

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT



**'WHO WILL
HELP US
GET
ACTION?'**

**A Proposal to Answer the Appeal for Political Leadership in Solving
the Problems Confronting the City of Minneapolis**

"WHO WILL

HELP US

GET

ACTION?"

A Proposal To Answer the Appeal for Political Leadership
in Solving the Problems Confronting the
City of Minneapolis

Approved

by the

Board of Directors of the Citizens League

April 25, 1969

Prepared

by the

Minneapolis Planning and Development Committee
James L. Weaver, Chairman

INTRODUCTION

The forces of change are bearing down remorselessly on the city of Minneapolis. The age and income structure of its population is changing . . . with fewer families in their prime working years and relatively more individuals that are elderly and of low income. Its economy is changing . . . with traditional industries such as warehousing and milling disappearing, and more service-oriented business appearing. Its tax base is changing . . . with the downward revaluation of obsolete property, and demolitions, and tax-exempt additions tending to offset the new construction. Its school system is changing . . . with buildings being demolished and relocated, with new approaches entering the curriculum, and a whole new relationship coming between the administration and the community. Its land uses are changing . . . in a combination of public and private redevelopment. Issues, finally, that dominated the city's politics only a few years ago have now almost disappeared . . . to be replaced by issues of social policy almost totally new to city government.

Minneapolis has been making an aggressive effort to keep pace with these changes. Urban renewal has been pushed hard, both for the central commercial and for the older residential areas. Replacement programs have been begun for the major, deteriorating public facilities: schools, fire stations, sewers, streets. Public housing has been provided for the elderly, and now for low-income families, on scattered sites, city-wide. The planning effort has been expanded in a major way. Much more aggressive use has been made of federal assistance. The results have been impressive, and have brought the city--deservedly--national commendation.

But the city recognizes, at the same time, that the problems have not been "solved". The fundamental changes at work in Minneapolis continue . . . and, if anything, accelerate and intensify. Issues are more complex, and more explosive. Projects are increasingly expensive. There is no resting on the accomplishments of the past. Everyone concentrates on the problems that still lie ahead.

Of all the changes made, some of the most significant have been in the city government itself. Since about 1965 the City Council has moved rapidly to build a strong central management agency . . . partly on its own motion, and partly by seeking action by the Legislature. The staff of the Coordinator consisted of about 4 professionals in 1965: Today it consists of more than 35. As a consequence, Minneapolis has been able to integrate its program better, and to take fuller advantage of federal programs--as in the Pilot City and Model Neighborhood programs.

The need for change continues in the organization of city government, as in the city itself. The changes in the government are, in fact, critical . . . since these determine the speed and effectiveness with which the physical, financial, social and other changes can be made.

The important step that needs to be taken in city government next . . . with the strengthening of professional management well under way . . . is the strengthening of policy leadership.

This report examines in detail the problems facing Minneapolis . . . and the very difficult policy decisions which will soon have to be made. It also reviews in depth the expanded program of planning aimed at providing solutions to these problems. Its central conclusion is that, if planning is to be effective, and if decisions are to be made on schedule, there must now be developed some clear center

for policy initiative and political leadership within the city government. We can no longer rely . . . city government should not want to rely . . . on pressures from the outside, or on the presence of impending crisis.

Just this kind of identifiable, effective leadership in pressing for decisions is now being sought, in Minneapolis, by countless groups and organizations--representatives of neighborhoods, of business, of minority groups--that have sprung up in recent years in response to the changes taking place, or being sought, in the city. They want to know, "What is the present city policy?" "Where do we go with our proposals?" "Who can put them before the City Council, and get decisions made?"

Currently, no such position of policy leadership exists. Nor is it being developed. *Rather, the potential for leadership is in the process of fragmenting among at least three offices: the office of Mayor, the office of Council President, the office of Coordinator.* There are three key elements of leadership: information and the resources to develop proposals; a seat at the center of power and decision-making, with a real ability to press for action; and, above all, the political accountability to all the people of the city which establishes the responsibility to lead. *The critical need, now, is to pull together these fragments . . . these essentials . . . into a single office.*

It is no criticism of the individuals now in city government that they have not so far built such a leadership office. They have inherited a framework of government designed for the relatively simple time when the city was building . . . not for the enormously controversial time when the city is re-building. Only recently has the need for this change been apparent.

Now, however, the need is urgent. *And there is, just now, a unique opportunity to make the change.* This issue of political leadership arises at a moment when both of the existing policy leadership posts--the posts of Mayor and of City Council President--are becoming vacant. An opportunity exists to merge these two offices, which may not present itself again for many years. *Action is needed, and is possible, this spring.*

This report lays out both the case for, and the method of, accomplishing such a merger. We believe it is a sound and a realistic proposal for developing a center of responsible political leadership in city government. It will not, in some respects, be an easy change for the City Council to support . . . for it involves the creation of an office designed to press the Council, on occasion, into controversies it would find more comfortable to avoid. But we believe we have demonstrated that just such leadership is essential to sound and speedy action on the city's problems.

It may be said that Minneapolis is doing well enough, by comparison with other major cities. It is our belief, however, that Minneapolis will choose to be measured not by the situation of New York, or Chicago, or Boston . . . but by its own standards of what its people want the city to become. We are convinced that its residents--and their elected representatives--will prefer, upon consideration, to be moved not by crisis, but by vision.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Minnesota Legislature take the initiative, and the City Council encourage and support, efforts to develop an elected, informed, responsible leader and policy spokesman for the City of Minneapolis.

We specifically recommend that the Legislature activate this issue by passing special legislation providing for:

1. A merger of the office of President of the City Council and the office of Mayor, and creation of a politically responsible leadership office called the Mayor of Minneapolis and President of the City Council. This office should have all of the present powers and duties of the existing offices, preside at City Council meetings, and have all of the rights of a member of the City Council except the right to vote.
2. A requirement that the citywide responsible leader present an annual message to the City Council identifying the problems of the city and his proposals to meet them.
3. A requirement that the citywide leader present to the City Council, with his comments, the proposed budget prepared by the Coordinator.
4. Designation of the politically responsible leader as the official policy spokesman of the city.
5. A change in the term of office of the four "citizen" members of the Planning Commission to terms which are coterminous with the office of the citywide leader.
6. Submission of all actions of the City Council, except those pertaining to its rules and operation, to the politically responsible leader to be subject to his review and approval or veto.
7. Designation of the Vice President of the City Council, who is elected by the Council, to act as the politically responsible leader in his absence.

We recommend that the City Council:

1. Support the recommended legislation this spring which would build upon the improvements in organization of Minneapolis government already begun by the City Council.
2. Increase the staff assistance to the politically responsible leader beyond that presently provided to the existing offices to enable him to perform his assigned responsibilities. Insure that, in addition to the right of access to all information to which any member of the City Council is entitled, he be involved in the early discussion of all proposals and policies.

3. Adopt a program budget and continue to assign additional responsibility to the office of the Coordinator in the coordination and preparation of programs, thereby building upon the recent and proposed improvements in the budget process and the management of services.
4. Publish alternative proposals and provide for public hearings at various steps in the budget process, with adequate notification of these through at least the regular public media to assure that all alternatives made are visible to all citizens.
5. Provide that the citywide leader present the reports and proposals of the Planning Commission to the City Council and assure consideration of the long-range planning proposals and the recommendations of the Planning Commission.
6. Establish a separate Board of Adjustment with provision for Planning Commission comment on requested variances to relieve the Planning Commission of part of its workload and enable it to concentrate on long-range planning.
7. Submit all public improvements to the Planning Commission for their review as early as possible, but at least before they are reviewed by the Capital Long-Range Improvements Committee (CLIC) or any capital budget review body.
8. Review the capital budgeting process, the role of CLIC and its relationship to the Planning Commission for closer coordination.
9. Encourage departments and independent boards to develop policies and standards setting forth their service plans.

We recommend that the City Planning Commission:

1. Be primarily concerned with the long-range comprehensive planning program and its development by providing direction to the City Council and the planning staff through budget requests and the adoption of work programs.
2. Adopt a set of procedures for handling a wider range and volume of public improvement projects to effectively exercise the power of mandatory referral.
3. Encourage all departments and independent boards to develop and adopt a set of policies and standards, with the cooperation of the planning staff, which can be used in the review of projects and the development of the comprehensive plan.
4. Continue to streamline the operation of the Planning Commission by delegating particular areas of concern to committees and the staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A Statement of the Problem:	
Policy Leadership Is Essential for Policies and Decisions To Meet Present and Future Problems	1
Identifiable Leadership Essential for Effective Planning.	11
Discussion of Recommendations.	23
Work of the Committee.	49

POLICY LEADERSHIP IS ESSENTIAL FOR POLICIES AND DECISIONS
TO MEET PRESENT AND FUTURE PROBLEMS

Minneapolis faces serious problems.

Minneapolis, as a built-up, aging center in a growing metropolitan area, is faced with many serious problems. These problems are associated with the increasing age, deterioration and obsolescence of its structures; the changes in its population including the moving out of the city of its middle-income families and an increase in the number of low-income, minority and elderly people; and the impact of the growth of population and economic activity in the metropolitan area on the city. The resulting problems of blight, loss of job opportunities, traffic congestion, decline in neighborhood commercial services and the social unrest, are all apparent. They combine to affect the lives of all persons living in the metropolitan area, but especially the residents of Minneapolis.

Each of these problems presents an immediate challenge to the city. They also have major implications for the city's future in terms of its population, livability, the types and quantity of public services needed, land uses, tax base, and the quality of life that its residents will enjoy.

The solution of these problems will require not only an understanding of them but, most importantly, decisions about what will be done, and a sense of direction about where the city is going.

Policies and decisions needed.

Policies and decisions by the elected policy-makers are needed if problems are to be confronted and solved. The adoption of policies--statements indicating the city's position with respect to specific issues and the direction it intends to move--can do much to mobilize the resources and provide direction. They not only serve to alert citizens about the city's concern on issues it feels are important, but also provide a guide to governmental agencies and private interests about what is to be done. In addition, the adoption of policies enables the city to present its concerns to all levels of government which have resources that might be used to solve these problems.

Decisions by the city about how it wishes to develop, the land uses it will encourage, the location of transportation arteries, the actions that are necessary to provide adequate housing and attractive living areas, and the programs necessary to meet the educational, recreational and health needs of its population can be guidelines to private developers, public agencies, and its citizens. The city will be in a position to guide or influence the decisions of others only if it knows how it will meet these challenges and where it wishes development to occur. Many programs and developments are unlikely to be proposed, die for lack of support, or, at best, will be delayed for several years, unless the city can make these decisions.

Politically identifiable leadership required for policies and decisions.

The city is presently unable to develop many policies and make decisions. Those which are difficult or controversial may not be made or the decision will be to do nothing. Under the present organization of government in Minneapolis, the City Council has the authority to make policy but lacks the responsibility, while the Mayor has the responsibility but lacks the authority. No one at the elected policy-making level is responsible and able to identify problems, make proposals for their solution, or obtain decisions from the City Council that will provide direction and begin to meet the many problems the city faces.

There is no one at the policy-making level designated as a spokesman for the city on matters related to its future development. This has often left the city in a weak position in terms of its influence over the development of programs of other levels of government, such as the state and federal agencies, and the Metropolitan Council.

Current issues which will require leadership for their early resolution.

In spite of the difficulties of determining the long-range implications, as well as anticipating future changes in technology, the economy, and possible government programs, it is important that decisions are forthcoming on a number of currently defined problems. The following are examples of decisions that will have a major impact on current development proposals and implications for the future of the city.

1. What is the present position of Minneapolis on the need for and location of proposed freeways?

Additional freeways, including the southwest diagonal, northwest diagonal, 28th Street crosstown, and Cedar Avenue, have been identified by transportation planners as necessary to handle the present and future travel demands into and through the city. Many of the present and soon-to-be-built freeway interchanges anticipate the construction of these freeways. The success of major renewal efforts in two large areas of Minneapolis--in the near northside and Model Neighborhood--are related to decisions about these freeways. Although the near northside project is now under way and is expected to be completed in five years, at a cost in excess of \$12 million, provision for the northwest diagonal, which is projected to go through this area, was not included in development plans approved by the City Council. Unless a decision is made soon about whether this freeway will be built, and its location, it is possible that homes will be rehabilitated or sites cleared and sold for new development on land which can possibly be acquired for this freeway after the area has already been renewed. Decisions about these freeways have major implications for future attempts to improve neighborhoods and stabilize those which are declining by reducing the traffic on arterial streets through these neighborhoods.

Who is responsible and accountable for getting these decisions made?

2. What is the city's position about the need for mass transit, the land-use policies the city will pursue to encourage its development, and the financing of it?

A number of suggestions have been made in recent years that some form of mass transit is needed to handle the heavy travel demand along certain corridors. The Metropolitan Transit Commission is about to make a decision about the system which might be developed. The position of the city with respect to the need for transit, the policies the city will pursue in terms of land use it will encourage, and its willingness to finance part of the improvements in present service or a new system will greatly affect the kinds of decisions which will be made.

Who is the spokesman for the city on proposals for mass transit? Is the Coordinator's proposal for a city-financed mass transit system the official city position?

3. What is the official city plan for the development of its arterial street system?

The development of the arterial street system can provide at least a partial solution to some of the present and future traffic congestion. However, this will require decisions about the location and the ways in which these streets will be developed. Considerable controversy has developed when the Public Works Department proposed to change residential streets to major arteries by cutting down trees and widening streets and by making one-way streets. There are indications that major arteries are still being developed on a piecemeal basis and located in areas that appear to contradict the desired development. These decisions will have major implications in terms of the type of development that is likely to occur, the access that will be provided to the major centers in the city, and the attractiveness and livability of residential areas.

What is the city's policy about the removal and replacement of trees for street widening? Who is responsible for developing policies concerned with the arterial street system?

4. Are we going to have decisions about the future location, types of facilities, and the means which will be used to provide adequate parking facilities in the downtown business district and neighborhood shopping centers?

Although proposals have been made in the past as to how to solve this recognized problem, the city appears to have made the decision to do nothing or simply lacks a policy. These decisions will significantly influence the future economic viability and attractiveness of shopping and working areas, and exercise a major influence on related decisions about the location and size of arterial streets which must handle the traffic generated by such parking facilities.

What assurances do we have that policies on parking will be forthcoming from the present system for policy-making in Minneapolis?

5. How will housing for low-income and elderly people be provided? Is Minneapolis going to provide most of the housing for low-income people for the metropolitan area?

Although the Housing and Redevelopment Authority has aggressively developed programs to provide for the housing needs of a portion of the elderly and increasingly responded to the need for providing housing to low-income families, a substantial number of low-income families and elderly people are still without adequate housing. At the same time, in the attempt to renew and preserve the existing housing stock, and as a way of retaining middle-income families, the city is beginning to pursue a policy of code enforcement, which may extend the life of many homes but also increases the cost of housing.

Who is responsible for developing policies and stating the city's position to other levels of government with regard to the dimension of the low-income housing problem and the way in which it can be solved?

6. What is the city's position regarding the density of residential development? What will be done to enable land assembly in areas where this is desired?

