



League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

POLICY STATEMENTS ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS PASSED AS AMENDED
AT THE CONCLUDING SESSION OF THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE
ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS - October 19, 1961

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

1. Because many of the problems posed by rapid growth and change within the Metropolitan Area are of intergovernmental concern, there is an interdependence and mutuality of interests on the part of the Area's governmental units. There is a need to give greater consideration to the welfare of the Metropolitan Area as a whole in solving these problems. This can only be accomplished with aid of the broadest possible understanding and support on the part of the Area's citizens. There is a need for expanded opportunities for citizen participation in working out solutions to problems of urban growth and change.
2. In marshalling the governmental resources necessary to deal with Metropolitan problems, the following principles are endorsed. Functions which are being discharged successfully by existing levels of government should be continued at these levels. The autonomy of existing governmental units must be preserved in this respect. Functions which cannot be discharged adequately at the levels to which they are presently assigned, or needed new functions which are not presently assigned, should be transferred or assigned to that level of government which is best fitted by virtue of its powers and geographic area of concern to discharge them. In this connection, the role of the counties in the Metropolitan Area should be examined from the standpoint of their existing and potential capacity to take on additional responsibilities for dealing with area wide problems.

Problems which require metropolitan solutions should in general be dealt with at that level. Additional ways of achieving coordinated action among metropolitan agencies must be developed. In the creation of new governmental units, the principle of responsibility to the electorate must be maintained.

In summary, three general alternatives are available in assembling the governmental resources necessary to deal with metropolitan problems. The first is to maintain and strengthen the status quo and attempt to deal with problems of intergovernmental concern through existing avenues of intergovernmental cooperation.

The second is to apply the principle of federation; that is, to maintain the existing structure of government in the Area and to supplement it by transferring to new levels of government those functions which cannot be dealt with adequately at existing levels.

The third is that of area wide consolidation--by replacing the existing units of municipal government with a single municipality serving the entire urban area.

The Conference feels that the first alternative will not be adequate to meet the tremendous demands which are presented by the growth situation confronting the Area.

Clearly, the third alternative is not in keeping with the desires and traditions of the people of this Area. The second alternative, which will involve limited transfer of autonomy for some functions to new levels of government, is considered to be the desired alternative. The rewards for this transfer will be measured in terms of an improved living environment for all of the citizens of the Metropolitan Area.

3. Because local government is constituted by state law, the Minnesota State Legislature is considered to hold the key to progress in solving metropolitan problems. As individuals, members of the Legislature have demonstrated a keen awareness of their responsibilities in this matter. As a body, the Legislature has not as yet demonstrated its full capacities for dealing with the problems of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area which presently contains over 45 per cent of the total population of our state. The Legislature must place the governmental tools necessary for metropolitan problem solving in the hands of those who are the most competent to use them, and who have the most to gain or lose from failure or success in their application. These hands belong to the people of this Metropolitan Area.

II. SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

1. We recognize that sewerage is a metropolitan problem and urge the establishment of a single metropolitan-wide agency to solve this problem.
2. We recognize the common interests of the entire Metropolitan Area in successfully meeting the transportation needs of the entire Metropolitan Area and urge the State Highway Department, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, each of the seven metropolitan counties, the City of Minneapolis, the City of St. Paul, and other units of local government to pool their resources in order to jointly develop a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Metropolitan Area, as soon as possible. We further urge this joint group to enlist the cooperation in this program of the affected private interests to the fullest extent possible.
3. We recognize the metropolitan nature of the problem of water resources management, and we further recognize the need for a comprehensive plan for meeting the water needs of the Metropolitan Area. We urge the State of Minnesota, the United States Geological Survey, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, the City of Saint Paul, the City of Minneapolis, and other communities to cooperatively prepare such a plan.
4. We recognize the need for the early acquisition of park and open space to serve the citizens of the entire Metropolitan Area. We further recognize the role of the counties in this matter and urge further study of possible avenues of inter-county cooperation in meeting this need.

5. We urge an examination of the public finance and taxation policies and the effect of these policies upon the development within the Metropolitan Area in order to provide a framework within which local government can more effectively solve its local problems and metropolitan needs can be met.
6. The Conference calls attention to the need for consultation with county and town officials on matters of state highway planning within the Metropolitan area.

