan Development Guide, which included a metropolitan highway plan for the year 1985. Technically, this represented the completion of the Joint Program activity, but participants immediately began talking about continuing the Joint Program permanently. Also in the summer of 1967 the Metropolitan Council succeeded the Metropolitan Planning Commission. The Council has published the Joint Program's Metropolitan Development Guide, but with a clear disclaimer that it wants to prepare its own, and that this guide is not official. Discussion about a way to continue the Joint Program was placed in the background during the early months of organization of the Metropolitan Council.

Early in 1968 intensive staff discussions got under way, with the old Joint Program Coordinating Committee (one staff representative from each of the participating agencies) developing a proposal for a continuing arrangement

essentially following the advisory, voluntary approach which characterized the Joint Program. This met with a counter proposal from James L. Hetland, Jr., chairman of the Metropolitan Council, that a so-called "troika" arrangement be set up, with the chairman of the Metropolitan Council, the chairman of the Metropolitan Transit Commission and the Commissioner of Highways serving on an equal basis as policy heads of the Joint Program. Since then various agency staff personnel have been negotiating intensively. One plan reportedly having staff approval of the various agencies late in November 1968 called for expanding the troika to include one county representative and one municipal representative.

A directive from the federal Bureau of Public Roads in May of 1968 to all transportation studies in the nation, including the Joint Program, stated that, in accord with previous instructional memorandums from the Bureau of Public Roads, every urban transportation study prepare an operations plan for continuing transportation planning. The memo was dated May 3, 1968, and stated that all studies now in the continuing phase, or about to enter the continuing phase, should submit their continuing operations plans for review and approval within four months. The four months deadline has now passed without agreement among the parties, but officials of the Bureau of Public Roads apparently are not yet about to cut off federal funds to this area because serious negotiations are in progress. Nevertheless, federal officials indicate they want agreement soon.

#### IV. Transportation Planning Nationally

The federal government has attempted to make it clear that it does not wish to dictate to any metropolitan area what kind of a transportation organization should be set up. According to Lowell K. Bridwell, Federal Highway Administrator, the organizational arrangement most frequently employed in the transportation planning process has been an ad hoc committee structure. In a sense the Joint Program Coordinating Committee fell into this category. Other arrangements, Bridwell said, include (a) legislatively established transportation agencies, (b) councils of governments or local officials and (c) regional and metropolitan planning commissions.

The Federal Highway Administration has regarded the urban transportation planning process as incomplete in each area unless it is tied to an effective program of project implementation and administration.

According to Bridwell, generally the urban transportation planning process has included a policy body and a technical body in each case. Federal requirements do not stipulate that the various transportation-building agencies be represented on the policy body in each area with a vote, but they do stipulate that the agencies be involved in the planning process.

A national conference on highways and urban development, sponsored by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the National Association of Counties, and the National League of Cities, in December, 1965, at Williamsburg, Virginia, produced a series of recommendations which have been

endorsed by national highway officials. Following are the final paragraphs from that conference report:

"It was the conference conclusion that:

"Local governments in urban regions should take active steps, if they have not already done so, to develop workable administrative mechanisms, such as associations of local governments, through which the continuing, coordinated planning process can be carried out in cooperation with federal and state agencies on a regional basis and through which the implementation of regional plans can be furthered.

"The development of such mechanisms will enhance the capabilities for participation in the continuing, coordinated, comprehensive planning process on the part of local jurisdictions.

"As one city official firmly stated, 'it seems to me that the state highway departments throughout this country have done a spectacular job of building the interstate and the intercity systems. The next big thing is in the urban areas and this will require a whole new set of decisions which we cannot expect, and should not ask, the state highway people to make. These are decisions which can only be made by local governments in urban and regional areas. It seems to me that one of the results of this conference should be that every metropolitan area should be told to form their councils of government, to get on with the job of providing as spectacular an urban system of freeways as we have statewide.'" (Underlining added)

The importance of each urban area determining its own transportation network has been a strong thread running through recent statements by top officials in the federal government. For example, Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, in a speech to the American Roadbuilders Association in February, 1968, said:

"First, that each urban area itself must decide what kind of a transportation system best serves and suits its particular needs."

John E. Robson, Under Secretary of Transportation, speaking before the American Transit Association in September, 1968, said as follows:

"I think we got to where we are now because our methods of making public decisions about urban transportation have been inadequate. Inadequate first because they did not sufficiently distinguish between urban and rural conditions . . . our urban transportation decision process has been inadequate, too, because decision making authority has been commonly fragmented among a crazy quilt of commissions, agencies, authorities, boards, officials and political jurisdictions . . ."

The planning requirements guide for urban mass transportation, prepared by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for purposes of implementing the Urban Mass Transportation Act, states as follows:

"Responsibility for transportation planning. Transportation planning should, wherever possible, be the responsibility of the agency carrying on comprehensive planning for the urban area."

The 1968 National Highway Needs Report, presented to Congress by the Department of Transportation, includes the following statement:

"Continuing urban highway improvement programs are of such crucial importance and so pervasive that inevitably they affect all parts of each area. Thus, future federal highway policy, whatever it may be, will have major impact on future development in metropolitan reorganization, particularly with respect to transportation. Federal policy can either stimulate or retard the trend toward stronger metropolitan organization, but even by inaction it can hardly be neutral. By encouraging the creation of metropolitan decision-making bodies, federal highway policy can reinforce, or at least not deter, other efforts, already operating in other functional areas (for example, water supply, sewerage, land use planning, air and water pollution control, and open space development) leading toward the strengthening of general-purpose metropolitan organizations."



## V. Advantages of the TRANCO Approach

In the establishment of TRANCO as recommended here, the committee believes that there will be an opportunity to clearly set forth a proper division of authority and responsibility between the Metropolitan Council, TRANCO and the operating agencies. By establishing these lines of responsibility it is expected that the lack of overall direction and overlapping of responsibility, which has characterized transportation planning to date in the area, will be overcome. At the same time it is expected that the organizational structure will encourage a free flow of ideas between the organizations in the formation of plans. The Metropolitan Council's powers should include the following, most of which it does not now have, to enable it to effectively control transportation planning and policy-making for the area: (1) Prepare land use plan and transportation goals or guidelines for the metropolitan area. (2) Approve long-range transportation plans as proposed by TRANCO, with authority to require TRANCO to make changes in the plans. (3) Resolve disputes on specific location and design. (4) Appoint members of the TRANCO board. (5) Approve TRANCO annual budget.

The establishment of TRANCO will assure effective policy control by the metropolitan area on a day-to-day basis. TRANCO's role should be as follows: (1) Prepare long-range transportation plans, within Council guidelines. (2) Determine the specific relative emphasis on highways and mass transit. (3) Supervise and direct preparation of alternative routes. (4) Approve location and design of highways and mass transit facilities. (5) Designate priorities of construction. (6) Establish construction standards. (7) Classify highways according to function. (8) Plan and regulate parking facilities. (9) Develop regulations for control of traffic on major highways.

The operating agencies, including the Minnesota Highway Department, the Metropolitan Transit Commission and the county highway departments, will continue to play an active part. Their role should be as follows: (1) Participate on a formal, continuing basis in providing technical assistance to TRANCO in preparation of long-range transportation plans. (2) Prepare detailed programming schedules. (3) Prepare specific engineering plans on projects. (4) Let construction contracts. (5) Supervise construction. (6) Maintain facilities. Following are specific reasons we favor the TRANCO approach over the Joint Program approach:

A. Places Areawide Transportation Decision-Making Where It Belongs -- Transportation planning and policy-making on an overall basis in the Twin Cities area is here to stay. Federal requirements call for a permanent organizational framework, not just a temporary committee which would be disbanded after completion of a study of limited duration. It also must be recognized that decisions on long-range transportation plans for this metropolitan area are not vague, idealistic thoughts about something too far in the future to really be concerned about. Despite the identification of plans as "long-range", they will be major policy decisions about the way this metropolitan area's transportation network will develop. It is at this point when critical decisions about whether to have a transportation facility in a certain general area are made. Such decisions are far too important to be left exclusively to technicians.