The city, by means of its land use and zoning policies, can have considerable control over the densities of residential development and indirectly its cost as well as the type of development that can occur. However, if developers are unable to put tracts together for townhouses or high-density apartments, we may be faced with a continuation of the 2½-story walk-up apartment house on two or three lots. Serious questions have been raised about whether this type of development is the most desirable in all areas and whether many of these structures are adequately built and meet desirable acoustical standards. Decisions related to land assembly and building codes are needed if the land use and zoning policies are to be meaningful. These decisions have implications for not only the future population of the city but also the quality of its structures, and the variety and cost of housing that can be built.

Who is responsible for providing leadership in making these decisions?

7. What are the city's policies with respect to the replacement of obsolete industrial facilities and the development of new sites for industry? Where and how should neighborhood shopping centers be consolidated, renewed, and provided with adequate parking?

The age and obsolescence of many buildings, and the lack of space for industry, require decisions about where and how these facilities should be replaced and how new sites should be made available for industrial development at prices competitive with land in surrounding suburban areas. The city Industrial Commission and the Housing and Redevelopment Authority have begun to propose programs to meet these needs. However, reports have noted that the major potential industrial sites are available on land presently owned by railroads. There do not appear to be policies directed toward opening discussion that might lead to making these sites available for development. The implications of the lack of decisions in this area are obvious in terms of the future tax base and the job opportunities available to residents of the city. Likewise, a significant increase in the number of jobs in Minneapolis can have a major impact on the transportation system that will be needed.

Another economic activity of considerable importance is the future of neighborhood shopping areas. For example, proposals for the development of the West Broadway commercial area in north Minneapolis were made in 1964, yet the problems identified appear to be unresolved. Decisions about whether parking will be provided in these centers and how it will be developed will significantly influence the future economic viability and the convenience of shopping centers to residents of the city and the metropolitan area.

Who is responsible for providing leadership in resolving these issues?

8. What is the official city position on its revenue needs and the way to finance future public services?

There are indications at the present time that the city will face a financial crisis in 1971 unless there are increases in the already burdened property tax or new sources of revenue are developed. Needless to say, this factor has serious implications for the maintenance of existing services and the future of city employee salaries, let alone the level and types of services that can be provided in the future.

What specific means should be adopted to develop new sources of revenue? Who is accountable for proposing alternative sources?

9. What is the official city position about the types of services that should be provided on a metropolitan basis? What assurances are there that the city will receive a fair share in terms of parks, transit, and highway development that will respect the neighborhoods and physical features of the city?

There is increasing recognition of the need for solving a number of problems on a metropolitan-wide basis. The creation of the Metropolitan Council as a mechanism for handling these services has given the city and the area an opportunity to identify its areawide problems and develop programs to meet these. However, in order for this organization to assist the city it must know what the position of Minneapolis is as to the type of services that should be provided and the way in which this should be accomplished. Similarly, policies addressed to these issues, and positions articulated by its official spokesman, are the only way in which the city can substantially influence the Council and be assured of a fair share of the parks, transportation facilities, and other services that are provided to the metropolitan area.

Who is responsible for developing these policies and acting as the spokesman for the official positions of Minneapolis to the Metropolitan Council, Hennepin County, the State of Minnesota, and the Federal Government?

10. What are the social service policies of the city? What direction is the city providing?

Recognition of the problems experienced by low-income and minority people has resulted in development of a number of programs to meet some of these needs. Many of these are federally aided, others are funded by the city, and still many others are directed by semi-public and private organizations. There is little coordination between these programs, even those operated by

the city. Proposals have been made to develop a human resources department to provide this coordination and begin to relate the activities of the Welfare Board, Department of Civil Rights, the Youth Opportunity Program under the Mayor, and the Community Action Programs of the MOER Board to each other, and assure that the interests of low-income and minority people are recognized in the development and administration of city programs.

Who is responsible for developing social service policies and assuring that programs are coordinated? Who can be held accountable for the present lack of coordination?

11. What is the present position of the city about the combined collection of trash and garbage?

For the past few years there has been considerable discussion about combining the collection of trash and garbage to improve the appearance and livability of neighborhoods and to reduce pollution.

Who can be held accountable for the failure to act? Who is responsible for obtaining a decision about whether the city will have combined trash-garbage collection?

Where is the leadership role in Minneapolis government?

The policy leadership role in Minneapolis is fragmented, and at the present time is split between the Mayor, the President of the City Council, and the Coordinator.

The Mayor, who is often viewed by the citizens as responsible for providing leadership, is elected citywide and, as such, is assumed to be its public spokesman. However, his power and influence and resulting authority in the area of policy-making is very limited. He has the power to veto resolutions and ordinances of the City Council, appoint the police chief, appoint members to boards and commissions, and handle the ceremonial duties for the city. The exercise of these powers, even in their fullest, gives him only an indirect voice, if any, in the development of proposals. He has no function in preparing the budget, even though it is at this point that decisions are made about what services will be provided and the extent of their funding. His ability to influence the City Council is limited to addressing the Council, calling special meetings, and by exercise of his largely negative veto power.

At times, he may appear as the official spokesman of the city, but often his positions are his own and have not been adopted by the City Council. Frequently, positions adopted by the City Council are not submitted to him for his approval and are transmitted to others by way of an alderman or the Coordinator. In discharging his responsibilities, the Mayor has a staff of two assistants and a secretary.

The President of the City Council has gradually emerged as one of the policy leaders of the city. He is a ward alderman elected President of the Council by the majority of the Council. His primary responsibility is to preside at Council meetings. However, for many years the President has acted at times as the spokesman for official city policy adopted by the City Council which was not submitted to the Mayor for his approval. In addition, recent presidents have increasingly assumed the leadership role of an executive policy-maker by convening department heads and handling a number of issues within the Council. He is generally one of the aldermen who has been part of a coalition responsible for making or avoiding important decisions. Although he has only one staff assistant, as the leading officer of the City Council--the executive policy-making body in Minneapolis--he has considerable access to the resources of the Coordinator's office and the departments.

The third office which exercises the policy leadership role is that of the Coordinator. He is appointed by the City Council to act as the chief administrator of the city. This office has gradually evolved from the original office of research engineer. Initially, the office was established to advise the Council on utility rates, city employee salary negotiations, and analysis of the budget. In the past three years, the City Council has substantially increased the responsibilities of this office to include the following: Analysis and recommendations of departmental requests in the budget and the conduct of studies on long-range capital expenditures; performing studies directed to improving the administration and operation of all departments of the city under the jurisdiction of the City Council; expanded activity related to personnel, including wage negotiations, and the conduct of studies relating to employment procedures; direction of the data processing division; and the preparation of plans and applications for federal programs. Both the city inspection department and the planning staff were made divisions under the Coordinator in 1968.

The staff of the Coordinator's office has increased from 5 employees in 1966 to 18 in 1968 and 34 in 1969. The budget has grown from \$51,000 to \$387,400 in 1969. In moving the building inspection and planning departments under the Coordinator presently is responsible for directing the activities of 268 city employees. The total budget of all of these activities under the Coordinator has increased from approximately \$1,571,000 in 1966 to \$3,005,250 in 1969. These increases in responsibilities, staff, and budget have given the Coordinator substantial access to information from departments and agencies and the opportunity for improving the information available to the City Council.

The Coordinator has acted not only as the chief advisor to the City Council but also in some cases as the spokesman for the city. He was closely involved in handling the negotiations with the Minnesota Highway Department over the location and construction of freeways, and has frequently appeared to be the spokesman on such matters as metropolitan sewers and mass transit. His influence in the policy-making function, even though he is appointed by and responsible to the City Council, cannot be under-estimated.

Fragmentation of the leadership role has resulted in conflict and uncertainty.

The emergence of the President of the City Council as a partial political leader within the system has resulted in considerable conflict between this office and the office of the Mayor. This condition has been aggravated where there have been partisan differences between the Mayor and the President of the City Council. These conflicts have only contributed to the further confusion and uncertainty within the system about who the policy leader is and his function.

The fragmentation of the leadership function and the conflict between elements in it have produced an impossible situation. It requires that individuals who seek a resolution of issues or who make proposals to correct problems must first identify the office they would see as the most persuasive and helpful. Specific development proposals have often been submitted directly to the Coordinator in the hope that he could advance them as part of the programs included in the budget. Others have relied upon the Coordinator to support their proposals in the discussion he has with the City Council. Others may take their proposals directly to the President of the City Council in the hope that, by exercising his executive leadership role in convening department heads, the proposals could be incorporated into the programs of the departments and finally appear in the budget. Reliance is also placed upon his ability to persuade the City Council to take action on some issues. Finally, others might submit their proposals to the Mayor with the expectation that in the exercise of his citywide leadership he would be able to influence the City Council. However, this is very limited and generally proposals which require funding are not taken to this office, since he has little influence in the budget-making process and must ultimately rely upon his veto power to encourage the departments and the Coordinator to incorporate these proposals in the budget.

One of the major effects of fragmented leadership is that the city does not have an identifiable spokesman. This role is extremely important to the extent that the city must increasingly rely upon the support of other levels of government for program funding. In the past there has been considerable confusion and uncertainty on the part of governmental agencies about what the city desired, its position about the location of particular projects, and what assistance it might provide in solving the problem. In a recent case, for example, in the discussions over the metropolitan sewer system, there was considerable uncertainty about whether the Coordinator spoke for the city in proposing that the North Suburban Sanitary Sewer District contract with the city to handle its sewage in the future.

The leadership role in Minneapolis is further complicated and fragmented by the autonomous status of functions such as schools, parks, and libraries. However, it is possible that the necessary coordination between these independent agencies and the City Council could be achieved if the city had an identifiable, responsible political leader.

What does leadership require in Minneapolis?

Development of a single office, elected citywide, with specified responsibilities and accountable to the voters, is necessary before leadership can be exercised in solving its problems. The dispersion of responsibility into various offices as at present, or into a committee, only perpetuates the uncertainty that presently exists and does not permit the pinpointing of decisions by the citizens. It is extremely important and a fundamental principle that policy-making in government should reside with those elected by the people. If citizens are to be able to identify who was responsible for making or avoiding particular decisions, they should be able to focus on a specific office.

The problems facing Minneapolis cut across ward boundaries and affect the entire city. This would suggest that the political leader should be elected at-large. A single ward alderman on the City Council, or even one designated by the Council, lacks the recognition of a citywide leader. It is very difficult for a ward alderman to act as a credible spokesman for the entire city if the issues with which he is dealing particularly affect his ward. For example, if citywide issues such as the location of freeways, housing densities, or low-income housing are proposed for a particular ward, the alderman would have to be most concerned about the interests of his constituents and have extreme difficulty in attempting to act as a citywide leader. This potential conflict would only call into question the credibility of this office.

The office, if it is to enable leadership to be exercised, must have specified responsibilities for acting as the advocate in:

- (1) Identifying problems.
- (2) Providing direction by formulating policies and making proposals.
- (3) Obtaining decisions from the policy-making body--the City Council.
- (4) Acting as spokesman for the city to its citizens and governmental agencies.

The missing element in the organization of government in Minneapolis is an office which is charged with advocacy at the policy-making level. The particular responsibilities suggested above are viewed as those which are essential for this office. They provide a guide to citizens in partially evaluating the performance of anyone who occupies this office as well as an outline to potential office-holders of what is expected.

What is required to make a leader effective?

The effectiveness of a citywide, politically responsible leader will depend on the functions assigned to this office and the powers it is granted. Without these, the assignment of responsibility is meaningless. These functions and powers include at least the following:

Access to information. The information collected by departmental and planning staffs must be available to the political leader. He will need assistance in identifying problems and issues and in seeking alternative solutions. This access to information does not mean that he must necessarily control the administration of

services, but rather that he needs the essential data to understand problems, an assessment of the city's capability to finance programs, and alternative suggestions about the ways in which problems might be solved.

An understanding about the long-range implications of decisions. The citywide elected leader, more than anyone else, has the responsibility to attempt to understand the long-range implications of current decisions. Although the crises of the moment may require decisions, only if they are made with an understanding of their long-range effect can they contribute to achieving the policies and objectives related to the future development of the city. The need for this perspective would suggest that the politically responsible leader have a close working relationship with the planning staff and those concerned with the development of plans in each of the departments. From another perspective, planning will not be effective unless it is tied to a leadership position at the policy-making level.

The ability to make proposals. Part of the success of the politically responsible leader will depend upon his ability to make proposals at the policy-making level. One possible way that this might be developed is to require that he present messages to the City Council and the city expressing his views about what problems he thinks are important, the direction he feels the city should move, and the particular programs that are needed.

Influence over the development of programs. The ability to make proposals is alone insufficient to make a politically responsible leadership office effective. It must also be able to influence the development of programs, particularly as they are expressed in the budget. This would suggest that this office have a role in the preparation of the budget so that at least serious consideration is given to proposals in this form before the budget is submitted to the City Council.

Sufficient power to obtain decisions from the City Council. The key to the success of a political leader will be in what policies he was able to formulate or what decisions he was able to obtain from the City Council. This will require the granting to this office of whatever minimal powers are necessary to assure that decisions are made. This does not mean that the position of the advocate must be accepted without question by the Council, nor that the citywide leader should dominate this body; but instead it means the Council and the political leader must join together in formulating policies and making decisions which will state the position of the city on many important issues.

Designation of the politically responsible leader as the spokesman for the city. Recognition as the official spokesman of the city on its positions and policies before agencies and other levels of government is essential both to the city and to the effectiveness of this office. As a citywide politically responsible office, it will already have achieved some of this status, but it is important that this be clearly spelled out to eliminate the possible confusion and to assure that the political leader will discharge this responsibility.

IDENTIFIABLE LEADERSHIP ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE PLANNING

Planning and Policy-Making

The major concern of the Planning and Development Committee initially was with the long-range planning function, its operation and influence on development decisions. Long-range planning is viewed as an important and necessary function to assure that an overall perspective of the city's development is maintained, and that environmental, economic and social considerations are recognized when decisions are made. If it is operating effectively, its greatest influence can be to assist policy-makers and agencies with an understanding of present and anticipated problems and their interrelationships, a view of what the future development of the city might be, given various policy and program alternatives, assistance in developing service programs or capital improvements that could meet the present and anticipated challenges and, finally, provide some determination of the implications for the future of decisions which are currently made.

Effectiveness of Planning

The influence of planning on policy-making will depend on both its relationship to the policy-makers and agencies and the acceptance by these of a long-range, overall perspective in developing programs and making decisions. If planning is to be effective, it must exist in an organization which is closely related to the policy-making body, particularly the elective office responsible for providing citywide policy leadership and identifying problems, proposing solutions, and obtaining decisions from the policy-making body.

Likewise, the influence of planning will be significant only if it is closely related to the departments and agencies which develop service programs and initiate public improvement projects through budget requests. While this departmental focus is important, a recognition of planning at the chief administrative and budget development level is essential. It is at this top administrative level that coordination of departmental programs occurs and where numerous allocative decisions related to funding for services, capital improvements and staff are initially made in recommendations to the policy-making body.