III. MECHANICS OF SOLVING METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

1. We urge Governor Andersen to appoint a Metropolitan Problems Committee to work with the legislature in the preparation of legislation necessary for solving problems of intergovernmental concern within the Metropolitan Area and to formulate recommendations concerning the role of the State Government in this area. We recommend that this committee be bi-partisan in nature and broadly representative of the various groups within the Area.
2. It is recommended that organizational resources to fill needs in three general areas be explored.
 - (1) A Metropolitan Convention or Assembly calling together in a single body, representatives from all of the area's governmental units for the purpose of determining, prior to the 1963 Legislative session, desired action on metropolitan problems.
 - (2) A continuing forum where by local governmental officials may discuss metropolitan issues and coordinate the activities of local government in this field. This concept has been described by the term Metropolitan Council.
 - (3) A forum whereby private citizens and groups can meet with public officials to acquire information, express opinions and develop advice concerning metropolitan problems. The Governor's Conference on Metropolitan Problems is a workshop device for filling this need. Consideration should be given to calling it annually or more often if needed.
3. We urge the Minnesota Senate and the Minnesota House of Representatives to each establish a permanent Committee on Metropolitan Affairs in the next session of the Legislature. We also recommend that any existing legislative study committee take full recognition of the problems of the metropolitan area as well as its advisory resources available to the legislature from the seven county area.
4. The Conference recognizes the primary responsibility of the State Government in equipping local government to carry out its responsibilities in the urban development field. We recommend the coordination of State agencies to advise and assist local government in solving its problems and to communicate to local government, information concerning the plans and policies of the State affecting local interests.

METROPOLITAN MAZE...

The Council-Watcher's Guide



Prepared by the League of Women Voters and Published
Jointly by the League and the University of Minnesota



METROPOLITAN MAZE

... the Council-watcher's guide

	Page
We Start with a Difference	1
We Meet Some Needs Cooperatively	2
Opinion Crystallizes	2
The Legislature Acts	2
The Council Begins	2
Some Important Forces Interact (land use, financing public services, taxing policy)	3
Other Metropolitan Areas Adapt in Varying Ways	5
Areawide Services (chart)	7
Questions for the Future	8

METROPOLITAN MAZE

... the Council-watcher's guide

Something new in governmental structure ... nothing just like it anywhere else ... a possible model for the rest of the country. ... This is how the Twin Cities Area Metropolitan Council is being described. Briefly, the Council is an agency established by the Minnesota legislature in 1967 to coordinate the planning and development of the state's largest metropolitan complex.

This booklet, prepared by the League of Women Voters, sketches the circumstances that led to the Council's formation and helped determine its present structure; outlines the Council's responsibilities and evolving activities; discusses some of the interacting factors that influence land use, taxing policies, and the financing of public services in the area; takes a brief look at what other metropolitan communities are doing; and poses some questions for the future.

In addition to the problems peculiar to it, the Twin Cities area shares with other centers the special urban problems related to public services, housing, education, job opportunities, and many more. These concerns are reflected in the League of Women Voters' program of study and action. Hence this booklet serves as a companion piece to other League publications that deal with the development of human resources and the financing of state and local government. It also serves as a companion piece to the University of Minnesota's new film "What Kind of Tomorrow?" used in its Community Service Program dealing with Metropolitan growth problems and potentials.

The League and the University of Minnesota have joined forces to provide the metropolitan citizen with this information as a guide for study and for citizen participation.

WE START WITH A DIFFERENCE

Minnesota's Twin City area is in many ways unique in the nation. It is ONE metropolitan area with TWO focal points (the center cities) and it contains one-half the total population of the state. It is the center of a large trading region and it is isolated from other metropolitan centers.

St. Paul and Minneapolis — long-time cultural, tourist, and industrial centers — have separate newspaper coverage, separate transportation patterns, and separate downtown retail business and office areas. In recent years suburban growth has resulted in the development of many large retail and office centers outside the cities.

Geographically, the central cities with their suburbs in seven surrounding counties make up a single urban complex with common problems and common assets. Physical size and expansion possibilities are not limited by major barriers such as mountains, lakes or oceans, and the nearest major metropolitan area is several hundred miles away.

Because of the concentration of financial and distributive facilities and offices, the influence of the Twin Cities area extends to the Dakotas and eastern Montana, throughout Minnesota, and into western Wisconsin and northern Iowa. Economically, its importance is enhanced by its being the head of navigation on the Mississippi River, the headquarters of two major railroads and of the Ninth Federal Reserve District. It has a high quality labor force and a highly diversified economy that is not dependent on any one industry. Politically, it can claim extensive citizen participation in govern-

ment. People in this area have a better understanding of the issues and support their convictions more actively than do those in many other parts of the country.

Both the state capitol and the Twin Cities campus of the state university are located in St. Paul and Minneapolis. Most state legislators live in the metropolitan area during the legislative sessions, and in addition, state agencies are accessible to residents and municipalities. The scholarly expertise of the various departments of the university is also readily available and exerts an important influence on the growth of the area.

Out of this unique pattern of development have grown some unique problems. Three great rivers — the Mississippi, the Minnesota and the St. Croix — first brought agriculture, commerce and industry to the area. These rivers and our many fine lakes also are tourist attractions. Decisions concerning water and land use become extremely difficult because the needs of recreation, transportation and housing must be balanced against the industrial and commercial needs and the jobs and services they represent.