The type of transportation organization established now should be the type to exist for years to come. Under our proposal the Metropolitan Council--as the body responsible for making decisions about comprehensive metropolitan development--will control the implementation of its programs by its approval of transportation plans. The Council will have power and responsibility for determining the type of transportation system this area wants. At the same time our proposal gives TRANCO the very important policy role of handling the details of transportation planning and policy-making. The Council would not involve itself on a day-to-day basis with such important policy considerations as, for example, the exact location of a freeway. This will rest with TRANCO.

We cannot accept Joint Program-type approaches for transportation organization in which the Metropolitan Council has only one vote among many agencies. Such approaches place the Council in a subordinate position. We believe it would be terribly short-sighted if the Metropolitan Council were to be party to a permanent arrangement for transportation policy-making in which it had, say, only one vote among five governmental agencies and associations. The Metropolitan Council cannot be relegated to a position, for example, where the metropolitan association of counties, the metropolitan association of municipalities, the Metropolitan Transit Commission and the Minnesota Highway Department each has equal power with the Metropolitan Council and where any two of them, voting together, would have twice the power of the Council.

The Council, insofar as planning and policy-making for the Twin Cities area is concerned, is in a position above these agencies and associations. Any permanent arrangement which does not place the Council in this position appears to us to be fundamentally inconsistent with what the Legislature intended in setting up the Metropolitan Council. The Legislature created the Metropolitan Council precisely to get away from inter-agency policy arrangements in the metropolitan area. To take somewhat of a crude parallel, can we imagine a basketball team in which the coach and every player each has an equal vote in determining the team's attack? Quite clearly the coach makes the decisions, in consultation, to be sure, with members of the team. But he makes the policy.

B. Assures Meaningful Participation by the Transportation Builders -- We believe that road builders and transit builders must actively participate in the process of developing transportation policy. Although the responsibility of decision-making rests with TRANCO, the system will only be effective with the energetic participation of the operating agencies. Our proposal does not in any way mean to reduce the involvement of the existing transportation building agencies. The important thing to recognize is that their involvement would be where it belongs. Their technical assistance would be an absolute necessity for TRANCO and its planning.

C. Avoids the Problem of "Wearing Two Hats" -- With transportation policy carried out by TRANCO as a body subordinate to the Metropolitan Council the problem of a member of the policy body representing one of the transportation building agencies would not be present. Each of the agencies which participated in the Joint Program had first responsibility, and correctly so, to look after its own best interests, which might or might not coincide with the best interests of the area as a whole. Building a policy body out of representatives of the various agencies tends to diminish the prospect for a truly overall approach to transportation planning. Instead there is an amalgam of the various special interests.

Each agency would hesitate to take action offending another agency for fear of reprisal. Consequently, it is likely an "alliance" would develop between the representatives of the agencies, thereby further reducing whatever voice the Metropolitan Council would have. In fact, agency representatives should not be

expected to make policy decisions for this area. Another problem with the "two hat" situation is that of the time limitations imposed on persons who would sit on the policy body. If, as several of the proposals have suggested, the Commissioner of Highways, the chairman of the Metropolitan Transit Commission, and the chairman of the Metropolitan Council each sits on the policy body of the transportation organization, it is difficult to imagine when, on a continuing basis, these individuals could find time to devote to this most important project in addition to their other duties. Unless guarantees were provided to the contrary, they would undoubtedly end up sending substitutes to the meetings, thereby destroying the whole intent of the policy body. Each of them has schedules which are very demanding for his own field. They must have their own regular meetings with their own agencies. It is very unlikely they would have time to attend transportation coordinating committee meetings when needed or place high priority on attendance at such meetings.

D. Focuses Decision-Making -- Under various Joint Program-type approaches it is never clear where actual decision-making lies. Generally, each representative of an agency has to get approval from his own board. The Joint Program only made recommendations to participating agencies. The participating agencies then decided, on their own, the extent to which they wished to carry out the recommendations. For example, there was no commitment to follow on standards for freeway interchange spacing. These standards have already been extensively violated as the individual agencies have handled their specific problems.

Our approach assures that official decisions for this metropolitan area will be made. We find it hard to imagine an effective transportation policy body for this area that does not make binding policy. How can a transportation plan really be developed if it must be approved by each individual agency as well as the transportation policy body?

E. Avoids the Problem of Giving Every Agency "Representation" -- Even if we were to return to old Joint Program representation formula, many legitimate transportation interests would not be represented. Under the Joint Program, the seven metropolitan county engineers, the Minneapolis and St. Paul city engineers, the Minneapolis and St. Paul planning directors, the Minnesota Highway Department, and the Metropolitan Council's predecessor--the Metropolitan Planning Commission--were equally represented. If we expanded on this pattern we would have to add, legitimately, at the very least the Metropolitan Transit Commission, plus certainly some suburban municipal engineers and planners.

Most persons would agree that each agency should not have the same vote. But how would we weight the votes? How much more weight should the Metropolitan Council vote have than the Scott County engineer's?

Furthermore, whether or not an agency has "representation" on a policy body does not necessarily give it any greater voice than if the agency were involved on a technical staff basis. Some attempts at reconstituting the Joint Program suggest one individual to sit on the policy body to represent, for example, the county interests. How can one individual possibly represent, at the same time, the interests of the Hennepin County Highway Department and the Scott County Highway Department?

Our proposal not only avoids the complicated problem of determining what agencies should be represented but it also provides, as no Joint Program approach does, that in a sense everyone in the metropolitan area will be represented.

F. Assures a "Functional" Approach, Rather Than an "Agency" Approach -- Under our proposal the work program for transportation planning and policy-making will cover the important issues as seen by the policy body on their merits without concern for the impact on the agencies. If representatives of the agencies were sitting on the policy body, it would be logical they would try to make sure the work program included only those items they wanted to include. If federal requirements make them get into certain controversial areas the natural tendency would be to minimize wherever possible any involvement in the internal affairs of the various agencies. Each agency would have a different concern for different reasons. This would encourage back-scratching and thereby seriously hinder an effective work program that really would get at the critical transportation problems facing this area. We doubt, for example, that a meaningful attack on the question of priorities of construction could be made by such a policy body. The county representatives would be most anxious to protect their freedom, as would the Highway Department, and we might well find alliances developing to preserve the status quo or to prevent a real hard look at the critical issues, especially if they were likely to be controversial.

G. Assures Meaningful Participation by Policy-Makers -- Our proposal places policy-makers in control of the transportation planning process, with technical staff working under them. The Joint Program was primarily an organization of technical staff personnel. Participation by policy-makers was incidental or totally absent. Various Joint Program-type suggestions for succeeding the Joint Program seem to perpetuate this situation.

H. Provides Orderly Resolution of Highway Disputes -- Several urgently needed highway projects in the metropolitan area have been held up for several years due to major controversies about their location. Under our approach TRANCO would approve routes and locations for this metropolitan area. This would not mean that the individual agencies would not propose routes but it would mean that TRANCO and not each individual municipality will have the approval authority. Then, if a municipality still objects we would provide a single appeal procedure to the Metropolitan Council which then would make the final decision.

Furthermore, and to clearly understand how our proposal would unblock the road program, we would build into the procedure at the earliest possible date meaningful involvement of local interests in the planning of new roads so that the controversies which now exist when highway plans are presented publicly for the first time would be substantially reduced. TRANCO would assure that appropriate procedures would be set up to involve a variety of disciplines in addition to engineering in the preparation of alternative plans for routes. TRANCO would further assure that meaningful liaison be provided among local citizens, local planning staffs, local engineers, and the planning team on a specific route. As a result of such procedures, a route when finally approved will have had a good amount of discussion and give and take. An integral part of this early procedure would be the new two-hearing requirement of the Minnesota Highway Department. Under this arrangement one hearing would be held prior to the selection of the preferred route and another hearing after that route had been selected.