A third requirement for effective long-range planning is that provisions be made for review of development decisions to determine their conformance with the adopted long-range development guide. This review is necessary as a check to determine if planning is operating effectively at the policy-making and administrative levels, and to determine if the development guide continues to reflect the long-range development intentions of the city. If planning is operating effectively and is recognized particularly at the administrative level, projects that are submitted for review will not in all likelihood be inconsistent with the development guide. However, if planning is not accepted or operating effectively, it is possible that projects could be proposed which would be inconsistent.

It is also possible that, even if planning were effective, the development guide was not current and no longer reflected current long-range development objectives for the city. This would suggest that the development guide was inconsistent and should be changed.

Who performs long-range planning in Minneapolis?

City Planning Commission--Under the city charter and in accordance with Minnesota Laws of 1959 and 1965, the City Planning Commission is charged with performing the long-range planning function in Minneapolis.

The membership of the Commission consists of nine persons: The Mayor; one member each selected by the following boards: the City Council, the School Board, the Park Board, and the County Board of Hennepin County; and four legal voters appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the City Council. The Mayor may appoint a citizen to represent him in his place on the Commission.

The Mayor's appointees serve for four years, while the ex-officio members are selected in July of each odd-numbered year. Members serve without compensation.

Regular meetings of the Planning Commission are held twice a month on the Thursday prior to the regular meeting of the City Council. Meetings usually last 2½ to 3 hours. In addition, members are appointed by the President, who is elected by the members, to serve on at least two of the five standing committees and to hearing committees concerned with appeals to the zoning ordinance. It is estimated that in one year, from August 1967 to 1968, members spent 700 man hours in business related to the Planning Commission.

Powers of the Planning Commission.

The Commission's responsibilities under the Minneapolis city charter, chapter 13, and Minnesota Laws of 1959 and 1965 are as follows:

1. Preparation and adoption of a comprehensive city plan for the future physical development and improvement of the city.
2. Preparation and recommendation of specific plans for public improvements consistent with the comprehensive municipal plan to the proper officers of the city.
3. Recommendations of a zoning ordinance and amendments to the City Council. This ordinance and amendments must be in accord with the comprehensive municipal plan and designed to carry out that plan. Public hearings to consider the zoning ordinance and all amendments must be held by the Planning Commission.
4. Preparation of an official map for the City Council designed to carry out the policies of the major thoroughfare and community facilities plans of the comprehensive municipal plan.
5. Acceptance or rejection of all subdivision plats or replats of land within the city to be based on their conformity to the city's subdivision regulations. This activity is deemed legislative and discretionary and not administrative.

6. Review all public improvements authorized to be constructed in the city for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. No public improvements can be authorized or constructed until their location and design have been approved by the Commission. In case of their disapproval, the Commission must communicate their reason to the City Council, where a majority vote is sufficient to overrule such disapproval. If the reasons for disapproval are not given to the City Council within 30 days after the plan for public improvements are submitted to the Planning Commission, the plan is deemed to be approved by the Commission. This power to review public improvements, which is otherwise called "mandatory referral", applies to all special districts or political subdivisions having jurisdiction within the city.
7. Preparation of a program for coordination of normal public improvements and services of the city.
8. Review of Minneapolis school district plans and proposals for physical improvements for compliance with the comprehensive plan. This review must occur prior to an election held on a proposed issue of bonds, prior to the issuance of such bonds, and before the proceeds of the bonds can be expended. In the event the Commission disapproves any proposed project, the unanimous vote of the members of the Board of Education is required to overrule the disapproval.
9. Preparation and recommendation to the City Council of a capital improvement plan for the city, which must be in compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan.
10. Review of improvement proposals of the Housing and Redevelopment Authority for compliance with the comprehensive plan.
11. The carrying out of any other duties or administrative and enforcing powers the City Council may direct.

What has the Planning Commission done?

In 1956, when planning was at a low ebb, the City Council engaged the services of Frederick T. Aschman to review the function and organization of city planning in Minneapolis. In a report issued in 1957, Aschman concluded that there were a number of defects in the planning function, including: A lack of continuous basic research, a plan which offers little in the way of solutions to major planning problems, a lack of attention to its recommendations by various local governing bodies, an organizational separation of capital improvement programming from the city planning agency, too great an involvement in project planning by the commission, and inadequate financing of city planning. Aschman made a number of recommendations pertaining to the structure, powers, the organization and administration of the Planning Commission and proposed a number of activities to improve the planning process.

Many of the recommendations in the Aschman report were immediately adopted, particularly those directed to increased staff and funding. The budget of the Planning Commission was increased from \$82,792 to \$192,033. Since then, funding

has continued to increase with minor reductions in the early 1960's to \$551,825 in 1968 of which \$227,000 were federal grants-in-aid. Professional and secretarial staff increased from 10 in 1958 to 55 in 1968.

In the first four years following the reactivation of the Planning Commission the Commission was very concerned with zoning policies and problems. After much debate and discussion with the City Council, the city's basic zoning ordinance was finally adopted in 1962.

The major effort of the staff from 1958 to 1961 was in collecting data, formulating goals, and developing a plan for central Minneapolis. At the same time, studies related to the land use, economy, and transportation were developed. Reports on Industry Square, Seward, Whittier, and Loring Park neighborhoods were also produced. These reports identified a number of problems in particular communities and represented the first attempts at substantial development of the planning process. They were accepted by the Planning Commission and submitted to the City Council.

Effectiveness of the early planning activities of the Planning Commission.

With few exceptions other than those related to the subsequent actions of the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, these early reports and plans were not generally accepted as a guide for the city's development. There was a lack of attention to recommendations of the Planning Commission by the City Council. One graphic example of what happened after one of these preliminary plans was submitted to the City Council is the case of the preliminary plan for central Minneapolis. In this case, the planners, together with many of the important business firms in downtown Minneapolis, have identified parking as the major problem. The planners suggested that parking should be provided in peripheral terminal ramps connected directly to the freeway which surrounded the central business district. However, although the City Engineer agreed that serious problems would arise unless peripheral parking terminals were built, he emphasized the difficulties of building the necessary expressways and the expense involved. No member of the Council had expressed interest in taking part in the public discussions from which consensus on particular proposals had emerged. Neither the full Council nor any of the committees or the Mayor considered the plan or any of its parts. In spite of considerable agreement that a problem existed, there was no one at the policy-making level who was viewed as responsible for reaching an acceptable solution, nor anyone who saw himself in this position. As a result, proposals such as those for pedestrian walkways, peripheral parking ramps, and the creation of large blocks were largely ignored. Even with this "official" lack of interest in the plan, it nevertheless was partially effective in influencing the thinking of downtown businessmen in the subsequent decision to develop the Nicollet Mall and as it provided a framework for land-use proposals later incorporated in the zoning ordinance prepared by the Planning Commission.

Community improvement program study.

The second major phase of the Commission's activity was directed to its work from 1961 to 1967 on the community improvement program study. This study, which was largely financed by federal grants, was an attempt to analyze the ten communities of Minneapolis which had been identified by the planners and develop action recommendations. This work was reviewed by a separate advisory body to the

Planning Commission appointed by the City Council. The 115 reports and technical papers covered such important topics as community facilities, economic and housing improvement studies, minority housing in Minneapolis, industrial area improvement, and urban design. They represent the most comprehensive attempt at analyzing the various problems which exist throughout the city, particularly those related to blight. The final summary report was accepted by the City Council in 1967 and transmitted by the Council to operating agencies as a guide for the future physical and social improvement of the city. The summary report not only identified some of the major problems facing Minneapolis but also outlined a number of goals, policies, and specific recommendations for programs to eliminate blight. There are indications that this report has been very influential as a policy guideline to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority and code enforcement department under the Coordinator in developing proposals for federally aided renewal and conservation programs.

Comprehensive Plan.

One of the major responsibilities of the Planning Commission is to prepare a comprehensive plan for the city. This plan consists of two parts: A statement of goals, and a development guide consisting of land-use, residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, public facilities, and social service plans. In addition, certain reports of the Planning Commission are incorporated and made a part of the comprehensive plan. In the introduction to this document the opening statement is that this plan is a course of action whose purpose is to coordinate and guide decisions and actions to desired ends, encourage thinking and discussion by citizens on the future of the city, and point up problems still needing solution that result from the lack of policy, conflicting plans, or plans not based on accepted goals. In spite of its intentions, however, in the past the plan, which was adopted only by the Planning Commission, has not been viewed as a guideline expressive of the intention of the city either for departments, agencies, other levels of government or the community. It is primarily used as the basis for the Planning Commission's review of capital improvement projects, Housing and Redevelopment Authority improvement proposals, school building proposals, and in recommendations to the City Council on zoning ordinance or zoning amendments. It may indicate to some degree the Commission's probable position on decisions it may make.

The most recent comprehensive plan was adopted in 1966 and revised by incorporation of the goals of the summary CIP report in 1968. Since then, there has been limited work by the planning staff in developing additional neighborhood analyses and in correlating the individual studies and reports into a functioning whole. The staff for the past two years have been heavily engaged in the preparation of federal aid applications for both Pilot City and Model Neighborhood as well as involved in the initial activity establishing both these programs. At the present time, however, with increased budget and additional personnel, it would appear that approximately half of the 23 planners in the planning and development division are engaged in studies that can be incorporated into the comprehensive plan or in its direct revision and updating.

Apart from the organizational problems associated with how the comprehensive plan and the reports of the Planning Commission can be made effective guidelines for developmental decisions, the major problems associated with long-range planning are to assure that the planning process is continuous, that the comprehensive plan reflects the community consensus about what the goals and future development of the city should be in all areas, and that it be a workable document which is understood by the Planning Commission members.

One of the major difficulties experienced by the Planning Commission which has affected their ability to devote most of their time to long-range planning is the considerable demands placed upon them in acting as the Board of Adjustment and in the development of amendments to the zoning ordinance. Under the zoning ordinance, the Planning Commission acts as the Board of Adjustment to hear requests for variances under the ordinance and appeals from administrative decisions. This is accomplished by assignment of three Commission members to a hearing committee which considers the requests and makes recommendations to the Planning Commission. If the recommendation of the hearing committee and the staff are in agreement, usually the Planning Commission will accept this recommendation without discussion. If there is disagreement, there may be additional prolonged discussion at the Planning Commission meeting. Finally, however, the Planning Commission forwards its recommendation to the City Council, which has the final authority to approve or disapprove the request. This entire process is extremely time-consuming for the members who must serve on hearing committees, and in the deliberations of the Commission during its regular meetings. In one year, from August, 1967 to 1968, there were 93 requests for variances and one appeal. Approximately half of the entire time spent by Commission members during this period was on matters related to zoning administration and amendments, including variances, conditional use permits, appeals, and map and text changes to the zoning ordinance.

Proposals have been made in the past year that the Planning Commission be relieved of some of the work associated with the administration of the zoning ordinance. In 1965, the State Planning Enabling Act was changed to allow Minneapolis to have a separate Board of Adjustment. The only action that is required is an amendment to the zoning ordinance by the City Council to establish such a board. Discussions are presently under way between the Planning Commission and the City Council with a view to making this organizational change. The establishment of a separate Board of Adjustment would be one means of allowing the Commission to concentrate on other work, particularly those more directly concerned with long-range planning. This additional time might permit Commission members to become more familiar with the present comprehensive plan, and enable them to concentrate on its further development.

If the comprehensive plan and reports of the Planning Commission are to represent the community consensus about its future, it must reflect the ideas and contributions of its citizens, interested elements within the community, departments and agencies, and the policy-makers. Provision for the representation of broad community interests, local neighborhood interests, minority groups, agency representatives, and the policy-makers must be provided for in the development of the comprehensive plan. To a limited degree, it might be possible for these interests to be represented in the membership of the Planning Commission. However, the essential need to involve a large number of people and a wide variety of interests suggests that some mechanism be developed -- possibly advisory committees -- to participate in the development of the comprehensive city plan.

How is planning related to program development?

The development of programs, until recently, has been primarily the responsibility of the individual departments, agencies, and the staffs of the independent boards. This responsibility has been handled either by the department head or, in a few cases, by the planning staff within the agency. For the most part, the programs devised have reflected the singular interest of the department in providing and expanding or improving a particular service. The recommendations of departments were reflected in budget requests for additional personnel, equipment, or capital improvements that would enable the department to increase its level of service. Long-term, even five-year plans were not developed or in any case not published. Coordination to the extent it was achieved resulted from the work of the City Council.

The Planning Commission until the mid-1960's played no significant role in coordinating even the capital improvements program, since its review of capital improvements was extremely limited.

The single agency in Minneapolis, which differs from the others in its approach to program development, has been the Housing and Redevelopment Authority. The Authority is a semi-autonomous planning, land assembly, and low-income housing agency. It is directed by a five-member board appointed by the Mayor and has been responsible for the major urban renewal, rehabilitation, and public housing programs in the city since 1947. The focus on planning and the future development of the city are combined in this agency in its preparation of preliminary plans for renewal in areas identified as blighted either by the Authority or by the Planning Commission; in the coordination of all governmental agencies for public improvements and renewal projects, including streets, parking, schools, parks, and utilities (these often qualify as a portion of the city's non-cash contribution to the cost of redevelopment or rehabilitation); and in the preparation and submission of applications for redevelopment or rehabilitation to the City Council and the federal government. One of the distinguishing characteristics of the Housing Authority has been its ability to put together a package of projects in a proposal for the physical improvements and development of a specific area. A factor accounting for the success of this agency has been the substantial funding by the federal government. This has acted as an inducement to the City Council and agencies to gain their participation. The Authority has exercised considerable initiative in engaging in continuous negotiation with city agencies which will participate in public improvements in a renewal area to obtain their commitment in a cooperative agreement that is part of the urban renewal contract with the Housing and Urban Development Department.

Planning is closely related to program development in the Housing Authority. Although the planning staff of the Housing Authority, during the 1950's, performed both the general planning related to the identification of blighted areas and the development planning associated with a specific renewal project, it has increasingly performed only the latter. In recent years, the Housing Authority has cooperated with the Planning Commission in studies concerned with the condition of housing and the identification of blighted areas. The reports of the Community Improvement Program produced by the city planning staff represent the most comprehensive attempt, to date, to identify blighted areas and suggest various programs and priorities directed to the removal of blight and the improvement of housing. Since its adoption, there are indications that the CIP reports and recommendations have been influential in decisions about urban renewal project applications which have since been submitted to the City Council.

In addition to its role as a general planner identifying areas of blight, the Planning Commission also reviews the specific renewal proposals of the Housing Authority as they evolve, to determine whether or not they conform to the city's comprehensive plan.

Coordination of Program Proposals.

Important changes have been made in the way programs are developed in the past three years. The stimulus for this change came, in part, from the availability of federal funding for programs which would coordinate the physical, social, and economic development programs as a total package in an overall attempt to develop a strategy to improve the core areas of the city. This approach, which is seen in Pilot City and Model Neighborhood, utilizes the package concept earlier demonstrated in urban renewal and expanded it to incorporate social and economic programs and services.

The City Council assigned responsibility for preparing federal aid applications and coordinating the proposals of various departments to the office of the Coordinator. The Coordinator at that time was the previous director of the Housing and Redevelopment Authority. Data and plans which evolved as part of the Community Improvement Program were used in the initial application and planning staff members were assigned to the Coordinator's office to assist in the preparation of these applications. Agencies involved in carrying out this program also assigned personnel to the Coordinator staff. These initial efforts at coordinating programs for the purpose of federal aid applications were coupled with other efforts directed to personnel, budget, and administrative improvements, and culminated in the reorganization of the Coordinator's office in February, 1968.

The reorganization plan, adopted by the City Council in a committee report, moved the planning staff under the Coordinator to increase the planning coordination between agencies and to integrate planning into the programming activity. In addition, the Coordinator was given an expanded role in the preparation of the budget, made the director of the building inspection department, provided with additional assistance to handle employee wage problems, and given the responsibility to handle the development programs of the city. Planning personnel were assigned to the newly constituted Department of Planning and Development, with many planners engaged in assisting the Coordinator to prepare federal aid applications, to work in the initial, formative activities associated with resident participation and the establishment of Pilot City and Model Neighborhood, and to work related to improvements in the budget system. The department continued to be responsible for comprehensive planning, both physical and social, with the intent that programs which would evolve from the department would flow from the comprehensive planning activity directly into the programming activities of the Coordinator's department. It is expected that this will enable planning to significantly influence the development of operating and capital programs at the administrative level.

Increased coordination between agencies may also be accomplished as a result of joint studies between the planning staff and departmental planners. Under a federal planning grant, the planning department is presently engaged in an inter-agency procedure study which will attempt to consolidate the various planning and policy positions of such agencies as the School Board, Park Board, Library Board, Welfare Board, Housing and Redevelopment Authority, and the Planning Commission. The objective of this study is to determine or assist in formulating the service policies and standards

for each of these agencies. The resulting "service plans" are intended to serve as a guide to agencies in developing proposals that meet some long-range service objectives and policies and standards that can be incorporated as part of the comprehensive plan to be used in the review of capital improvement projects and the coordination and joint use of facilities and services. At the present time, most departments and agencies do not have such statements of policy or agreed-upon standards that are published as part of a long-range service and capital improvements plan.

The concern for coordination between programs, the integration of planning into programming at the top administrative level, the assignment of development responsibilities to the office of the Coordinator, and the strengthening of the Coordinator's role in budget preparation have resulted in significantly altering the organization of administration in Minneapolis. Increasingly, the Coordinator is becoming the chief administrator of the city -- responsible for the management of services, preparation of the budget, and development of program proposals.

How is planning related to budget-making?

Long-range planning is effective, in part, to the extent that its considerations are recognized in the budget-making process, at the department level, at the top administrative level, and most importantly at the policy-making level. Generally, in the past, planning concerns have been almost exclusively expressed in terms of the capital budget. This has consisted of a review by the Planning Commission of capital improvement projects to determine whether they conform to the comprehensive city plan.

Planning Commission Review of Public Improvements.

Under the city charter, the Planning Commission has the power to review all public improvements to determine whether they conform to the comprehensive plan. In case of disapproval, the Commission must communicate its reason to the City Council and the majority vote of the Council is sufficient to override such disapproval. If the reason for disapproval are not given to the City Council within 30 days after the plans are submitted by the Planning Commission, the plans are deemed to be approved by the Commission. This power, which is called "mandatory referral", was largely inoperative until two years ago, due to an opinion by the City Attorney in 1954 which severely limited the types of public improvements which had to be submitted to the Planning Commission. However, since the most recent opinion by the City Attorney in 1967 and a decision by the court in 1968, which required the provisions of the city charter be followed, this review power has been greatly strengthened. The only major public improvement, according to the City Attorney, which would not have to be referred to the Planning Commission will be freeways constructed on rights-of-way owned by the state.

Generally, in spite of the present existing power of mandatory referral, the Planning Commission is not yet reviewing most public improvements in the city. Only the capital improvements of the School Board, Housing and Redevelopment Authority plans, and library projects are totally submitted to the Planning Commission for their review. Few of the projects built by the Public Works Department during the past year have been submitted to the Planning Commission. The substantial arterial street improvements on municipal state aid streets and county state aid streets are still not reviewed by the Commission. Part of the difficulty experienced in making

mandatory referral effective is related to the timing of submission and the working procedures within the Planning Commission. The planning department must have sufficient time to review projects to make this procedure meaningful. In any case, if mandatory referral is to be effective, projects should be submitted directly from the department to the Planning Commission prior to their review as part of the capital budgeting process. In addition, the broad interpretation of what a public improvement means requires that the Planning Commission determine how it will handle various types of projects. A set of detailed working procedures is needed between the Planning Commission and the individual departments. Although mandatory referral can be viewed as largely a negative power, it can be useful to the extent that it delays projects and focuses attention on projects that are not in agreement with overall development objectives contained in the comprehensive plan.

Capital Budgeting.

One of the functions which Aschman had recommended the Planning Commission perform in 1957 was that of capital improvement programming, including the establishment of priorities, financial analysis of proposals, estimates of available revenues, and allocation of funds in a yearly "capital budget" and allocation and scheduling of projects in future years. This function, it was felt, resulted in recommendations which were not based on adequate data or upon comprehensive city planning policies. He recommended that the Capital Long-Range Improvements Committee (CLIC) be reconstituted as an arm of the Planning Commission by initially absorbing and supplementing the CLIC staff work by the department of city planning. In spite of this recommendation, however, CLIC has remained as the primary capital budgeting agency. All projects requiring bond financing from the Park and Library Boards and City Council agencies are submitted to the City Council and then to CLIC. CLIC is an advisory body to the City Council, made up of approximately 138 members. Twelve of the thirteen aldermen serve on the committee. The task forces of CLIC review the projects, rate them, and send them to CLIC for integration into a capital program for the next five years. The first year of the program is reviewed by the Ways and Means Committee and approved by the City Council and the Board of Estimate and Taxation.

Some of the shortcomings in the present capital budgeting system as it operates under CLIC include the following:

- (1) Not all capital projects are submitted for review by CLIC. Projects financed from current revenues out of the permanent improvement fund or those financed exclusively by federal grants are not sent to CLIC but are handled directly by the City Council. These have included improvements associated with the upper harbor development, public works maintenance buildings, and traffic control buildings.
- (2) Projects rated by CLIC are not all previously reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- (3) The financial impact of a capital project is not estimated in terms of its effect on the operating budgets. Commitments are therefore made to projects without the full knowledge of their impact.
- (4) Many projects are submitted to CLIC without adequate supporting facts and data or without sufficient time to give thorough consideration.

(5) Some departments, such as Public Works, do not have five-year published programs which are submitted yearly to the City Council and CLIC.

In spite of these limitations in the capital budgeting process and the shortcomings associated with the present review process, CLIC has been successful in several important aspects. The organization has brought a degree of order in public consideration to the bond financed capital program of the city and to a large extent has reduced the logrolling previously experienced in the City Council at the time the capital program was adopted. Since its establishment in 1952 by a committee report of the Council, the procedures developed for considering capital improvements have forced departments to give greater attention to long-range planning. It has also encouraged coordination of projects such as joint school-parks and public improvements in urban renewal projects. Generally, the committee and its task forces spend a considerable amount of time in open discussion about capital improvements, bond finance policy, and even some of the operating programs.

It is possible that concern for planning considerations can be expressed without requiring that CLIC become an arm of the Planning Commission. This could be initially accomplished by requiring that all projects submitted to CLIC first be reviewed by the Planning Commission. At a minimum, the capital budgeting system could be immediately strengthened by eliminating many of the shortcomings presently noted in the capital budgeting process. However, the function and position of CLIC in the governmental structure should be reviewed, particularly in light of the presently evolving budget system.

Planning-Programming-Budgeting.

The ability of planning considerations to be recognized initially in the early development of the budget is possible under the system of budgeting presently evolving in Minneapolis. One of the most significant results of the reorganization of the office of Coordinator was to increase the responsibility of the office for preparation of an executive budget. Although the budget is assembled by the Board of Estimate and Taxation, the Coordinator has been assigned responsibility for evaluating the departmental requests and submitting his budget. In 1968, for example, the Coordinator's appraisal of each of the line item requests appeared next to that requested by the department. Ultimately, and possibly in the next year, it is the intention of the City Council that only the Coordinator's figures will appear in the budget which is submitted to the City Council.

The adoption by the Coordinator and the City Council of a planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS) has far-reaching implications both in terms of the kind of information the budget will provide and the integration of planning into the budget process. The requests of departments will be assembled into a program budget rather than the line item type and programs will be analyzed in terms of their cost-benefits and the degree to which they achieve long-term development objectives. Many problems remain to be worked out in this system, but it is hoped that at the end of three years the City Council will be presented with a budget that provides a clearer understanding of what is being accomplished in terms of programs for the coming year and some measurement of the degree to which they achieve long-range planning objectives. Many operational aspects of this system are yet to be worked out, including the times and places within the budget process where the public will be given the opportunity to see what the alternatives are and voice their interest.

DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations contained in this report are the result of a number of meetings and discussions concerned with the possible alternatives which might solve the problems identified by the committee. These are discussed under the headings of each recommendation.

Merger of the offices of the President of the City Council and Mayor.

Problem -- The lack of an identifiable political leader who can be held responsible to the citizens for identifying problems, making proposals, obtaining decisions from the City Council, and acting as the policy spokesman, is the most critical shortcoming of the organization of Minneapolis government. This leadership role is presently fragmented among the City Coordinator, President of the City Council, and the Mayor. We have concluded that if this vital function is to be performed, a leadership role must be identified and be held responsible to the citizens. We further concluded that such a position should be selected by the citywide electorate, have access to information, the responsibility for making proposals and influencing programs, the responsibility for understanding the long-range implications of decisions, the power to obtain decisions from the City Council, and the recognition as the policy spokesman.

Alternatives considered -- The development of the position of a politically responsible leader might be accomplished in a number of ways. These include the following: Adopting a strong mayor-council form of government or a city manager form of government, by changes in the office of coordinator, or by increasing the responsibility and powers of the mayor or president of the city council.

Strong mayor-council form of government. Characteristics: The mayor is responsible for exercising leadership in identifying problems, initiating proposals, developing the programs, and obtaining decisions. In addition, however, the mayor is also responsible for the administration of city services. He appoints department heads and members of boards and commissions, subject to city council approval.

This approach was basically the one proposed and rejected by the voters in 1960 and 1963. In addition to separating the legislative and executive functions, these proposals would also have changed the budgetary powers of the library and park boards.

We concluded that, although we continue to favor this approach as fundamentally sound, the major issue today is how to develop a politically responsible leader. Although problems related to the efficiency of administration, and the coordination of programs, remain, we recognize the significant improvement in management and the budget process initiated by the City Council, and would see continued efforts in this direction as solving many of these. Moving in the direction of again recommending that the legislative and executive functions be separated appears to be unrealistic in light of voter rejection and the recognition that the City Council has taken the initiative to correct some of the problems related to administration and city management that were of substantial concern a few years ago.

City manager form of government. Characteristics: Under the city manager-council form of government at least some of the councilmen are elected at-large, and the mayor is selected by the city council from among its members to preside at meetings and handle ceremonial duties. A city manager is employed by the city council to handle administration and budget preparation. All department heads are appointed by the manager, and their activities are directed by him. The policy-making function resides in the city council. Frequently, however, the manager plays an important role in identifying problems and in making proposals through the budget.

A major feature of the manager form of government is the assignment of responsibility for administration to a professional employed to perform this function. In many respects, the office of the Coordinator in Minneapolis is that of a city manager. At this time, the Coordinator does not directly make appointments of department heads, and only the inspection department, planning department, and some important aspects of the budget and finance functions are directly under his supervision. However, as the chief source of information and advisor to the City Council, the Coordinator is performing many of the same functions as a city manager. Indeed, with the increase in responsibilities and the increasing role of the Coordinator in policy-making, it would appear that Minneapolis is heading in the direction of developing a city manager form of government.

We rejected this alternative, in spite of attractive features related to improvements in administration, as this approach does not provide for any visible, responsible policy leader who can be held accountable to the voters. Under the council-manager form, the responsibility for developing policies, and especially for making decisions, is diffused and not pinpointed. There is no one in the policy-making body who must be concerned that policies are formulated and problems met. Likewise, we recognize that the manager cannot provide the dynamic leadership needed in a large city which an elected, responsible official can furnish. On matters of policy, the manager will find it difficult to provide leadership, particularly on controversial proposals, since he is an appointee of the council and lacks a popular basis of support which may be available to an elected representative. If he should decide to attempt to provide this leadership, he may, on the other hand, be accused of dominating the policy-makers, since he has the greatest access to information from the departments and planning organizations. The resulting possibilities for avoiding problems and postponing decisions are substantial under this form of government. We also recognized that the city-manager form does not exist unless a part of the council is elected at-large. This has not been tradition in Minneapolis and there is little indication that we are moving in this direction.

City Coordinator. The increased responsibilities and functions of the office of the Coordinator suggested that it might be possible to develop a policy leader out of this office. As has already been noted, the Coordinator has played an increasingly important role in identifying problems, developing proposals, advising the City Council, and even acting as the spokesman for the city on such matters as the location of the interstate freeways and the metropolitan sewage disposal issue. As the chief administrator of the city, the Coordinator has superior access to information to assist in identifying problems, considerable influence over development of programs by exercise of the budget-preparation function, and some recognition, as a result, as the policy leader and spokesman on some issues.

We rejected this alternative, since the Coordinator is primarily a chief administrator and not a political leader who can be held responsible to the people. He

is appointed by the City Council to coordinate and administer services under the City Council, and in this capacity is an administrative officer. As the chief administrative officer, he is not selected by the citizens, nor does he have the power to obtain decisions from the City Council or complete recognition as the policy spokesman. Although it would be possible to provide that the Coordinator be elected, this would completely alter the office and simply require that a substitute chief administrative office be created.

Instead, the Coordinator should remain as the chief administrative officer in a governmental structure in which he can effectively function.

Mayor. A fourth alternative which might provide for policy leadership would be to increase the responsibilities, powers, and staff assistance available to the office of Mayor. At present, he is the only citywide elected official, and for many purposes, particularly at times of crisis, is recognized as the citywide leader. However, he has only a staff of three assistants to provide him with information, to assist in identifying problems, and limited ability to initiate proposals, particularly as they are expressed in the budget. His only opportunity for influencing the budget is largely after it is adopted, when he may exercise his veto. This opportunity comes at the end of the budget process, and is largely a negative power. It does not assure him of participation in the many decisions which are made in the preparation and adoption of the budget. His ability to initiate proposals is limited to formal messages to the City Council, the calling of special meetings of the Council, by the indirect method of appointing citizens to boards and commissions, and by the exercise of his veto power. Generally, the Mayor has only been effective as the policy leader of the city when he has been able to focus on one particular action of the City Council, and by exercise of his veto power draw attention to the Council's action and call for the support of the community to reverse this action.