I. Assures Adequate Consideration of the Transit Program -- The comprehensive planning process would be dominated by the highway building agencies if each agency were represented on some sort of a transportation board. But with all the agencies in a subordinate position, then transit interests will be on an equal footing with the highway interests. One of the most important decisions to be made in transportation planning for the area is the split in ridership between private automobiles and public transportation. This is known as the modal split. It usually is the product of extensive computer work but very much dependent upon the policy decisions as to what is put into that computer program. TRANCO would be responsible for making this decision, which then would be carried out by the transit and the highway interests. A further role for TRANCO in the transit-highway issue is for it to clearly indicate what kind of a role each should play. One suggestion has been made that transit provide the radials serving the downtowns with highways providing the grid system. Such a division of responsibility, if sound, would not likely be made by a Joint Program-type organization.

The Joint Program was officially known as a transportation planning program. But the principal effort of the Joint Program has been preparation of a proposed major highway plan for the Twin Cities area. This plan, carrying the technical title "system 14", is still classified as a test network but is the product of several refinements. The key component of the plan is a 691-mile network of freeways and expressways for the Twin Cities area by the year 1985.

Although system 14 is basically a highway plan, the Joint Program attempted to use the most sophisticated techniques available to predict future highway and transit demand. Serving as a background for the forecasts was the fact that in 1949 about 26 per cent of the non-school trips were by transit, that this percentage had declined to 9 per cent by 1958, and was even less at the time the forecasts were developed. The currently existing pattern of low-density development in the Twin Cities area and an apparent preference to continue this pattern, the spread of residential, commercial and industrial growth in all directions around the central cities, the lack of any strong indication that the downtown areas of the central cities would grow substantially, the development of large suburban centers, and the fact that this metropolitan area has two downtowns plus the University of Minnesota as major traffic generators, did not dictate to the Joint Program participants any great degree of optimism for substantially greater transit ridership.

With this background and in the absence at the time the forecasts were made of any tested and available new forms of transit that would adapt efficiently to the Twin Cities situation, the forecast of some 6-7 per cent of non-school trips by transit seemed reasonable. This forecast does not mean that transit ridership will decrease. On the contrary, the absolute number of daily transit trips in the metropolitan area is expected to double from its current level by 1985.

Built into the Joint Program effort, then, was the assumption that development in the area will continue at a rather low density with employment dispersed, that the bus system as it currently exists will not be substantially altered in the future, and that no available form of mass transit could substantially increase transit ridership except, perhaps, at an unjustifiably higher expenditure.

Even though transit assumptions in the Joint Program, under the circumstances, may have been sound, the fact remains that the modal split was developed in an atmosphere dominated by the highway agencies and where there was no assurance that any assumed or tested transit system could be developed by a capable, responsible, and financially able agency. The public confidence in the product of the Joint Program would have been enhanced considerably if mass transit could have been given stronger representation. The acceptance of a modal split prediction for transportation planning purposes undoubtedly would be much more likely if it were developed by an agency with formal responsibility for both highways and mass transit.

In conclusion, it would appear that the Joint Program transit forecasts were not unreasonable, given the factors considered by the Joint Program. However, the Joint Program assumed, among other things, that transit would pay its own way; that parking charges, which can affect transit ridership considerably, would not be manipulated to stimulate transit ridership; and that access to freeways would not be regulated. But perhaps most important of all the Joint Program has not had the input from a transit organization. The establishment of the Metropolitan Transit Commission by the 1967 Legislature has changed this picture considerably.

The willingness and capabilities of highway technicians and planners should not blind the public to the real possibility that motorists, utilizing the most advanced highways now foreseeable, will encounter limitations and obstacles to the satisfaction of insatiable demands. Even now, many are inclined to irritation and complaint when they discover traffic density, road conditions and weather adversely affect their speed or time on the road. Even with the best of future highways, any such conditions may not be fully alleviated and indeed, in time, may be aggravated.

Those concerned with highway responsibilities need to begin educating the public that factors affecting the adequacy of highways, now and in the future, include: Density of traffic; dispersal of communities; adequacy of parking; costs of construction, maintenance, vehicle operation and time lost on roads; availability of land for unlimited highway construction; and impact on social, cultural and other community values.

The Transit Commission now has under way a major study on a new type of transit system for the Twin Cities area. This study is being undertaken separate from the Joint Program, although the consultant on the study is using much of the Joint Program data. The product of the transit study and its acceptance could have a major impact on the modal split (that is, the number of persons who choose transit and the number of persons who choose private cars) and affect the number, size, placement and timing of construction of freeways and expressways in the area.

It is becoming more and more unrealistic to talk in terms of highways and mass transit as mutually exclusive. From the standpoint of assuring that public transportation gets adequate attention, the distinction is entirely in order. For too long, highways have dominated the transportation scene. But, highways are facilities which can be used by private transportation and public transportation, which, of course, is transit. Transit is not just non-highway public transportation. One reason this distinction should not be made is that on

a national basis the definition of what constitutes a highway purpose is being significantly broadened. For example:

1. Exclusive or Preferential Bus Lanes -- Provided that traffic projections will show a certain level of bus usage in a future year, federal highway trust funds can be utilized for the construction of such bus facilities. Regulations to this effect have been approved by the Federal Highway Administration. Available funds for public transportation will be most difficult to find in the future. To the extent that funds already available and committed can be used, significant improvement in public transportation can be realized.

The Federal Highway Administration, in its memorandum to state highway departments on the encouragement of reserved bus lanes, points out that such action will greatly improve traffic flow on freeways, thereby improving the productivity of highways by moving more people. To justify public acceptance, probably some 120 to 180 buses per hour would be needed, although one bus per minute would be sufficient in terms of the number of people that would be carried to justify an exclusive lane.

2. Provision in 1968 Highway Act -- One of the provisions of the 1968 Highway Act passed by Congress provides for federal highway trust funds to be used for fringe area parking facilities which would serve as places where persons could park their cars and transfer to public transportation for the ride to the loop.

3. Milwaukee Bus Rapid Transit Plan -- The federal Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Milwaukee County, now is sponsoring a two-year study aimed at implementing a bus rapid transit system which will include a four-mile highway constructed exclusively for bus use in Milwaukee. The bus route would parallel Interstate 94. Other plans call for fringe parking facilities, bus terminals, and other structures needed for the success of this system. It is expected that the bus rapid transit system would relieve the highway of roughly 34,000 vehicles daily, thereby increasing the utilization of the highway.

4. Speeding up Traffic on Regular Streets -- Another new program authorized by the federal government in the 1968 Highway Act is one designed to improve the traffic-carrying capacity of local streets and enable traffic to move more quickly. One concept being discussed is to provide ways whereby buses could be given preferential treatment at semaphores.

J. Provides a Meaningful Role for Municipal Planning -- Once the corridors on future transportation facilities have been officially identified, a local municipality where a corridor is located will be given encouragement to make the proposal on the specific route location itself. We can think of no better way to prevent someone from the "outside" imposing a route location upon a community than to have that community itself make the proposal on the specific route location.

K. Calls for Legislative Action -- To establish TRANCO will require an act of the State Legislature. The legislative intervention is particularly appropriate, not only because the decision on transportation organization for the Twin Cities area should be made by the Legislature, but also it is important to clarify for the various operating agencies their roles in transportation planning. Is it the intention of the Legislature, for example, to have the Minnesota Highway Department determine where highways should be located in the metropolitan area? Is it the intention of the Legislature to have county governments build freeways? Is it the intention of the Legislature to have the Highway Department and the Transit Commission each prepare separate transportation plans for this metropolitan area? Is it the intention of the Legislature to have the Metropolitan Council play a secondary, passive role in transportation, the single most important metropolitan function?