The office of Mayor might be strengthened to enable the Mayor to act as a policy leader. This could be accomplished by a variety of means such as the following: Appointment of the Coordinator and department heads, preparation of the budget by the Mayor, or by giving the office an item veto over appropriations. All of these alternatives are viewed as major changes in the present organization of Minneapolis government.

Focusing the responsibility for policymaking in the office of Mayor would continue the present separation of the Mayor and the City Council. At times this would be desirable, if it moved conflicts between these two parties out into the open. However, potential for conflict could also result in efforts to withhold information or to make decisions without the knowledge of the Mayor.

We rejected this alternative, both because of our recognition that some of the possible ways this office could be strengthened have been rejected by the voters in the past, and because we concluded that we should attempt to build upon the improvements and types of changes already made by the City Council. This would suggest that the staff developed under the Coordinator remain in this office to assist him rather than being transferred under the Mayor. Moving in the direction of strengthening the Mayor's office as the chief executive officer of the city runs counter to the trend of the past few years and is unlikely to resolve the problem of fragmented leadership and the necessity to develop an office which has both the responsibility and the authority to formulate policies and make decisions.

President of the City Council. The existing office of President of the City Council has increasingly assumed many of the characteristics of a policy-initiating and leadership function. The Council President is an alderman, elected from a ward, who is elected by a majority of the City Council. His primary responsibility is to preside at Council meetings. However, since he is elected by the City Council, he has often functioned as a spokesman for the Council on matters pertaining to the city's policies and the operations of city government. In recent years, the President has acted in an executive capacity by convening the department heads at regular meetings and by acting as one of the Council leaders in providing directions to the Coordinator.

As the leader of the City Council, the President has many of the characteristics of a policy leader. He has excellent access to information for the identification of problems through requests to the Coordinator's office; can influence the development of programs and the budget by means of his associations with the department heads and the Coordinator's office, as well as his usual membership on the Ways and Means Committee; and, finally, can obtain some decisions from the City Council, since he is normally elected by the majority caucus, and as President of the City Council has close communication with its members. He is in and of the system and is able to sense the politics of decision-making. He shares in the role of a policy spokesman by acting as the spokesman for the Council, most particularly on those matters which pertain to administration and Council policies which are adopted without the approval of the Mayor.

We rejected this alternative primarily because the Council President is not elected by, and responsible to, all of the citizens. He is not specifically engaged in performing duties other than presiding at Council meetings and acting in the place of the Mayor in his absence. It has become apparent that the office has other implied powers, but responsibility for giving direction, making proposals, and acting as spokesman are not specified. It is possible for the President to shift responsibility to either the entire Council or the Mayor on some occasions, and thereby avoid responsibility for a decision. Finally, even if such responsibility could be pinpointed, he could only be held directly accountable by the voters of his ward.

RECOMMENDATION: Merge the Office of President of the City Council and Mayor

After considering all of these alternatives and their feasibility, we concluded that it would be possible to achieve the objective of developing a policy leader and spokesman by merging the present office of President of the City Council and the Mayor, and creating a new leadership office called the Mayor of Minneapolis and President of the City Council. This office will be elected city-wide and responsible to all of the citizens and will have the duties and responsibilities of the Mayor, including: Appointment of citizens to boards and commissions, selection of the Chief of Police, power of the veto, and representation of the city at ceremonial functions. He would also have the duties and responsibilities of the office of President of the City Council, including presiding at Council meetings, participating in committee and Council discussions, and in all these exercise the rights of a member of the City Council, except the right to vote.

We have concluded that this recommendation would go a long way toward developing a policy leader and spokesman for the city. It would eliminate the present conflicts between the President of the City Council and the Mayor, and,

most importantly, assure that this policy leadership position would rest with an office which is elected city-wide. It would also encourage involvement of the politically responsible leader (PRL) in the early discussions leading up to decisions. A merger of these two offices would not in any way alter the changes made in recent years by the City Council, but would simply provide a focus of responsibility for policies and decisions for the city departments and the citizens.

Recent changes in the organization of government in cities with city managers reveal the need for a policy leader and spokesman. In San Diego and Hartford, Connecticut - cities with Council Manager forms of government - amendments were recently made to their city charters to strengthen the office of Mayor as the policy leader. San Diego, in 1963, amended its city charter to provide that the position of Mayor, as policy leader, be strengthened, and that his office be given an enhanced status by increasing his power of appointment of boards, commissions, and committees, and requiring him to present an annual "state of the city" message. One of the advocates of this change was the then-city manager, who believed that the exigencies of modern government, in a large, complex city, thrust the manager into the political arena. He favored the strengthening of the Mayor's position and could see no incompatibility between such a move and a continuance of the Council-Manager form.

Likewise, Hartford, Connecticut, in 1967, voted to revise its Council-Manager charter to strengthen the office of Mayor. Under the revised charter, the Mayor is elected directly - separately from Council candidates. He presides over the Council without a vote, but with a veto over Council actions, which can be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the Council. In addition, he was given the power to appoint certain city boards and commissions, subject to Council approval, and is clearly designated as the "policy leader" of the city. The express duties of the City Manager were not changed, except in regard to certain nominations.

Presentation of an annual message.

Problem - With the focus of responsibility for leadership in a single office, explicit opportunity should be provided for enabling the politically responsible leader to identify problems and provide direction by formulating policies and making proposals. These opportunities should enable him to publicly state his positions and proposals to the City Council and the city and thereby provide a guideline to departments and agencies and to the policy-making body about what he feels is important. These opportunities should also provide the citizens with an understanding of what the PRL feels is important, what his proposals and programs are, and thereby enable them to initially evaluate his performance.

RECOMMENDATION: Presentation of Annual Message.

We recommend that the city leader be required to present an annual message to the City Council and the city, identifying its problems and his proposals to meet them. This recommendation would simply specify one occasion on which the city leader should articulate the problems he sees and the direction he feels the city should be moving. This proposal is not unlike that of the President's "State of the Union" message and the Governor's "State of the State" message. It should provide citizens with an opportunity to evaluate the objectives and programs of the political leader and will provide an indication to the City Council, the Coordinator, and the operating departments about what the PRL would see as the needed programs and some of the criteria by which he would subsequently review and comment upon the budget.

Present and Comment Upon the Budget

Problem - The decisions involved in the preparation of the city budget are some of the most important that are made each year. The decisions are related to the types and levels of service that will be provided, the number of staff that will be employed, and the purchases that the city will make of supplies and equipment. At the present time, this budget preparation function is divided into two parts-the operating budget and the capital budget.

The operating budget is assembled from requests by departments that are submitted to the Board of Estimate and Taxation, where they are compiled into a document called the Budget Estimate. This is submitted to the City Coordinator, who then makes recommendations about each of the items, and the budget is finally submitted to the City Council and from there to its Ways and Means Committee. The capital budget, on the other hand, is compiled from the recommendations of departments and sent to the City Council, which in turn transmits those requests which are to be funded from bond proceeds to the council-appointed Capital Long Range Improvements Committee for their review and recommendation. This is then sent back to the City Council, and to the Ways and Means Committee before final adoption by the City Council.

Although the Mayor can veto the Appropriations Resolution, he has no formal role in the actual preparation of the budget or in the discussions during this process. Since the budget often expresses the direction and support that will be given to particular programs, it is important that the office which is given responsibility for initiating proposals also have some influence over this process.

Alternatives - The actual role of the PRL in the budget preparation could range from having complete responsibility for this function, having the power to veto line items of the budget, or simply presenting the budget prepared by the Coordinator to the City Council.

Preparation of the budget by the responsible leader would be the most direct way for this office to exercise its influence over the budget development process. This would require removing this function from the office of the Coordinator and providing substantial staff assistance to the President-Mayor to perform this task. However, such a change would probably be viewed as a major alteration of the organization of Minneapolis and would shift a substantial amount of the executive power presently vested in the City Council to the PRL. It is also possible that moving this function out of the Coordinator's office would damage or postpone many of the changes in the budget process presently under way.

A second alternative would be to grant the citywide leader the power to veto line items of a line item budget or programs in a program budget. The exercise of this power could be persuasive and indirectly result in involving the PRL at an early stage in the budget's discussion. However, we have concluded that this approach is largely negative and would not necessarily accomplish the objective of assuring complete involvement by the PRL in these decisions. The exercise of the veto power would come only at the end of the budget process, and would not necessarily result in his involvement at the important early stages.

Simple presentation of the budget prepared by the Coordinator by the Politically Responsible Leader might give the appearance of his involvement. However, we have rejected this alternative since it is possible that the PRL could be called upon to discuss the recommendations of the budget and yet not have been necessarily involved in its preparation.

RECOMMENDATION: Politically Responsible Leader-Present and Comment Upon the Budget

After considering all of these alternatives we concluded that at a minimum the PRL should be given the responsibility to present to the Council each year the budget prepared by the Coordinator together with his comments. This proposal will require that the PRL have staff assistants directly under him to assist him in analyzing the budget. It should enable him to evaluate the proposals of the Coordinator in light of his recommendations about what the city should be doing, the priorities he thinks are important, and the programs which he has already articulated at least in the annual message. By giving the citywide leader the responsibility to present, review and comment upon the budget, he will be able, at least indirectly, to influence the decisions which will go into the Coordinator's budget. At the same time, his comments on the budget will provide an indication to the citizens of what his programs will mean in terms of a budget and a comparison between the recommendations of the Coordinator, the PRL, and the subsequent actions by the City Council.

Designation of the Citywide Leader as the Official Spokesman of the City

The lack of a single-identifiable policy spokesman in Minneapolis is one of the most serious shortcomings in the organization of government in Minneapolis. This has resulted in confusion and uncertainty about what the city's position is and who is responsible for articulating this position. The fragmentation of leadership and this position of the spokesman has resulted in creating a vacuum that has been filled by the Mayor, President of the City Council, individual Aldermen, the Coordinator, and department heads all stating positions which may be in conflict with one another, but which in any case brings into question the credibility of any of these positions. One of the affects of this confusion and uncertainty is to provide agencies and citizens with little assurance that the assumptions under which they are working are accurate and correct.

The lack of an official spokesman has also compounded the difficulties of governmental agencies outside of the city in determining whom to contact when commitments and decisions from the city are needed. This is particularly important during the discussion of proposed state legislation and policy contracts before state and federal agencies and the Metropolitan Council.

RECOMMENDATION: Designate the Citywide Leader as the Official Policy Spokesman for the City

It is essential that the role of articulating the city's policies and its positions be centered in one office. Only in this way, will citizens and agencies know where to turn when this is needed. In addition, the designation of one office will focus responsibility for performing this function and not permit it to be assumed by others or not exercised because no one knows who is responsible.

Only the citywide responsible leader can adequately perform this function. As the only leader elected citywide, the PRL is the only office that can be held responsible to the entire city on important policy matters and is the only office which can reliably assure citizens and agencies that the statements it makes represent the policies and the positions of the city. This important function cannot be performed by the Coordinator or department heads as they do not have the power to contract or bind the city in agreements and cannot be held

responsible for their actions to the voters. Likewise, to vest this function in the City Council is to perpetuate the present uncertainty and diffuse the responsibility to the point where no single office can really be held accountable for not acting.

A major part of the success of the citywide leader in becoming the policy spokesman will depend upon his role in policy making. His effectiveness in being able to obtain decisions from the City Council and the image that he is able to develop by making proposals and gaining the support throughout the community will substantially increase his stature as the spokesman of the city. However, this can be initiated by providing explicitly that the PRL be recognized in legislation as the official head of the city for all ceremonial purposes, by the courts for the purposes of serving civil process, by the Governor for the purposes of martial law, and by all agencies and citizens as its official spokesman. This charge to the office of the PRL focuses responsibility upon this office and will enable others to initially know where to turn and whom to hold accountable for performing this function.

Change in Terms of Office of Citizen Appointees to the Planning Commission

Problem - The City Planning Commission is the primary agency in Minneapolis concerned with the long-range development of the city. This concern is expressed in its activity related to the collection and analysis of data in identifying problems, the development and adoption of a comprehensive plan for the city, and in the recommendations it makes to the City Council on goals and policies, desired land uses, and on zoning. In addition, the Planning Commission has the power to evaluate whether public improvements and requests for changes in zoning, variances, and conditional use permits are consistent with the long-range comprehensive policies of the Commission.

The membership of the Planning Commission consists of a representative of the School Board, Park Board, County Board, the Mayor, the Council, and four citizens appointed by the Mayor to four-year terms. This mixture of ex-officio members and citizen appointees has resulted in developing the only body in Minneapolis which is able to coordinate the planning activities of the independent boards and the City Council. The only independent board which is not represented is the Library Board.

Although the Planning Commission can be a vehicle for communication and coordination of program development between the independent boards and the city, there is no focus of responsibility for relating its recommendations to the decisions of the policy-making body. The president of the Planning Commission is elected by the members of the board. The alderman who represents the City Council on the Commission is not charged with the responsibility of bringing the recommendations of the Planning Commission to the City Council or assuring that they will be seriously considered. Likewise, the Mayor cannot perform this function since he sits outside of the Council and is not able to initiate proposals which could reflect the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

The present appointment of four citizens by the Mayor to four-year terms on the Planning Commission operates to give the Mayor only slightly more of a voice than his own membership. Unless he is re-elected for more than one term, it is possible that some of the citizen appointees could reflect positions other than his own and possibly those which might have been rejected by the voters. Without significant influence in the development of policies, the Mayor is likewise

unlikely to attempt close communication with his appointees since he is not in a position to exercise leadership in bringing the recommendations of the Planning Commission into the policy-making arena.

Alternatives - In developing a politically responsible leadership office, which is more closely tied to the policy-making body, various alternatives were considered that could strengthen the planning function and relate it to policy-making. Abolishing the Planning Commission and moving the planning staff under the politically responsible leader could provide a direct input from those employed to be concerned about long-range development into the office responsible for articulating this concern at the policy-making level. However, it is possible that in doing this, the staff could be directed to handle immediate problems, simply expand the general staff available to the PRL, and thereby lose or diminish the concern for the long-range implications of decisions. It is also possible that this approach would result in actions to conceal these concerns if they were politically damaging. This potential also exists in the present system where the Commission does not receive direction from the policy-makers and the staff is responsible to the Coordinator.

A second alternative would be to change the membership of the Planning Commission to consist only of representatives of independent boards, the City Council, and the PRL. This would make the Planning Commission into a body consisting solely of ex-officio officials. Although this approach has some attractiveness because of the relationship to the policy-makers, most aldermen and some members of independent boards are so involved with the demands of their office that they are unable to spend sufficient time at the numerous meetings and hearings of the Planning Commission. In addition, the responsibility of the Planning Commission to be concerned about the long-range future of the city would suggest that it have representation from various interests throughout the community in addition to elected officials. These citizen members, if they are representative of various interests in the community, can bring both a perspective of these interests and concerns to the deliberations of the Commission, as well as lend the support of elements within the community to the recommendations of the Commission.

We concluded that the existence of the Commission was important in assuring a center for the discussion of the long-range implications of decisions and coordination of the planning activities of the independent boards with the city.

RECOMMENDATION: Change the Terms of Citizen Appointees to the Planning Commission

If planning is to be effective and a useful source of information about the long-range implications of decisions, it must be closely tied to the policy-makers and particularly to the office responsible for acting as the advocate in making proposals and formulating policies. Likewise, it is important that the planning department, as with all others in the city, receive direction from the elected policy-makers. Since, under our proposal, the citywide leader is responsible for performing this advocacy function, he must also have the ability to provide some direction to the planning department in obtaining information on those issues which he would see as important. At the same time, since we have concluded that a Planning Commission is desirable to assure that the planning staff is engaged in long-range studies, and for the purposes of coordinating the independent boards and the city, a way must be found to achieve both of these objectives. This could be accomplished by changing the term of office of the present "citizen" appointees to have them coincide with the term of office of the

politically responsible leader. This would enable him to give direction, at least indirectly, through his appointees and have a majority of the vote on the Planning Commission. In order for this approach to be successful, however, it would be necessary for the PRL to select members on the basis of their interest in long-range planning and have an understanding with his appointees, by frequent communication with them, about what his objectives are and what issues he would see as important. His ability to provide direction to the Planning Commission is also important, since we are recommending that he be responsible for submitting the recommendations of the Planning Commission to the City Council. These recommendations in the end should reflect to a large extent his position about the long-range future development of the city. Unless they do, they are not likely to be any more influential in the future than they have in the past.

This recommendation should not in any way discourage the planning staff from continuing to develop alternative proposals, but instead should provide them with guidance about what is possible. It will also more directly enable the voters to influence the direction of planning proposals when these focus on the election of the politically responsible leader.

Approval of all Actions of the City Council by the Citywide Responsible Leader

Problem - The City Council for some time has expressed its will by a variety of means, including the adoption of ordinances, resolutions, committee reports, and motions. The form which is used, however, is important, since the city charter requires that all ordinances and resolutions specified by city charter or state statute must be sent to the Mayor for his approval. The Mayor may then either approve them, not approve them within five days, in which case they become effective, or he may veto them and return them to the Council. If the Mayor should veto them, the Council may then override his veto by a two-thirds vote. However, the City Council may also express policy or make commitments by adopting committee reports or motions, which are not submitted to the Mayor. The effect of this is to result in two types of policies in Minneapolis: Those adopted by the City Council and the Mayor or by a two-thirds vote of the Council in overriding a veto, or those adopted only by the City Council.

A majority of the actions of the City Council are by adoption of committee reports or by motion. These two types of action are used in discharging the executive powers granted to the Council by the charter. Some of the actions are quite routine, including approval of the schedule of payrolls, approval of claim payments, and the acceptance of bids. Others include the granting of individual license applications required by ordinance, as well as liquor licenses, and special permits. In addition, the Council sends directives by these means to departments to order Elwell projects and the taking of bids. City employees are authorized to attend schools and conventions, and department heads are authorized to requisition replacements where vacancies exist within their departments by these means.

Other actions of the City Council which have major implications in terms of policy, however, are also made by adoption of committee reports and motions. These have included decisions to employ consultants for special studies such as possible extensions of sewage service to the northern suburbs and the expansion of the auditorium; the establishment of advisory committees to develop recommendations on the organization of city administration, the police department, and the

improvement of the auditorium; and directives to the Coordinator to prepare studies concerned with the city's legislative program. The major reorganization of administration and the centralization of planning, building inspection, and budget preparation functions in the office of the Coordinator were made by the adoption of the committee report. Finally, the City Council has used such means to state the Council position on particular matters including the timing and priority of development of freeways in the city, the decision to accept preliminary sketches and order final detailed plans and specifications for the auditorium, together with a commitment to a tentative schedule of financing. Positions of the City Council with respect to proposed legislation are also expressed in this manner.

This situation has developed because of an opinion by the City Attorney which relies on a decision by the Supreme Court; *State of Minnesota vs. The Minneapolis and St. Louis Railway Company*, 39 Minn. 220, September 14, 1888. This opinion suggests that actions by the City Council in adopting committee reports or motions express their will and do not require the approval of the Mayor.

It has been suggested that the Council only adopt committee reports and motions in matters that are essentially executive in nature. However, there is serious question about whether many of its actions have not been legislative in nature, and whether this approach has been used to avoid involving the Mayor or submitting a possible position to him for his approval. Many of the important decisions with regard to certain proposals and projects are made in the early stages and the citywide political leader must be involved in these if he is to be held ultimately responsible for the decisions. Often the major commitments to construction of a public improvement or to propose legislation are made prior to their final adoption in the form of a resolution or ordinance. If the citywide political leader is not aware of these policy commitments and involved in the formulation of policies until they reach their last stage in the form of an ordinance or resolution, he is often in an untenable position and because of the timing may not be able to reject the policy even though he does not agree wholeheartedly with it. In effect, this also gives him the opportunity of passing the buck and placing responsibility for these decisions on the City Council rather than on himself. This has only resulted in diminishing the responsibility of this citywide office and ultimately the citizens' ability to hold the office accountable. We have concluded that the present ambiguities and uncertainties about what the city's policy actually is should be eliminated and that the citywide political leader should be involved in and a party to all major policy decisions, regardless of how they are expressed.

Alternatives - The PRL could be involved in discussions related to city policies and express his position by either a vote on the City Council or having the right to veto Council actions.

In giving the present Mayor the right to vote on the City Council he would also have to become a member of the City Council. If this were done, it would result in an even number on the policy-making body, with the possibility that decisions could not be reached because of the impossibility of breaking the tie vote. In order to move in this direction, therefore, the Council would have to be enlarged by at least one additional member. Although this possibility has been explored in the past, it would be a major change in the composition of the City Council and add an additional complication with little benefit in meeting

the problem of the lack of citywide leadership. Making the PRL a member of the City Council would result in demanding that he spend considerable time in the discussion of all matters coming before the City Council. As the ceremonial chief of the city, and as the person primarily concerned with the long-range implications of current decisions, the citywide leader would find it extremely difficult to be both a conscientious alderman, reviewing the numerous administrative issues before the Council, as well as performing the leadership role.

In giving the city leader the power to veto Council actions, changes in the composition of the City Council would not be necessary, as he would exercise a power which is already vested in the office of the Mayor. Under our recommendations, the politically responsible leader is given the responsibility to function as a policy leader in all areas of concern to the city, but particularly in those affecting its future development. We have concluded that if this office is to be held accountable to the electorate for performing this important role, and is the only citywide elected policy-maker, he should have more influence than that provided by a single vote. The submission of all actions of the City Council to the citywide leader only gives him the opportunity to approve or disapprove of these. Those which are procedural in nature will undoubtedly be approved by him either directly or become effective after five days. It is only on those rare occasions when he would perceive a policy to be incorrect or harmful that he would be likely to veto it. In any case, the veto would only result in returning the ordinance or resolution back to the Council for their further consideration. If the Council agreed that their earlier action was expressive of their will, they may again pass it by a two-thirds vote. We concluded that giving the PRL the power to veto actions of the City Council would be preferable to making him a member of the City Council with the right to vote.

RECOMMENDATION: Submission of all actions of the City Council, except for those pertaining to its rules and operation, to the politically responsible leader to be subject to his review and approval or veto.

Our recommendation is directed to eliminating the present ambiguity over what types of action require approval by the Mayor and as a way of assuring that the citywide political leader is involved in and a party to all policies and commitments made by the policy-making body. The recommendation would in effect make committee reports and motions equivalent to a resolution and thereby subject to approval by the citywide leader.

The only actions of the City Council which would not be subject to his review and approval are those pertaining directly to its operation and the way in which it conducts its business. The adoption of rules and committee assignments are prerogatives of the legislative body, which should not be subject to the review or possible veto by the citywide leader.

Designate the Vice President of the City Council to act as the politically responsible leader in his absence.

Problem - It is essential that some office be designated to perform the duties of the citywide leader during his absence from the city or when he may be unable to discharge the duties of his office. Under the present charter the President of the City Council, elected by the City Council, performs this

function during the absence of the Mayor while the Vice President of the City Council at such times becomes the acting President of the City Council. Most of these occasions are of short duration so that it is not necessary, for this reason, to have a second citywide elected office.

RECOMMENDATION: Designate the Vice President of the City Council to act as the politically responsible leader in his absence.

We recommend that the Vice President of the City Council, who is elected by the Council, be designated to act as the politically responsible leader during his absence. He shall preside at Council meetings and exercise all the power and discharge all of the duties of the politically responsible leader. The Vice-President while performing the duties of the politically responsible leader shall be known as the acting political leader. Acts performed by him when so acting will have the same force and validity as if performed by the politically responsible leader.

Implementation of the Recommendations for Legislation

Many changes can be made in the internal operations of city government and the administration of services by action of the City Council, or simply by practice. Examples of internal changes that have improved the coordination of services and the budget process include the establishment and assignment of responsibilities of the office of Coordinator, directives from the City Council to the departments, and authorizations by the Council for staff to improve services and the planning for them. Some of this has been accomplished without any changes in the City Charter. However, other changes require revisions of the Charter which can be activated by the Charter Commission or the Legislature.

In recent years, including 1969, the City Council has gone to the Legislature for many of the Charter changes. The Legislature has the power under the State Constitution to establish units of local government and to change their charters by means of special acts in accordance with Chapter 595 of the 1967 Laws. The Legislature has responded to many of these requests by exercising initiative in making many changes to the Minneapolis charter. Examples of these include the following:

IN THE 1967 SESSION, special legislation affecting the charter of Minneapolis included: City Coordinator - A state law permitted the City Council to designate the position of the City Coordinator and appoint a person to this position who would serve at the pleasure of the Council. Consolidation of funds - A state law enabled the City Council to establish a general fund containing the assets and liabilities of five special funds. Street tree revolving fund - A special Street Tree Revolving Fund was established and bonds authorized beyond the limitations contained in the charter. Fair Employment Practices Commission - Establishment of. Official salaries - Salaries for elected public officials were set, subject to approval by the City Council. Similar special laws affecting the charter of other cities in this session included: Duluth--authority to transfer public utility funds to the general fund; Ely--authority to transfer public utility funds to the general fund; and St. Paul--changes to the employment residence requirements, changes related to provisions for a police ambulance and purchasing procedures, and the setting of local official salaries.

IN THE 1965 SESSION, the Legislature passed legislation affecting the charter of Minneapolis in the following areas: Membership of the Library Board - Changed the membership of the Library Board to consist of eight trustees, six of whom would be elected. Procedures for paying employees - Permitted payments to employees by check. Park Board special assessments - Permitted the levying and payment of special assessments by the Park Board in equal annual installments over a five-year period. Library charges - Authorized the Library Board to establish book rental collections, make charges for services rendered in the Library Museum, and for the use of copying machines, telephones and typewriters. The Legislature also changed the budget procedure for St. Paul, permitted Montevideo to close part of a street, permitted Moorhead to establish a Department of Business Development, and authorized St. Louis Park to pay employees automobile allowances.

IN THE 1963 SESSION, the State Legislature took the initiative to make changes in the Minneapolis charter in the following areas: Administrative Assistant to the Mayor - Authorized the Mayor to appoint an administrative assistant, who would serve at his pleasure. Trunk highway bonds - Authorized Minneapolis to advance cash or engineering services to the Commissioner of Highways and issue bonds for the advance construction of certain highways.

These examples of recent changes to the City Charter are only illustrative of a number of changes which have been made by this process that go back to the very beginning of the charter. In fact, the present City Charter is very largely nothing but a compilation of the special acts of the State Legislature prior to 1920.

It is our view that our recommendations are not inconsistent with the actions by the State Legislature in the past. They are not so substantial as to alter the basic organization of city government, but only more sharply define the role of a politically responsible leader, much as the designation of the office of the City Coordinator in 1967 has enabled the city to increasingly focus responsibility for administration in this office.

Recommendations to the City Council

Adoption of the enabling legislation.

Problem -- The legislation we are recommending is only for an enabling act which will permit Minneapolis to create an office, accountable to the voters, responsible for providing direction and developing policies. This action will become effective only if the City Council adopts it. In suggesting this approach, the city will have an opportunity to fully air and discuss the proposal and voice its position through its elected city representatives. In order to be effective, the concurrence of both the city's elected representatives in the State Legislature and on the City Council is necessary.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt enabling legislation to focus responsibility for providing direction and developing policies in an office accountable to the voters.

We recommend that the City Council exercise the leadership it has so ably demonstrated with regard to the organization of city management and adopt the enabling legislation which will create a citywide office, accountable to the voters, responsible for providing direction and development of policies. We have concluded that such an office would significantly assist the City Council in focusing on citywide problems and provide a mechanism that will better enable the city to develop policies and make decisions. This office will not reduce the Council's present function or responsibilities. This proposal attempts to build upon the major improvements in the organization of city management in which the Coordinator has been given the responsibilities of an administrative leader. Our recommendation would only provide the opportunity for citywide leadership at the policy-making level where 13 ward opportunities presently exist.

The adoption of the enabling legislation will require leadership on the part of all aldermen -- that same type of leadership which at times in the recent past has been demonstrated.

Increase staff assistance to the politically responsible leader.

Problem -- The ability of the politically responsible leader to perform the many responsibilities assigned to this office will depend to a great extent on the staff assistance he receives and his access to all information. As the citywide leader and policy spokesman, this office is charged with identifying problems, developing solutions, obtaining decisions, directing the Police Department, and acting as the ceremonial head of the city. The duties assigned to this office will require staff assistance in the area of budget review, police administration, legislative liaison, planning, administration, and general secretarial work. At the present time, the only staff available to the office of the Mayor consists of three assistants, while the President of the City Council has only one. The present total of staff available to the existing offices will be insufficient and must be increased if the city-wide leader is to have the resources with which to perform his duties. The effectiveness of the politically responsible leader will depend not only on the assistance he receives from his staff, but also the access he has to all information to which any member of the City Council is entitled and

most particularly to his involvement in the early discussions of proposals and policies. This involvement will depend on the good will of both parties to involve each other in the discussion of proposals and the development of policies.

RECOMMENDATION: Increase the staff assistance to the politically responsible leader beyond that presently provided to the existing offices and insure that the office has a right to access to all information and be involved in the early discussion of all proposals and policies.

An increase in staff assistance beyond that presently provided to the existing offices is necessary if the politically responsible leader is to have the ability to discharge the responsibilities assigned to his office. There is difficulty in determining precisely how many additional positions will be needed, but staff should be provided for budget review, legislative liaison, and planning, at a minimum.

The requirements for increased staff will be diminished to the extent that the citywide office is given the right of access to all information to which any member of the City Council is entitled. This should include, at a minimum, the information available from the Coordinator and the department heads, which is presently available to members of the City Council.

Finally, involvement in the early discussion of all proposals and policies at the top administrative and policy-making level is necessary if the citywide leader is to be well-informed and to effectively act as spokesman for the city. This might suggest the involvement of the politically responsible leader in policy discussions at committee meetings, and possibly membership on any budget policy committee which might be established under the planning-programming-budgeting system.

Adopt a program budget and assign additional responsibilities to the Coordinator's office.