L. Consideration and Protection of Community Values -- One of the critical problems facing the urban highway planning today is that many citizens believe community values are receiving inadequate attention. The transportation facilities must be interwoven into the whole total fabric of the community. Appropriate procedures must be set up to assure that this will take place. National experiments are under way in three major cities, supported by federal funds. In our metropolitan area many of the proposed freeways will go in areas where major impact on the whole community will be felt. Under TRANCO the appropriate procedures will be set up so that these values can be considered on a continuing basis.

#### VI. Municipal Approval of Highway Plans

For the last several years, one of the major obstacles to an orderly development of the urban highway program has been the veto power held by municipalities over county and state highway plans. The existing state law exempts interstate highways from the regular provisions of the municipal veto and provides for a way for the State Highway Department to move ahead even if a municipality does not approve. The Highway Department first is required to submit the issue to the Metropolitan Council and, after some hearing processes, may move ahead. On routes other than the interstate system the law states as follows:

"No portions of the trunk highway system lying within the corporate limits of any city, village or borough shall be constructed, reconstructed or improved unless the plans therefor shall be approved by the governing body of the city, village or borough before such work is commenced, nor shall the grade of such portion of the trunk highway system lying within such corporate limits be changed without the consent of the governing body of the city, village or borough."

This law has been, in effect, the only protection a local unit of government has had against the arbitrary actions by the State Highway Department. A municipality, dissatisfied with the design of a facility, can accomplish a modification with the understanding that it will approve if such modifications are made. However, within our metropolitan area, with some 130 municipalities located almost side by side, the action by one municipality to disapprove a route has substantial impact on others. In rural Minnesota, where one unit of government covers the entire community,



the problem is not as acute. For example, the effective movement of people into Minneapolis from the west along Highway 12 has been held up for several years over the dispute on the location of an interchange on Highway 12. The Village of Golden Valley refuses to allow an interchange at France Avenue. The City of Minneapolis refuses to allow one at Glenwood Avenue if France Avenue does not have an interchange.

A major problem with the present situation is that there is no way to assure a dispute can be resolved. If a locality disapproves, nothing happens until either the State Highway Department changes its viewpoint, or the locality changes its viewpoint. Further, the existing requirement encourages "blackmail" whereby a municipality may withhold approval on one project as a lever to accomplish an improvement on another project. Or, conversely, the Highway Department may refuse to carry out what the municipality wishes as a lever to obtain approval on another segment. Each segment cannot be handled on its own merits.

The differentiation of a trunk highway from an interstate highway in terms of approval is, as far as we know, unique in the nation. To the extent that approvals are required elsewhere, there is no distinction between interstate and other highways. The distinction in Minnesota could, it appears, have the effect of resolving the Highway 12 dispute, but probably only to the benefit of the Minnesota Highway Department. There is a good chance that Highway 12 from the loop to Interstate 494 will be made an interstate highway. If this takes place, then the local approval requirement will no longer apply, as it now does. There is no need to have different consent requirements apply to interstate highways.

A recent report to the Metropolitan Council by its Highway Local Consent Advisory Committee listed several examples of roadblocks which have occurred throughout the metropolitan area because of the local consent issue. That report also lists a number of projects which were held up because of this problem. The Local Consent Advisory Committee's recommendation to resolve these disputes has been adopted by the Metropolitan Council and will be submitted to the 1969 Legislature. Basically, this would provide for a panel of experts to resolve the disputes between a locality and the State Highway Department. The panel of experts would be selected from a list suggested by the Metropolitan Council.

Our proposal for the establishment of TRANCO treats the local consent issue in a totally different light. We believe that the State Highway Department and the local unit of government are not the parties that appropriately belong on both sides of a dispute if one happens to occur. That is, the location of routes within our metropolitan area is essentially a local decision and should be resolved locally. Under our proposal, the State Highway Department would not be proposing route locations. Actually, the proposal would come through TRANCO on behalf of the metropolitan area. This would follow extensive steps which were taken to insure local participation in the planning process to start with. If, after all these actions have taken place, the local unit of government still is dissatisfied with the approval of a route as approved by TRANCO then it should appeal to the Metropolitan Council, which would arrange for a final decision to be made. The Highway Department itself would not really be a party to the dispute.

## VII. Priorities and Programming

It is most important that the distinction between priorities and programming of construction be clearly understood. As we understand it, priorities are more general than programming. TRANCO should establish the priorities for construction of highways in this area. That is, it should indicate that a certain stretch of road should be built to completion before another is started. Within these general priorities, the various highway building agencies would work out the detailed programming schedules, whereby each project is divided into a number of different contracts which are let at different times. This will depend also on the funding which is available. The various agencies would continue to prepare their programming schedules as they have to date. They would be submitted to TRANCO for review as to their conformance to priorities established by TRANCO before they are adopted as the official programming schedules. Any attempts to build a project which does not conform to the priorities as established by TRANCO would be subject to a negative recommendation to the federal government for assistance.

TRANCO would be expected to develop a scientific method for rating projects as to their relative priorities. Such a rating system has been attempted by staff within the Metropolitan Council on an informal basis. Under this rating system, the certain proposed freeways were judged as to need by a number of different criteria. The criteria were given different weights and then the priority list was drawn up. Whether or not the criteria used were weighted properly is not known, but it is this type of approach which needs to be followed in this metropolitan area so that those projects with the greatest cost-benefit ratio according to metropolitan goals can be built first. We will undoubtedly always be faced with limited funds. The decision whether to build a stretch of highway in one part of the metropolitan area rather than another will have considerable impact on the timing of growth in these areas.

The Minnesota Highway Department is the main agency responsible for major highways in the Twin Cities area. It builds most of the freeways and expressways. The Hennepin County Highway Department is also building freeways. The Hennepin County Highway Department and the Minnesota Highway Department now are building, independently of each other, parallel north-south freeways through the western suburbs. The county is building County Road 18 to freeway standards, and the state, Highway 100. The need for two parallel freeways in this area in addition to one already built—Interstate 494—has been questioned by some planners in the Metropolitan Council, though highway engineers claim traffic forecasts show a need for both. Aside from the issue of whether both County Road 18 and Highway 100 need to be built as freeways, it is likely that overall ease of movement in western Hennepin County would be assisted if one of the two freeways could be built to completion first, using the total financing available to both. As it is, it will take five years or more to build each one.

## VIII. Functional Classification of Roads

This is a somewhat undramatic, but very important, aspect of urban transportation planning. Whether the State Highway Department, county highway departments or municipalities are responsible for jurisdiction over certain roads is largely a matter of historical accident. The urban extensions of the through routes in the

state are under the jurisdiction of the State Highway Department; the roads which traditionally were part of the rural county highway system years ago are county highways; and the balance are municipal roads. As our urban area has grown, certain county highways, because of their location, have become very heavy traffic carriers and are far more important than certain state highways. The same is true for certain streets under municipal jurisdiction. This is why the functional classification study is so important. The functional classification study needs to be undertaken by TRANCO and not by any of the existing highway agencies, because the product needs to have the respect of all agencies and not be suspect for advancing the cause of one against another. Following the study TRANCO can recommend to the Legislature the appropriate jurisdictional or financing changes that should be made.

In the Milwaukee metropolitan area the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, which is the transportation planning agency for that metropolitan area, has already completed its functional classification study for the metropolitan area, and now is in the process of assigning appropriate jurisdictions. Its transportation plan for the Milwaukee area pointed up the importance of the functional classification study in the context of overall transportation planning.

The Minnesota Highway Department for several years has been talking about undertaking a functional classification study throughout the state, but has always had higher priorities for other work.

The 1968 Highway Act requires functional classification studies be undertaken throughout the nation.

For several years there have been claims that far too many miles are classified as state highways than should be in Minnesota. In 1954 the Automotive Safety Foundation's report to the Minnesota Highway Study Commission, which was established by the 1953 Legislature, estimated that there were some 3,000 miles of rural trunk highways which were more suited to be county highways and should be returned to the counties. These roads averaged no more than 300 vehicles per day. In 1963 a report of the Minnesota Highway Department on 20-year Minnesota trunk highway needs repeated the claim that there were too many highways on the state highway system. That report suggested that up to 2,381 miles could be removed as state highways. Nothing has ever happened to change the jurisdiction over these highways. The allocation of state highway funds to construction districts is based on the 20-year needs of these districts, which include, of course, the needs on these state highways which really should be returned to counties. This tends to inflate the actual trunk highway needs of such districts. On the other hand, in certain heavily populated counties there are county highways which are carrying far more traffic and function far more as state highways than certain state highways do. They are not included in state highway needs and consequently the appropriate amount of state highway funds is not forthcoming.

#### IX. Development of the Urban Design Concept

Although some highway agencies may view with certain skepticism the emerging concept of multi-disciplinary teams working on freeway location and design, the idea has broad support today from highway leaders throughout the nation.

A. Bureau of Public Roads -- F. C. Turner, chief engineer for the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, in a speech to the American Association of State Highway Officials in December, 1966, called on highway officials to "act with renewed vigor and imagination in coping with new and emerging problems." He noted that there is the responsibility to provide cities with an adequate transportation system as well as other accommodations needed to make cities better places in which to live, work and enjoy life. He pointed out that the Bureau of Public Roads has developed a concept for the joint cooperative development of urban freeways simultaneously with provisions for other needed urban accommodations. "In such a joint development, the concept is not merely one of thrusting a new highway through a built-up urban area, but rather it is one of making a plan which would improve an entire corridor having multiple and complementary uses."

B. Comments by Alan S. Boyd -- Mr. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, has stated repeatedly in public statements that transportation facilities must serve the city. In a speech last February to the Automotive Service Industry Association he stated as follows: "I think we are going to have to understand that transportation must be carefully built into the basic design of the city, just as an elevator is part of the very blueprint of a building. It is a rare architect who designs a building and then tells the contractor to nail on some elevators as best he can. Yet that is precisely how we go about expanding and rebuilding our cities and suburbs."

"We are going to have to understand that cities are for people and so are highways and automobiles. And we have reached the point in most of our major cities where we can tolerate more freeways and automobiles only to the extent that they are fully integrated into the overall transportation system of the city as well as its overall pattern of life."

C. Comprehensive Route Selection Methods -- Our committee in its deliberations was made aware of a proposal in New Jersey to select a route for a new freeway designed to protect social values to the greatest possible extent and at the same time avoid excess cost of construction of the highway. The method was developed by Ian McHarg, partner in an architect and planning firm in Philadelphia. In arriving at the recommended location the method took into consideration topography, land values, degree of urbanization, residential quality, historic value, recreational value, agricultural value, wildlife value, water value and susceptibility to erosion. The most likely location for the road was developed by a composite of maps which showed the areas of greatest value in each case.

D. Experiments in Chicago, Brooklyn and Baltimore -- With extensive commitment of planning funds from the Department of Transportation, projects are under way in these three cities to develop a route location and design for major freeways that will effectively integrate the freeway into the total urban fabric. In Chicago, a crosstown expressway parallel to Cicero Avenue will be built. The two roadways of the expressway will be divided by a mile area within which extensive industrial redevelopment will take place. In Brooklyn the problem will involve a "linear city" that will be built above and along an expressway. In Baltimore the problem involves the best way to integrate a freeway, whose route has already been fairly accurately determined, into the entire community.

In all of these cases inter-disciplinary teams are involved. Highway engineers alone are not making the proposals. Furthermore, and equally important, the projects are not being left only to the technicians from whatever disciplines, but they are involving citizens of the area on an ongoing basis.

The whole idea of design concept teams is to effectively insert community values into the highway planning process, where such input has been inadequate in the past. This means that all possible steps will be taken to determine, before the location and design are fixed, what values need to be protected and what values are more important than others. It is difficult to identify exactly how this will take place, but it definitely means that technicians from a variety of backgrounds and citizens in the area affected would be involved in the process.

E. New Ideas in Urban Freeway Design -- Urban advisors to the Federal Highway Administrator have submitted a detailed report titled "The Freeway in the City" suggesting new principles to follow on urban freeway design. The entire emphasis of the book is to make the transportation facility complement the community and not ruin it.

XI. Traffic Movement, Parking, Right-of-Way Acquisition, Construction Standards

A. Traffic Movement -- The Federal Highway Act of 1968 provides a total of \$200 million nationally, of which \$3,279,000 will be allocated to Minnesota in fiscal 1970, for a special effort at improving the movement of traffic on local streets. This program is called Traffic Operations Program To Increase Capacity and Safety (TOPICS). The types of improvements most of which can be accomplished with existing right-of-way and eligible therefore for federal aid participation will be the following:

- Channelization of intersections.
- Provision of additional traffic lanes on approaches to signalized intersections.
- Construction of pedestrian grade separations or highway grade separations at complex interchanges or rail highway grade crossings.
- Installation of control systems to make traffic signal operations responsive to traffic conditions by diverting traffic from congested areas, for establishing part-time one-way operation, for reversing direction of traffic on selected traffic lanes, or for separate bus lane controls.
- Addition and upgrading of highway lighting, traffic control signs, pavement markings and signals or other devices required to facilitate traffic movement and increase the safety of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
- Development of separate traffic lanes for loading, unloading or transferring passengers at surface transit terminals and intermediate transit stops, including platforms and shelters within the street right-of-way.

- Development of truck loading and unloading facilities where necessary to facilitate traffic movement.
- Establishment of traffic surveillance systems including traffic operation data collection and analysis centers, where traffic flow measurements and accident data are continuously evaluated to identify locations where corrective action is needed.

Many informed persons stressed the importance of improving the traffic-carrying capacity of existing major streets in the Twin Cities area, which are not expressways or freeways, but which can be major traffic carriers. It has been stated repeatedly to us that certain freeways will not have to be built if traffic capacity can be increased on existing streets. As far as we know, we have not had a systematic areawide effort in the Twin Cities area to improve the capacity of existing major streets. TRANCO would have the responsibility to see that such an effort would be undertaken.

B. Parking -- The importance of parking in the overall transportation planning process has been stressed repeatedly in recent years. Developments indicate clearly that TRANCO's responsibilities must include planning for parking facilities. Following are some examples:

1. Metropolitan Transit Act -- The 1967 Legislature, in establishing the Metropolitan Transit Commission, gave the Commission power to undertake a large variety of improvements in the public transit system in this metropolitan area, including the construction of parking facilities. The nature and extent of parking facilities and where they are located undoubtedly have a significant effect on the demand for highway construction and on the effective utilization of existing highways.

2. 1968 Highway Act -- The 1968 Highway Act passed by Congress provided for federal funds to be used for fringe area parking facilities. These funds would require matching funds by the states, meaning that the Minnesota Highway Department's plans for this metropolitan area would have to include parking facilities. The likelihood that such facilities would be included in the plans would be enhanced if these plans are coordinated through TRANCO with the overall outlook.

3. Interstate 35W Parking Study -- A study prepared for the Minnesota Highway Department and submitted in the summer of 1967 discusses the feasibility of a parking ramp built over Interstate 35W in the vicinity of 46th Street in Minneapolis. The idea would be that persons destined for downtown would park their cars in this ramp and transfer to buses the rest of the way so that traffic would not be overloaded near the loop. The high cost of this facility probably is its greatest drawback at this time. Possibilities for additional parking facilities over freeways exist elsewhere. It is doubtful that the Minnesota Highway Department, by itself, would propose such improvements. One additional plan being talked about now is for a large parking ramp to be built over the Third Avenue North distributor route on the fringe of downtown Minneapolis.