Problem -- A considerable number of the major decisions made by the City Council are expressed in the adoption of the city's budget. This budget establishes the types and levels of service that will be provided, establishes priorities as between services, and, by its provisions for planning or staffing, may chart future commitments by the Council to particular services. At the present time, the budget is largely a line-item budget made up of requests by individual departments for funds to provide personal service, contractual service, materials and supplies, and miscellaneous charges. Under personal service, each department lists the number of present positions and those proposed, as well as their salary ranges. Various specific items are listed for materials and supplies, for capital outlay, and for current charges. Budget discussions by the City Council Ways and Means Committee in the past have centered almost entirely on the changes between the current funding and that proposed for each division and department. The net effect of this has been to closely analyze the expenditures of each established division, but seldom to discuss the service which was provided or its relationship with all others or with agreed-upon objectives. There is little measurement of the performance of the divisions or agencies with any stated objectives, or even assurances that each of them is coordinated in their service.

The reorganization of the Coordinator's office has resulted in significantly increasing the responsibilities of the office of the Coordinator. However, although

considerable progress has been made, many agencies remain fairly autonomous and by varying degrees are related to this office of the chief administrator. Many of the department heads are appointed directly by the City Council, while others are appointed by independent boards. Some are under civil service. At the present time, there is no central administrative budgeting agency, and aspects of finance administration are scattered between elective offices of Comptroller, Treasurer, the Board of Estimate and Taxation, the finance divisions of each department, and the administrative division of the Coordinator's office. Likewise, the personnel function is split between the Civil Service Commission, the independent Library and Park Boards, and the administrative division of the Coordinator's office. Aspects of the personnel system, such as training, are left to each department or to the Coordinator's office. The health and welfare function is divided between the Welfare Board, the City Council in terms of funding, the Coordinator's office in the development of federal aid applications, and the Planning Commission in their social services plan. Although it may not be necessary to unify each of these functions under one organization, it is essential that each of these functions be coordinated to the maximum extent, to assure the greatest possible efficiency and service improvement. Similarly, it is important that each agency know and understand how its service is related to others and, as much as possible, its exact relationship to the Coordinator and all other agencies involved in the service they partially provide.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt a program budget and continue to assign additional responsibilities to the office of the Coordinator in the coordination and preparation of programs.

We recommend that the City Council continue to support efforts directed to developing a program budget and finally adopt this type of a budget system. This system should provide for an improved method of analyzing the budget in terms of the levels of service to be provided, the relative priorities of programs, or of the objectives to be achieved. The program budget should include the capital expenditures requested under each program, as well as the total operating costs of each part of a program regardless of the agency which provides the service. The Coordinator's office has begun to develop an outline of the program budget and, with continued support from the City Council, such a system should be operative in three years.

We recommend that the City Council continue to assign additional responsibilities to the office of the Coordinator in the coordination and preparation of programs, thereby building upon the recent and proposed improvements in the management of services. Past efforts directed to the preparation of federally aided programs have already resulted in substantial coordination of a number of programs operated by different agencies affecting particular areas of the city, such as Model Neighborhood and Pilot City. These efforts should continue to further coordinate and clarify the objectives of each agency and the relationship between departments and the Coordinator. This need is most apparent in terms of the various social and welfare programs, but is also evident in the public works programs and the independent library, park and recreation, and education programs. Additional responsibilities for finance, budget preparation, personnel, and the social and welfare programs should be given to the Coordinator's office as the chief administrative office of the city. Continued streamlining of administrative functions and further development of the Coordinator's office suggest additional changes in the organization of administration and of portions of the city's charter concerned with this organization. One example of possible charter changes would be the way in which many

department heads are selected and the role of the Coordinator in these procedures. At this time, however, continued efforts by the City Council to increase the responsibilities of the Coordinator's office should clarify the relationship and role of the departments relative to the Coordinator and further focus on the Coordinator as the chief administrative officer.

Publish alternative proposals and provide for public hearings at various steps in the budget process.

Problem -- The public interest in proposals to change services or in those affecting taxpayers or particular neighborhoods or groups suggest that all alternatives suggested, from whatever source, be visible to all citizens. It is possible, however, that unless provision is made to assure this visibility, many alternatives will not be seen or possibly not developed. It is possible, for example, that departmental proposals may be seen by only the Coordinator and never the City Council, the Mayor, or the public, or that only a single recommendation of the Coordinator will be developed and presented to the City Council. It is important that all interested parties be aware of these proposals in their early formulation to provide them with an opportunity to contribute to the discussion and to voice their concern before proposals are far advanced and decisions made.

One of the major problems involved in assuring the visibility of alternative proposals is the way in which citizens are made aware of these proposals or notified of hearings or meetings at which they will be discussed. For example, the proposals of the Public Works Department for the municipal state aid five-year plan are not presently published or available. The notification of public hearings or meetings is generally accomplished by publication in the city's legal newspaper, Finance and Commerce. It is only in the area of land use changes or of zoning under the Planning Commission that a more extensive system of notification is employed.

RECOMMENDATION: Publish alternative proposals and provide for public hearings at various steps in the budget process, with adequate notification of these through at least the regular public media to assure that all alternatives are made visible to all citizens.

We recommend that at least alternative proposals made by the staffs of departments directed to particular problems or issues be published as much as possible. This should include the proposals for changing the levels or types of service and all capital improvements. In addition, public hearings should be conducted at various steps in the budget process prior to the adoption of long-range plans, short-range plans, and in the discussion of program and agency budgets. Adequate notification of these hearings and of meetings should be assured through at least the regular public media and by additional notification to directly affected or interested citizens. Some indication of the business which will likely be handled at City Council and board meetings prior to the meetings would also be helpful. The City Council should explore and adopt an improved system of notification and assure that all alternative proposals are presented and visible to all citizens.

Provide that the citywide leader present the reports and proposals of the Planning Commission to the City Council.

Problem -- The reports and proposals of the Planning Commission are presently

sent to the City Council as simple communications from the Planning Commission. Unless these directly pertain to zoning changes, the zoning ordinance, or capital improvements referred to the Planning Commission, they are often received and simply filed. These include such important reports as those concerned with the planning and development of major sections of the city, planning standards for public improvements, and significant goals and policies. The only report of the Planning Commission which has been reviewed and adopted by the City Council in recent years has been the summary report of the Community Improvement Program.

There is no mechanism, at the present time, which will assure that the reports and proposals of the Planning Commission are considered by the City Council or its committees. Although an alderman is a member of the Planning Commission, he is not charged with presenting or advocating the reports to the City Council or to the appropriate committee. The assignment of responsibility in performing this function is important if planning is to significantly receive the contributions of the policy-makers and if it is to be effective.

RECOMMENDATION: Provide that the citywide leader present the reports and proposals of the Planning Commission to the City Council and assure consideration of the long-range planning proposals and recommendations of the Planning Commission.

We recommend that the citywide leader present the reports and proposals of the Planning Commission to the City Council. This office is designated as the primary elective office responsible for identifying the problems of the city. In addition, the citywide leader is a member of the Planning Commission and makes four appointments to the Planning Commission. The presentation of the reports and proposals of the Planning Commission by the citywide leader would tend to focus increased attention on these reports and encourage their serious consideration by the City Council. In addition, however, the City Council should assure that these long-range planning proposals receive their serious consideration either through their present committees or through a separate committee established for this purpose.

Establish a separate Board of Adjustment.

Problem -- One of the greatest limitations on the ability of the Planning Commission members to devote most of their time to long-range planning is the considerable demands placed on them in acting as the Board of Adjustment, and in development of amendments to the zoning ordinance. The Planning Commission, in effect, wears two hats, one as the Planning Commission established by the City Charter and the other as the zoning ordinance designated Board of Adjustment. In this latter capacity, the Planning Commission hears requests for variances under the zoning ordinance and appeals from administrative decisions. Although the Planning Commission, to some extent, has streamlined this activity by assigning only 3 Commission members to a hearing committee, this activity nevertheless requires a substantial amount of time. The recommendations from the hearing committee are submitted to the full Planning Commission whose members may further discuss these matters. Generally, if the recommendation of the hearing committee and the planning staff are in agreement, the Planning Commission will accept this recommendation without discussion. However, if there is disagreement, there may be additional prolonged discussion at the Planning Commission meeting. The entire process is extremely time-consuming for the members who must serve on hearing committees, which may meet from 2:00-6:00 p.m. one day per month. More importantly, additional time may be consumed at the regular

meetings of the Planning Commission and reduce the amount of time available for discussion of matters more directly related to long-range planning. In addition to serving as members of these hearing committees of the Board of Adjustment, members of the Planning Commission also serve on 5 different standing committees of the Planning Commission, which consume a considerable amount of the members' time. In one year, from August, 1967, to August, 1968, there were 93 requests for variances and one appeal. Approximately half of the entire time spent by Commission members during this period was on matters related to zoning administration and amendments, including variances, conditional use permits, appeals, and map and text changes to the zoning ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION: Establish a separate Board of Adjustment with provision for Planning Commission comment on requested variances.

We recommend that the City Council amend the zoning ordinance by establishing a separate Board of Adjustment to relieve the Planning Commission of part of its workload and enable it to concentrate on long-range planning. Discussions are presently under way between the Planning Commission and the City Council directed to making this organizational change.

In establishing a separate Board of Adjustment, it is desirable that the Planning Commission, through its staff, be required to prepare a written report on the planning aspects of each appeal to help guide the board in its evaluation of the case. This is necessary because of the implications of Board decisions on the zoning ordinance and the comprehensive plan which are prepared by the Planning Commission. Likewise, since the Planning Commission is responsible for updating the zoning ordinance, the Commission's understanding of the ordinance and the planning criteria which it represents should be communicated to the Board members. It is also important that the Board consist of some members who are familiar with planning and land use and that these members are given an adequate orientation to acquaint them with their duties. The quasi-judicial nature of this board would also suggest that the City Attorney be available to instruct members on the legal standards to be complied with in making grants.

Submit all public improvements to the Planning Commission.

Problem -- Although the Planning Commission, under the City Charter, has the power to review all public improvements to determine whether they conform to the comprehensive plan, this power, called "mandatory referral", was largely inoperative until two years ago. As a result of a City Attorney opinion in 1967, and a decision by the District Court in 1968, however, this review power has been greatly strengthened and under the law restored to the Planning Commission. Nevertheless, in spite of the present authority which the Commission has to review all public improvements, two major difficulties arise resulting from the past practices of some departments and those associated with the timing of this review.

At the present time, only the capital improvements of the School Board, Housing and Redevelopment Authority, and Library Board are totally submitted to the Planning Commission for their review. Few of the projects, including the substantial arterial street improvements on municipal and county state aid streets, have been submitted by the Public Works Department during the past year. This situation is somewhat complicated by the lack of adequate understanding between the Planning

Commission and the departments as to how various types of improvements will be handled and the type of review that will be required.

A second difficulty experienced in exercising the power of "mandatory referral" results from problems associated with the timing of this review. The charter provides that if reasons for disapproval are not given to the City Council within 30 days after the plans for public improvement are submitted to the Planning Commission, the plans are deemed to be approved by the Commission. In some cases, particularly when the proposal has significant implications for the comprehensive plan, it may not be possible for the Planning Commission to make an adequate review within the 30 days allotted. More importantly, however, the problems of timing are more closely related to the issue of when the Planning Commission is first aware of and involved in discussions about proposed capital improvements. The planning process is considerably strained and possibly circumvented when projects are submitted in their final form just prior to their incorporation in the annual budget.

RECOMMENDATION: All public improvements should be submitted to the Planning Commission for their review as early as possible, but at least before they are reviewed by the Capital Long-Range Improvements Committee (CLIC) or any capital budget review body.

We recommend that all capital improvements be submitted to the Planning Commission for their review to determine whether they conform to the comprehensive plan. This review power is important and useful to the extent that it delays projects or focuses attention on projects that are not in agreement with overall development objectives contained in the comprehensive plan. This recommendation can be accomplished by a policy of the City Council directing departments under their control to comply with this charter requirement. In addition, however, operating procedures between the Planning Commission and departments will be needed to more explicitly describe how these various types of projects will be handled and the extent of review that will be necessary.

It is important that all public improvements be submitted to the Planning Commission as early as possible but at least before they are reviewed by the Capital Long-Range Improvements Committee (CLIC) or any capital budget review body. The Planning Commission must have sufficient time to review projects to make this review power meaningful. This would suggest that departments confer with the planning staff as the projects are evolving to keep the planning staff and the Commission aware of all major proposals. In any case, projects should be submitted directly from the department to the Planning Commission at some time prior to their review as part of the capital budgeting process. The office of the Coordinator, the City Council, and the Capital Long-Range Improvements Committee, or any capital budget review committee which might be established, should be aware of the opinion and judgment of the Planning Commission prior to their deliberation on the annual and 5-year capital budget.

Review the capital budgeting process, the role of CLIC and its relationship to the Planning Commission.

Problem -- The primary capital budgeting agency in Minneapolis is the Capital Long-Range Improvements Committee (CLIC). This organization is advisory to the City Council. Its task forces perform many of the operations required in a capital

budgeting process, including the review of projects, establishing priorities, and final integration into one-year and five-year capital programs. CLIC has been very successful in seeing its recommendations adopted by the City Council. Some of the shortcomings, however, which exist in the present capital budgeting system include the fact that not all capital projects are submitted for review by CLIC. Those financed from current revenues or exclusively by federal grants are not sent to CLIC but are handled directly by the City Council. In addition, there is a serious weakness in the budgeting process in that projects which are rated by CLIC are not all previously reviewed by the Planning Commission to determine what their impact will be on the city's development and to assess whether they conform to the city's comprehensive plan. Likewise, the financial impact of a capital project is not estimated in terms of its effect on the operating budgets. In general, many projects are submitted to CLIC without adequate supporting data or without sufficient time to give thorough consideration. Finally, some departments, such as Public Works, do not have five-year published programs which are submitted yearly to the City Council and CLIC.

In addition to the present shortcomings of the capital budgeting process, there is also the serious question about how this should be handled in the future given the increasing responsibilities for budgeting in the Coordinator's office. The evolution of the planning-programming-budgeting system may suggest significant alterations to the present arrangement and to the role of a citizens advisory body as advisory either directly to the City Council, to the Planning Commission, or to the Coordinator.

RECOMMENDATION: The City Council should review the capital budgeting process, the role of CLIC and its relationship to the Planning Commission for closer coordination.

We recommend that, in line with the evolving program budget and the attempts to integrate planning and programming into this budgeting system, the capital budgeting process be thoroughly reviewed. The role of CLIC and its relationship to the Coordinator's office and to the City Council should be further clarified.

The capital budgeting system, at a minimum, should be immediately strengthened by an action of the City Council directing all departments to submit all capital improvement projects regardless of their source of funding for review by the Planning Commission and CLIC. Significant improvements in the data which accompany requests should be required, including estimates of the effect on the operating budget of proposed capital improvements, increased additional information to justify the project, the number of persons served or the condition remedied. As a basis for initial discussion by any capital budgeting agency, it is important that all departments and agencies making the capital improvement proposals have five-year published programs which are annually updated to give those involved in making budgetary decisions some idea about what to expect in the coming years and as a way of indicating to the department the importance which the capital budgeting agency places on some of the projects.