4. Additional Ramps -- Plans are under way to expand substantially the number of parking ramps in the downtown areas of the central cities. Construction of these ramps has a great deal of impact on movement of traffic in the downtowns, the type of transit system needed, and the need for freeways. TRANCO needs to determine how to best coordinate parking with overall transportation decisions.

C. Right-of-Way Acquisition -- As the Twin Cities metropolitan area grows, demand for new or widened right-of-way will continue to exist. There has been no way whereby a revolving fund could be established in the Twin Cities metropolitan area to acquire right-of-way early, thereby avoiding the necessity of tearing down buildings later and acquiring right-of-way at much higher cost. A breakthrough has occurred, though, to some extent with approval by Congress in the 1968 Highway Act of a right-of-way revolving fund at the federal level, which will have a total of \$300 million available by mid-1972. States may use this money to purchase right-of-way up to seven years in advance of construction.

The availability of these funds will make it incumbent upon the Twin Cities area to find ways to identify the most critical areas for right-of-way acquisition. This cannot be just a product of study by highway engineers. It must intimately involve major developmental decisions for the Twin Cities area.

This requires, of course, that the metropolitan area determine the location of the future roads at an early date. This is particularly helpful in the areas where urban development has not yet occurred and, therefore, right-of-way acquired now will be far less disruptive of a community and less expensive.

D. Construction Standards -- Safety standards for freeways in the Twin Cities area are determined by the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) and the Minnesota Highway Department. AASHO is a national organization of officials of state highway departments which proposes design standards to the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads. Standards usually range from the minimum acceptable design to the preferred design. Highway engineers generally attempt to use the preferred design standards rather than just the minimum. However, they frequently are subject to pressures from local interests to modify the preferred design. Thus minimum acceptable design may be built into a freeway even though highway engineers may prefer the higher design. Currently there is no way whereby the metropolitan area can insist that the highest design standards be followed. TRANCO should be empowered to set standards that will not be compromised.

## TRANSPORTATION FINANCE

Transportation facilities are constructed from funds available from three major sources--the federal government, state government, and localities. Following is a discussion of each:

### I. Federal Financing

The bulk of state highway construction is financed from federal funds. Interstate highways are 90 per cent federally financed, and all other state highways are 50 per cent federally financed. In the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, Minnesota is scheduled to receive \$119,352,000 in federal aid highway funds. Total federal aid highway funds in the nation for that year will be \$5,425,000,000. Of this \$119,352,000 for Minnesota, \$86,641,000 will be for the interstate system. All of the revenues from the federal taxes on motor fuel, rubber, new trucks, buses and trailers, lubricating oils, truck and bus parts and accessories, and heavy vehicle use go to the federal highway trust fund and are used only for federal aid for highways. The highway-related excise tax on new automobiles is dedicated to general revenue and does not go into the highway trust fund. During 1967 the State of Minnesota contributed to the federal highway trust fund slightly less than \$110,000,000.

Although most of the federal aid to the State of Minnesota is used for state highways, a small amount is made available to counties. This is under a special provision of the federal law that provides funds for non-interstate highways classified as federal aid primary, federal aid secondary, and urban. A number of the federal aid secondary highways in Minnesota are under county jurisdiction. Federal aid, though, makes up a very small part of the total county revenues.

### II. State Financing

Voters of Minnesota approved a Constitutional amendment in November 1956, establishing a State Highway User Tax Distribution Fund. This fund includes revenues from two sources--the seven cents a gallon motor fuel tax, and the motor vehicle license fees. During the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1968, an estimated \$162,840,000 was received in the State Highway User Tax Distribution Fund. About \$106,000,000, or about two-thirds of the total, was from the motor fuel tax, and the balance was from the motor vehicle license tax. After certain administrative transfers within the state, about \$159,000,000 was left in the fund for distribution.

The State Constitution specifies how these funds shall be distributed. Basically, the distribution is 62 per cent to the trunk highway fund, that is, state highways; 29 per cent to the counties; and 9 per cent to municipalities over 5,000 population. The Constitution does enable a slight modification of this, however, by permitting 5 per cent of the total highway user funds to be distributed on a different basis. The Legislature has provided that this 5 per cent shall be distributed 70 per cent to the trunk highway fund, 21 per cent to the counties, and 9 per cent to the municipalities. The money in this category for counties and municipalities is to reconstruct and improve former trunk highways which have been turned back and are now designated as county and municipal state aid highways. Under the



procedure outlined, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the trunk highway fund received about \$99,000,000, the county state aid fund about \$45,000,000, and the municipal state aid fund about \$14,000,000.

The State Highway Department determines the use of the funds that are placed in the trunk highway fund. The State Highway Department is therefore financed from two principal sources--the share of the state highway user fund, and federal aid. In addition, the State Highway Department receives the income from drivers' license fees, interest on invested highway funds, five-eighths of the state's share of highway patrol fines, and some miscellaneous income.

The State Highway Department has the authority to determine itself how it distributes funds for construction purposes throughout the state.

The State Highway Department has divided the state into nine construction districts. It does not apportion interstate funds on an equal basis to each construction district since the interstate highway program is really a separate program. On all non-interstate highways, however, the State Highway Department has developed a very specific method for distribution of the trunk highway funds. This method is not spelled out in any regulation from the State Highway Department, but is a very key factor in the whole statewide highway construction program. The current formula for allocation among the districts is 50 per cent of the funds distributed according to each district's share of projected vehicle miles 10 years in advance on trunk highways, exclusive of interstate highways, and 50 per cent distributed according to each district's share of projected money needs 20 years in advance, exclusive of right-of-way costs. Under this formula, Districts 5 and 9, which make up the metropolitan area, receive a total of 34.7 per cent of the construction funds. Following is a chart showing the allocation of the trunk highway construction funds to the nine districts, along with the headquarters of each district:

District 1, Duluth	12.2%
District 2, Bemidji	7.2
District 3, Brainerd	10.3
District 4, Detroit Lakes	7.2
District 5, Golden Valley	21.5
District 6, Rochester	11.4
District 7, Mankato	8.6
District 8, Willmar	8.4
District 9, St. Paul	13.2

The Highway Department does not give exactly this amount each year, because of different construction schedules, but it averages out at this percentage over a period of a few years. Actually, the total metropolitan area is a little bit less than the total of Districts 5 and 9, because District 9 includes Chisago County as well as the metropolitan counties.

Total vehicle miles in the state in the year 1976 are estimated at 41,000,000 per day. This includes all trunk highways, including the interstate highways. In that year it is anticipated that the percentage of vehicle miles in Districts 5 and 9 will be 46 per cent. However, when vehicle miles excluding interstate highways are considered, the total drops to 28,000,000 vehicle miles per day, and the metropolitan area percentage drops to 41 per cent. It is this percentage on which the

allocations are based. State highway officials contend that, until the interstate highway system is completed, it would be inappropriate to include interstate highway vehicle miles in the projections of cost allocations, since interstate highways are separately financed. Upon completion of the interstate highway system, however, the apportionment would have to be based on total vehicle miles on trunk highways, including the interstate highways, for it to be equitable.

In terms of trunk highway needs as proposed by the various highway districts and approved by the State Highway Department, the most recent figures we had available are for both right-of-way costs and construction costs to the year 1986. On a statewide basis the Highway Department has estimated \$1.8 billion of trunk highway needs, of which \$514 million, or about 29 per cent of the total, are in Districts 5 and 9. Again, these are needs for trunk highways only, as needs are defined by the State Highway Department. Because the apportionment formula does not include right-of-way costs, they would have to be deducted from this, which would make the metropolitan percentage even less. The vast majority of total right-of-way costs are in the metropolitan area.

Two other aspects of the apportionment of state highway construction funds must be kept in mind. First, the State Highway Department has a special safety improvement program upon which funds for certain projects are allocated on a year-by-year basis without a specific percentage earmarked for each district. For the calendar year 1968 a total of \$3,714,500 was to be spent on the safety improvement program, of which \$1,770,500 was to be spent in the metropolitan area, or about 46 per cent. Another construction program which does not follow district boundaries on a normal apportionment is the maintenance resurfacing program of the State Highway Department, which involves overlaying many of the older highways in the state. During 1968, 1969 and 1970 the State Highway Department plans an expenditure of \$14,500,000 on this maintenance resurfacing program, with about \$1,328,000 earmarked for Districts 5 and 9, or about 9 per cent of the total.

### III. County Financing

Unlike the arrangements for state highways, the State Legislature has developed a very specific formula for the distribution of county state aid funds to the various counties. This formula is as follows:

- 10% distributed equally among the 87 counties, with each county receiving 1/87th.
- 10% in accord with each county's percentage of the total motor vehicle registration.
- 30% to each county based on its percentage of the total miles of county state aid highways in the state.
- 50% based on the percentage of each county's needs to the total needs of all the counties.

The legislation, further, is very specific as to what can be counted in the needs of each county. In the construction of county state aid highways in municipalities

over 5,000 population, only the construction costs of the center 24 feet of the street may be included in the money needs of that county, or, if it is a multi-lane facility, 12 feet times the number of lanes.

Based on this apportionment formula, the following amounts were distributed to the counties in 1968:

Total		\$45,244,948
Anoka County	\$	427,425
Carver County		374,265
Dakota County		557,876
Hennepin County		2,715,558
Ramsey County		1,248,555
Scott County		329,269
Washington County		<u>420,390</u>
Total Metropolitan Area	\$	6,073,338 (About 13% of the total in the state)

A considerable portion of county highway expenditures comes from a property tax levy. The property tax levy in mills for some outstate counties is higher than the mill levy in some metropolitan counties, ignoring the question of whether assessment levels are the same from county to county. This has had the effect of outstate counties claiming that the metropolitan area counties are not unfairly treated in the apportionment formula, because some of them are not levying as much as the outstate counties are.

#### IV. Municipal Financing

The apportionment of state aid funds to municipalities is in state law and provides that 50 per cent of the funds shall be allocated based on population and 50 per cent on needs. A total of \$14,287,775 was distributed in 1968 to municipalities over 5,000 population. In the metropolitan area, a total of \$10,027,599 was distributed to municipalities over 5,000 population. This is about 70 per cent of the total. Thus, metropolitan area municipalities receive a far greater percentage of the total municipal funds than metropolitan area counties receive from the total county funds. In absolute dollars we see that more dollars in state aid come to municipalities in the metropolitan area even though, on an areawide basis, counties have the needs for funds for highways serving broader purposes. When the total amount distributed to municipalities and counties is added together in the state, this amounts to about \$59.5 million, of which \$16 million, or about 26 per cent of the total, is given to the metropolitan area.

Municipalities also have access to the property tax for local roads. As a general practice, we found that, because of the amounts available for municipal state aid streets, a municipality is able to finance the total costs of improvement of its municipal state aid streets from its apportionment of state aid funds.

## V. Transit Financing

The 1967 Legislature imposed a one dollar per vehicle wheelage tax on vehicles in the seven-county metropolitan area to be used by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. This yields about \$900,000 per year. In addition, the Transit Commission is empowered to float revenue bonds. The Transit Commission does not have a property tax levy, although it would be empowered to impose a levy in the amount of the wheelage tax if the wheelage tax were ruled unconstitutional.

## VI. Future Dollar Needs for Metropolitan Area Transportation

We have reviewed the cost estimates of future transportation construction needs in the Twin Cities area and have discussed these needs with representatives of the Minnesota Highway Department, county highway departments, municipal governments, the Metropolitan Transit Commission and the Metropolitan Council.

Because of the uncertainty surrounding many of the estimates, and the outright lack of estimates in other cases, an accurate assessment of the needs and the adequacy of present financing levels to meet these needs is not possible. Very rough estimates prepared by the Joint Program (the cooperative effort of the Metropolitan Council and the Minnesota Highway Department) show construction and right-of-way costs and the major highway network only--freeways, expressways and arterials--on the order of \$2 billion to the year 2000 in the metropolitan area. It is not possible at this time to estimate the capital costs of transit in the Twin Cities area. Consultants' studies have just begun. Nevertheless, informed transit officials have indicated to us that costs up to \$1 billion for transit are possible. Undoubtedly, the extent to which transit facilities are constructed will reduce overall highway costs somewhat. But it appears reasonable that total construction needs of major ground transportation facilities in the Twin Cities area to the year 2000 will be well in excess of \$2 billion.

Our review indicates several problems exist in financing transportation construction in the Twin Cities area. They include the following:

A. State Highway Finance -- Based on certain assumptions, the long-term outlook for meeting state highway finance needs in the Twin Cities area is much better than the short-term outlook. If the current annual expenditure for both interstate and regular trunk highways is maintained substantially close to the present level, it appears as if an estimated \$1.8 billion in construction needs throughout the state (\$514 million in the metropolitan area) to the year 1986 can be met.

There are four assumptions behind this conclusion:

1. The major portion of the federal aid which is now earmarked for the interstate system will be allocated for other major state highways when the interstate system is completed about 1975. If this does not take place, the funds earmarked for non-interstate highways, now running about \$20 million a year in the metropolitan area, will not begin to be sufficient.

2. The state highway "needs" for the Twin Cities area are not greater than the amounts estimated by the State Highway Department. This issue may be very real. The State Highway Department has built into the future needs forecast for the Twin Cities area the fact of anticipated increase in traffic volume. However, not built into the needs forecast are other factors which the Twin Cities area may consider to be needs. For example, the State Highway Department does not include the acquisition of excess right-of-way for certain construction or esthetic purposes. Or, for example, tunneling under certain parks may be regarded as a "need" in the Twin Cities area but not from the Highway Department's standpoint. Certain parking facilities or exclusive bus lanes may also be part of needs. A change in determination of needs can affect cost estimates substantially. We were informed, for example, that new national safety standards had the effect of increasing overall construction costs by 13 per cent.

3. Increasing costs of highway construction due to inflation will be offset by normal growth in highway user revenues. This has been the case in recent years, but inflation may rise faster. These could be offset by increasing the rates on highway user taxes.

4. Highway maintenance costs will not bite into the highway construction dollar to any greater degree than they do today. This is the current expectation of maintenance officials in the State Highway Department.

On a short-term basis, the prospects of adequate financing for highways in the Twin Cities area are dim. A substantial portion of the needs in the Twin Cities area, about one-half of the total, is backlog which should be built today, not as late as 1986.

The formula for distribution of funds among the state highway construction districts has certain defective aspects:

- There is no way whereby needs in one district can be rated on a priority basis with needs in another district, with funds allocated accordingly. Priorities are set only within each district.
- About 3,000 miles of state highways, which should not be classified as state highways because of low traffic volume and limited purpose, are included as part of the state network for which needs are determined. When included in the state highway needs formula they tend to inflate needs in certain districts at the expense of others.
- In some construction districts major county and municipal highways are serving, in effect, as "state highways" because they are heavy carriers of traffic. But the dollar needs of these highways cannot be taken into consideration because they are not, legally, state highways. Thus the needs in these districts are less than they should be, thereby deflating the needs in these districts and giving a financial advantage to other districts.

- Only travel on non-interstate highways is counted in the determination of each district's projected vehicle miles. This may be equitable until the interstate system is complete, but not afterwards. Interstate highways handle a greater percentage of vehicle miles in the metropolitan districts than outstate. Also, a significant portion of the vehicle miles in the metropolitan area occurs on major routes which are not state highways. These cannot be counted as part of the vehicle miles in the metropolitan area.