The Capital Long-Range Improvements Committee and the Planning Commission are both vitally involved in the capital budgeting process. Although they differ in their perspective, it is important that CLIC have the benefit of the Planning Commission's assessment of each project and that this be taken into account in the rating formula. The close coordination and cooperation of both of these agencies

is essential if the city is to have a capital improvements program which meets agreed-upon development objectives. Similarly, it is important to the Planning Commission that it maintain a close relationship to CLIC to determine as much as possible where this important budgeting agency may differ significantly with the Planning Commission in the goals or objectives incorporated in the comprehensive plan.

Encourage departments and independent boards to develop policies and standards setting forth their service plans.

Problem -- The comprehensiveness of the city's long-range plan and the success in developing an improved budgetary system require that departments and operating agencies indicate what their objectives are, the set of policies under which they operate, and the standards utilized in providing service. One of the key elements in the planning and budgetary process depends upon an understanding by the decision-makers of what each agency intends to accomplish, not only in the next year, but in the future. In terms of the comprehensive plan, these service plans can have an important effect to the extent that they reflect policies or goals which may be in conflict with one another or with those adopted by the Planning Commission. It is important that such conflicts be discovered and attempts made to reconcile these in the continuous updating and evaluation of the comprehensive plan.

Service plans prepared by departments and agencies are presently being formulated as a result of inter-agency discussions. Other departments, however, have not begun to engage in studies required to develop such service plans.

RECOMMENDATION: The City Council should encourage departments and independent boards to develop policies and standards setting forth their service plans.

The City Council, in strengthening the office of the Coordinator, has developed an office which can have the capability of assisting departments under the Council in the preparation of their service plans. These plans will be important to the City Council in their decisions about priorities and allocation of funds within the operating and capital budgets each year. Such service plans should also serve as a guide to agencies in developing proposals that meet some long-range service objectives as well as articulate policies and standards that can be incorporated as part of the comprehensive plan to be used in the review of capital improvement projects and in the coordination and joint use of facilities and services. Continuous encouragement and support by the City Council of these efforts through directives and adequate funding can considerably assist the Coordinator and the departments in accomplishing this objective. Similarly, encouragement by the City Council to the independent boards whose capital improvement programs must partially be funded by city bonds subject to approval of the City Council, can assist in achieving this objective. It should be noted, however, that the formulation of these service plans may require some time and the possible assistance of the Coordinator's office or the planning department. A policy statement by the City Council establishing this objective, however, would greatly assist the efforts to initiate the recommended service plans.

Recommendations to the City Planning Commission

Concern for the long-range comprehensive planning program and its development.

Problem -- The Planning Commission is responsible for not only preparing and adopting the comprehensive city plan, but also preparing and recommending specific plans for public improvements, recommendations for a zoning ordinance and amendments to it, acceptance or rejection of all subdivision plats or replats of land within the city, review of all public improvements, review of Minneapolis school district plans and proposals for public improvements and services, and public improvement proposals of the Housing and Redevelopment Authority. These substantial responsibilities, in addition to those related to its operating as the Board of Adjustment, result in the Planning Commission having to carefully allocate its time and resources. In the past, almost half of the time of the Planning Commission was spent on matters related to the zoning ordinance and its administration. At times, the Commission has not been actively involved in providing direction to the staff as the policy-making board or in significantly evaluating the work by the staff on the long-range comprehensive plan. Some members have taken the view that this function is primarily one assigned to the staff, with little Commission involvement. However, the criteria, principles, and objectives outlined in the comprehensive plan are the primary basis for decisions by the Planning Commission concerned with land use, zoning, and the approval of public improvements.

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission should be primarily concerned with the long-range comprehensive planning program and its development.

We recommend that the members of the Planning Commission assign the development and updating of the long-range comprehensive plan as their first priority and that they actively participate in its development. The importance of the comprehensive plan and its component parts and reports cannot be under-estimated. Ideally, this plan should represent the community consensus about its future, and reflect the ideas and contributions of its citizens, interested elements within the community, departments and agencies, and the policy-makers. Members of the Planning Commission can have the greatest effect on assuring that these objectives are achieved and on whether the comprehensive plan is a realistic guideline for departments, agencies, independent boards, and the City Council. Participation by members is also essential if they are to understand the planning criteria which must be utilized in judging whether public improvements, the zoning ordinance, subdivision plats or replats, and the plans and proposals of agencies conform to the comprehensive plan.

The Planning Commission can express its interest in long-range planning by its participation in the preparation of the comprehensive plan and its updating. In addition, however, this can be expressed in its budget request, its recommendations to the Coordinator and the executive director, and by its adoption and follow-up on work programs.

Procedures for handling a wider range and volume of public improvement projects.

Problem -- The restoration of the power of the Planning Commission to review all public improvements in 1967-68 has resulted in a possible deluge of projects,

particularly from the Public Works Department. Difficulties related to how the Planning Commission will perform its review and the timing of this in terms of the contracts and activities of departments, have not yet been worked out.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt a set of procedures for handling a wider range and volume of public improvement projects to effectively exercise the power of mandatory referral.

The Planning Commission should act, as soon as possible, to develop guidelines and procedures for handling the substantially greater volume and range of public improvement projects that can be anticipated. Guidelines should distinguish between projects of major importance that will be handled by a committee of the Planning Commission and the full Commission from those which are routine and of minor importance that might be assigned directly to the staff. Close coordination with the affected departments and agencies is necessary if the review is to provide sufficient time for consideration of major improvements and yet not unduly delay the operating agencies in the letting of contracts and the development of their work schedules.

Development and adoption of a set of policies and standards by all departments and independent boards.

Problem -- One of the major inputs to the comprehensive plan should be the policies and standards of all departments and independent boards. These service plans should reflect the long-range thinking of these agencies, both in terms of the types and levels of service which would be provided, and the capital improvements necessary to achieve the stated objectives. These statements can provide considerable assistance to the Planning Commission in its review of projects as well as in the development of the comprehensive plan. Likewise, it is important that the service plans of agencies reflect the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan. At the present time, the staffs of the Planning Commission and the Park Board are engaged in inter-agency studies which may result in a set of service plans. However, comparable studies and efforts are needed in many other agencies and departments.

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission should encourage all departments and independent boards to develop and adopt a set of policies and standards which can be used in the review of projects and the development of the comprehensive plan.

The Planning Commission, which is made up of representatives of the policy-making independent boards and the City Council, is in a unique position to encourage and assist these agencies and departments in the development of service plans. The liaison between members of the Planning Commission and the board members of independent boards and the City Council can provide a vehicle for communication. In addition, the Planning Commission's power of review over capital improvements would suggest that the development and adoption of policies and standards might be tied to this review process.

The objective of developing and adopting a set of policies is both to assist the Planning Commission in its review of projects and in their development of the comprehensive plan, as well as assuring that the service plans of agencies reflect

the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan. At times, these positions may conflict. It would be desirable that the planning staff be assigned to cooperate closely with the comparable research or planning staff in the agency in initially formulating these service plans. At the same time, it might be desirable for a joint discussion of these plans between the members of the Planning Commission and the members of the independent boards and commissions and the City Council or Coordinator. Continued support of the inter-agency studies presently under way between the city planning staff and the Park Board, Library Board, and the School Board is desirable. Comparable efforts should be initiated between all other independent boards and the departments under the City Council.

Streamline the operation of the Planning Commission

Problem -- The responsibilities of the Planning Commission and the increasing expansion of its staff, the scope of its operation, and its duties place substantial demands on the time of the Planning Commission members. These include direction over an expanded program related to comprehensive plan, additional area plans, continuous zoning amendments and updating of the zoning ordinance, and a substantially expanded responsibility for reviewing capital improvements, and other special assignments to the planning department. In the past few years, the work of the Commission has increased substantially in the area of the planning for levels of service, review of major urban renewal plans, and increasing requests for changes in land uses. It is likely that the programs of the Planning Commission will continue to expand and that the demands on the Commission members will increase even if its function as the Board of Adjustment is removed to a separate board.

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission should continue to streamline its operation by delegating particular areas of concern to committees and the staff.

The Planning Commission, in handling its initial review of comprehensive plans, zoning amendments, review of public improvements, and recommendations of projects for carrying out the plan, and in advising other public officials and community groups, has accomplished this by working in five standing committees. In addition, special committees, such as the present Beautification Committee, are established for particular subjects of interest to the members. In addition, informal meetings of the Planning Commission with its staff have been held to increase the communication and understanding between them. It is important that the Commission constantly evaluate its allocation of time and use whatever procedures necessary to streamline their activities. Likewise, an ongoing program of information from the staff about their activities to the Planning Commission is necessary if the members are to be aware of what is happening and sufficiently informed so that the Commission can provide positive direction to the staff. As the workload increases, the Planning Commission should delegate to the planning director matters that are not related to the review or formulation of planning policies. The Commission should be left to the vital work of planning and policies, and the general supervision of planning work through progress report meetings, consideration of major projects, and the handling of particularly important relationships.

WORK OF COMMITTEE

Background

The Citizens League has had a continuing interest in the problems of organization and planning in Minneapolis government since 1956. A number of reports - particularly in 1956 - pointed up the urgent need to improve the administration of services, focus responsibility, and increase the efficiency of operation of planning and administration.

In November, 1967, the Citizens League authorized the formation of the Minneapolis Development Program Committee, which later became known as the Minneapolis Planning and Development Committee. This committee was assigned to:

Review the proposals since the publication of the Aschman report in 1957 for the organization of the planning and development function in the city government. Make recommendations for a more effective working relationship among the planning, capital budgeting and public works activities of the city. Make recommendations for more effective relationships between the city government and the independent agencies also carrying on development programs in Minneapolis, namely the Planning Commission, CLIC, Board of Estimate, and the newly expanded Coordinator's office.

In making this charge, the board commented:

"Responsibility for planning, financing, scheduling and building public improvements in Minneapolis is currently shared by the City Council, the Planning Commission, CLIC, the Board of Estimate, and the newly expanded Coordinator's office. The committee will examine the planning and development process that operates currently, and consider whether changes will be feasible or desirable."

Fourteen members actively participated in the work of the committee. The chairman was James L. Weaver, a Minneapolis corporate lawyer. Other members were Norton Armour, Mrs. C. P. Barnum, Mrs. Ralph Bruce, Jr., Arne Carlson, John Cummings, Dr. Seymour Handler, James Hawks, C. D. Mahoney, Raymond A. Reister, Thomas M. Scott, Melvin Siegel, Michael P. Sullivan, and Daniel Upham. The committee was assisted by Clarence Shallbetter, Citizens League research assistant.

Committee Procedure

The committee began meeting November 15, 1967, and met 34 times until March 21, 1969. Following the reorganization of the City Coordinator's office, which proposed a number of changes in the organization for planning and development, the committee suspended its deliberations for five months until September 1968, in order to better determine what the effect of this reorganization might be on this function. Detailed minutes of each meeting were prepared, running an average of six pages each, single spaced. The minutes were circulated to committee members, to persons who appeared before the committee, and to an extensive list of persons in Minneapolis interested in and knowledgeable about the question of planning and development in Minneapolis.

The committee attempted to obtain an appraisal of the planning and development function from those who were directly associated with it and others who have observed or participated in planning in other cities. Among the resource persons who met with the committee were:

Robert T. Jorvig, City Coordinator in 1967 and present Executive Director of the Metropolitan Council.

Lawrence M. Irvin, Minneapolis Director of Planning.

W. Glenn Wallace, Executive Director of CLIC.

Keith Stidd, Minneapolis City Attorney.

Thomas Thompson, Minneapolis Coordinator and previous Public Works Director.

Robert Ruhe, Minneapolis Superintendent of Parks.

Richard M. Erdall, Minneapolis City Council.

Dan Cohen, President, Minneapolis City Council.

Talbot Jones, chief planner, Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Donald P. Risk, Minneapolis City Council.

B. Warner Shippee, executive vice president, University Community Development Corporation, and former executive director of the St. Paul Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Robert MacGregor, Minneapolis City Council.

Norma Olson, secretary, Minneapolis Planning Commission.

Anthony Downs, senior vice president, Real Estate Research Corporation, and planning consultant.

Arthur Naftalin, Mayor of Minneapolis.

Ralph O. Quiggle, Assistant Planning Director, Minneapolis.

Robert Boblett, a previous member of the Minneapolis Planning Commission.

William Holbrook, president, Minneapolis Planning Commission.

H. D. Berman, previous chairman of the Planning Commission.

A number of members of the Citizens League committee were "resource persons" in their own right. These included individuals who were previously aldermen or members of the Planning Commission, or currently members of CLIC.

The staff of the committee received excellent cooperation from the Planning Commission, the planning staff, CLIC, the City Council, the departments and independent boards. Requests for information were always handled promptly. Without this kind of cooperation, the committee's work would have been much more difficult.

Much of the testimony before the committee was completed in April, 1968, but due to the reorganization of management and changes occurring in the Planning Commission, the deliberations of the committee took longer than expected.

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



MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Mail to: ☐ Home ☐ Office

Name _____ Telephone _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Employer _____ Telephone _____

Position _____

Employer's Address	YES	NO
My company has a matching gift program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My form is enclosed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Spouse Information

Spouse's Name _____

Spouse's Employer _____

Position _____ Telephone _____

Employer's Address _____

CL Membership suggested by _____

My tax-deductible dues contribution will be:

SUSTAINING \$500 or more. _____

SUPPORTING \$200-499. _____

CONTRIBUTING \$75-199. _____

*FAMILY \$40. _____

INDIVIDUAL \$30. _____

FULL-TIME STUDENT \$20. _____

BUSINESS \$150. _____

*Family Membership Complete Back Side

Includes one-year subscription(\$20) to the
Minnesota Journal, students half price.

Family membership entitled to a second JOURNAL. Please
designate name and address to which it should be sent.

*Through the Citizens League, thousands of metropolitan citizens
and businesses play a constructive role in dealing with the public
issues our community faces.*

RESEARCH and REPORTS

- Citizen committee research and debate develops new policy ideas which often become law.
- Experts equip the committees with facts and judgments.
- Comprehensive reports make the rounds, inform the public and frequently shape the debates.

PUBLICATIONS

- *Minnesota Journal* – twenty-two issues of engaging public affairs news, analysis and commentary — news you can't find anywhere else.
- *CL Matters* – an update of the League's community activities, meetings and progress on issues.
- *Public Affairs Directory* – a listing of agencies, organizations and officials involved in the making of public policy.

ACTION and IMPLEMENTATION

- Citizens communicate the League's work to the community and public officials, precipitate further work on the issues and get things to happen.

LEADERSHIP BREAKFASTS

- Public officials and community leaders meet with League members in locations throughout the metropolitan area to discuss timely issues.

SEMINARS

- Single-evening meetings offer debate and education covering pending public issues — an opportunity to become fully informed about and have an impact on issues that affect you.

INFORMATION RESOURCES

- A clearinghouse for metropolitan public affairs information and a resource of educational materials and speakers for the community.



*Public affairs
research and education
in the Minneapolis-Saint Paul
metropolitan area*

Citizens League

**708 South 3rd Street
Suite 500
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415**