Allocation formulas should be judged primarily on the extent to which their application engenders a distribution of funds which will provide the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people at the least possible cost. Admittedly, total benefits are not easily and accurately determined, but every attempt should be made to expand cost-benefit analysis in the planning and programming process by quantifying total expected benefits of alternative construction expenditures and relating such benefits to the respective costs of each.

Acceleration of the general highway program in the Twin Cities area through some supplemental source of funding is not now possible. Some municipalities have obtained special bonding authority to accelerate certain projects, but there is a growing reluctance to allow this to continue on a municipal basis because of its effect on the construction schedules elsewhere in the area. This problem would not exist, though, if there were a special bonding program for accelerating construction throughout the area.

B. County Highway Finance -- Highways currently under the jurisdiction of county highway departments in the Twin Cities area make up a significant portion of the major thoroughfares which service the area. It is difficult to arrive at an estimate of county highway needs for the future. As far as we could determine, the Hennepin County Highway Department is the only department in the seven-county area which has prepared detailed cost estimates for the future. These estimates are that a total of \$222 million in construction would be needed in Hennepin County between 1969 and 1985. Hennepin County has about one-half of the population of the metropolitan area. If we were to assume that similar cost figures would total at least that much in other counties, we could say that the total county expenditures for highways to the year 1985 would be in the vicinity of \$444 million, double that of Hennepin County.

County highways in the metropolitan area are currently financed basically from two sources--the property tax and the highway user fund--with most of the financing coming from the property tax. In 1966, out of a total of about \$21 million in county highway expenditures in the metropolitan area, only \$5.8 million was financed by highway user taxes.

Although county highway departments have not projected their future needs and costs to the extent and detail the Minnesota Highway Department has, it is totally unrealistic to expect that county governments will come close to meeting their highway construction needs under present funding circumstances. If additional state highway user aid is not made available, and if needs are to be met, the only other solution will be to increase property taxes.

C. Municipal Highway Finance -- The state aid to municipalities is reserved for major municipal streets only. It is intended for both construction and maintenance. Municipalities may supplement their construction funds with local property tax revenue. The municipal state aid roads in Minneapolis and St. Paul are financed almost exclusively out of the revenue from state aid. It would appear that the present level of state funding for major municipal streets is not out of line with needs.

D. Transit Finance -- Transit construction needs in the area have not yet been specified, so it is not possible to know the magnitude of dollars required. In any event, it is unlikely that the wheelage tax, at its present rate, will finance much more than administrative costs of the Transit Commission, some subsidies of bus operations, and a limited amount of other improvements. Either another source of revenue or additions to the wheelage tax will be necessary. The Transit Commission does have revenue bond authority, but it is unrealistic to expect major transit expenditures to be financed from the fare box. Such revenues are needed to defray operation and maintenance costs.

E. Post-Interstate Program

The overall direction of financing the transportation network developed for the Twin Cities area will be deeply affected by decisions made in Congress in the next few years on what type of federal program will be undertaken following completion of the interstate highway program, about 1975. The vast majority of funds now expended for highways in Minnesota are for the interstate program. Unless Congress uses the tax revenue now going to the interstate program for other purposes, substantial amounts of dollars will be available at that time. To get an idea of the magnitude involved, we can think of the great amount of construction which has taken place annually in Minnesota since 1956 and, how on an annual basis, funds to construct an equal amount will be available upon completion of the interstate program.

Influential lobbies in Washington, particularly the American Association of State Highway Officials, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties already appear in basic agreement on certain general outlines as to what policies Congress should follow. Running through all proposals is the establishment of some sort of federal aid urban network. TRANCO should lay the foundation for the appropriate use of these funds in the Twin Cities area after the completion of the interstate program.

Proposals from the three lobby groups and statements made by Department of Transportation officials appear to indicate that an unwarranted distinction is being made in urban areas between so-called state primary routes and other major urban highways. According to this thought, state primary routes would not be part of the federal aid urban system and would continue to be chiefly the responsibility of the State Highway Department. In our metropolitan area, if this were to be the case the vast majority of our major urban roads could be classified as part of the state primary system. It seems to us that the appropriate procedure to follow would be to establish a federal aid urban system which included all major routes in a metropolitan area which appropriately make up the metropolitan thoroughfare system, regardless of what jurisdiction is responsible for them.

Influential highway lobbies in Washington are laying a foundation to assure that, however the post-interstate funds are distributed, they will go exclusively for highway purposes. Claims of a major backlog in highway construction are being made to justify this preservation of the exclusive use of the funds for highways. At the same time, it cannot be ignored that major expenditures for mass transit will be needed in many metropolitan areas. It frequently is claimed that all highways are paid for exclusively by the highway users, but this is a fallacy. Substantial property tax dollars go into the building of major highways in Minnesota. The vast majority of expenditures for county highways, for example, come from property taxes.



APPENDIX  
(See Page 9)

The TRANCO-Council Relationship

One possibility for transportation planning and policy-making would be to eliminate TRANCO and place total responsibility directly in the Metropolitan Council.

We favored the TRANCO approach, on the merits, for the following reasons:

-- The job is too big for the Council to handle totally by itself in addition to its other duties. The major responsibility of the Council is preparation of an all-encompassing land use plan, requiring a large amount of staff input and tough political decisions by the Council about public and private land uses and the way they can be developed. A major part of this effort will be the definition of transportation guidelines, which can become more specific as the years go by.

With this major assignment, we cannot envision that the Council also would take on the multitude of specific highway functions such as we have proposed for TRANCO in this report. The Metropolitan Council would get bogged down on the specifics of route location questions, for example. Furthermore, some of the urgently needed transportation questions would not even be asked. The Council would not be expected to devote much time, for example, to the critical issue of functional classification of highways.

It is conceivable the Metropolitan Council could hire enough staff personnel to handle the duties, but this would seriously diminish effective policy control over transportation decisions. The decisions would be made more and more by the professional staff, rather than the policy-makers.

-- The Metropolitan Council, while not being bogged down, will retain control over the transportation elements critical to metropolitan development. It will approve the transportation corridors, that is, the general areas about ½-mile wide within which a transportation facility will be located. And it will approve whether construction takes place in one corridor before another. Thus, the Council will decide whether freeways are built in the southwest diagonal corridor, the northwest diagonal corridor and the Cedar Avenue corridor in Minneapolis. If any are to be built, the Council will approve the priorities of construction. But the Council will not, for example, decide the details of whether the southwest diagonal goes over railroad tracks or into the side of a hill. That detail, too important to be left solely to engineers, will be decided by TRANCO.

-- The TRANCO approach is being made in the context of discussions now under way in which three levels of responsibility are formally acknowledged: the Metropolitan Council, the operating agencies and a transportation planning body in between. There is a possibility that a framework placing the Council in a very weak position will be established. One plan under intensive discussion would create a transportation planning body with representatives from five agencies, each with one vote. The

five agencies would be the Council, the Minnesota Highway Department, the Metropolitan Transit Commission, the Metropolitan Inter-County Council, and the Metropolitan Section of the League of Minnesota Municipalities. The Council would have only one vote in five, and could easily be outvoted by the others. Our proposal for TRANCO appropriately places the Council where it belongs, in overall control, but with a body specifically responsible for transportation planning serving under it.

-- There is a great deal of tension between the generalist planners in the Metropolitan Council and the transportation planners, both highways and transit. Transportation planners, supported by powerful political forces, strongly resist being subservient to the generalist planners. TRANCO effectively prevents either type of planners from being subservient to the other. It will have a staff of transportation planners, but it will be cognizant of the generalist planners' interests and perspectives. The powerful political forces supporting the transportation planners would not go along with any unilateral decision to give the Metropolitan Council complete authority.