Around our cities no orderly pattern of growth has developed. We see instead a leapfrogging of small developments. Service needs, such as transportation for the area, are complicated by the fact that there is no one focal point of high density population. Our people live in two separate cities each with its cluster of suburban centers and low density residential areas.

WE MEET SOME NEEDS COOPERATIVELY

Governmental solutions to larger-than-local problems are not new to the Twin Cities area. Examples are the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District established in 1933, the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission in 1945 (both special-purpose districts), and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission in 1957. Local units of government formed such organizations as Inter-County Councils and Leagues of Municipalities. Many needs were met at the nongovernmental level through cooperative efforts in the business world, the sports world, and among religious and civic organizations.

There is an outstanding willingness on the part of core city and suburban leaders to work together for the benefit of the region as a whole. Out of this spirit the new Metropolitan Council was born.

The first specific proposals were advanced in the late 1950's and gathered momentum in the early 1960's. The pace

quickened significantly in the mid-1960's. The key factors were several. First, proposals came from prominent leaders of both political parties, some of them influential officials from the suburbs as well as from the cities. Second, the newspapers played an active role, especially the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, as did the business community and the Citizens League. With the formation of its Council of Metropolitan Area Leagues in the early 1960's, the League of Women Voters also helped to build interest in the various plans. Third, a major breakthrough occurred when it was suggested that a metropolitan governmental unit could be based on legislative districts rather than on municipalities. Fresh in people's minds was the one-man-one-vote question in the courts. Basing representation on legislative districts eased much of the friction caused by rivalry between suburbs and between the two cities. It also opened up the possibility of getting the legislature to create the governmental vehicle rather than going the referendum route.

OPINION CRYSTALLIZES

Through the summer and winter of 1966-67 opinion was crystallizing among the leaders in the metropolitan area. Agreement was reached on the need for areawide decision-making. Disagreement still existed between those who wanted the governmental unit to be an operating agency and those who wanted it to be a coordinating council. The first group—represented most articulately by Chambers of Commerce, Leagues of Municipalities, and political party leaders—envisioned a small full-time Board, probably elected, in charge of the actual operation of metropolitan

functions such as sewerage, transportation and planning. They saw this agency as a metropolitan unit, separate from the state but dependent upon the legislature for the transfer of new functions to it as areawide operation became necessary. The second group considered a coordinating council more appropriate and feasible because it would be less disturbing to existing special districts. They envisioned a part-time Board, appointed rather than elected. Most of them saw the coordinating council as a necessary first step toward an elected, operating agency.

THE LEGISLATURE ACTS

When the 1967 legislature convened, committees began to hold hearings on Senator Odahl's bill, the proposed metropolitan operating agency. Then two legislative leaders—Senator Rosenmeier from Little Falls and Representative Albertson from Stillwater—proposed a state agency responsible to the legislature with the Board appointed by the Governor. These two concrete proposals representing a divergence of opinion might have produced a stalemate except for two factors: (1) great momentum had developed for a metropolitan unit of government, and (2) federal legislation passed in 1966 was about to give significant new power to the already existing Metropolitan Planning Commission. The legislature became convinced that the Commission must either be changed drastically or be replaced by

something else.

Throughout the session a fascinating struggle took place between the opposing forces. Finally a compromise was sought. Representative Renner from outstate Walker and the Citizens League came up with a bill which proposed a metropolitan unit that would start as a coordinating district and become an operating agency after a couple of years. This bill had wide support, but was not adopted. Generally speaking, most of the metropolitan legislators favored the Renner bill, while the Rosenmeier-Albertson bill had the support of outstate legislators plus a few powerful metropolitan legislators. The latter bill was passed, and the Metropolitan Council became a reality.

THE COUNCIL BEGINS

The Twin Cities Area Metropolitan Council was established as an agency to coordinate the planning and development of the metropolitan area made up of the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott and Washington.

In accordance with the law, the Governor appointed a chairman and 14 Council members. Each Council member resides in and represents one of 14 Council districts. Combinations of legislative districts comprise the Council districts.

The Council supersedes the 10-year-old advisory Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the staff of the former commission has become the staff of the Council. The Council acts as a coordinating agency for the special districts (see chart) and has the power to suspend their development plans until the next session of the legislature. The Council also has the power to review development plans of local units of government on any matter having an areawide effect, but the powers of the Council on these matters are only advisory. The Council can suspend for 60 days the development plan, but then the local unit may move ahead with the plan if it wishes.

State law names the Council as reviewing agency where review is required by federal law or regulation. The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development (Model Cities) Act of 1966 requires that a regional agency review grant applications for planning or construction of hospitals, airports, libraries, highways and other transportation facilities, water development and land conservation projects, in addition to open space projects (such as parks and recreational areas) and sewer and water facilities. State law also gives the Council the power to review requests for grants from the open space program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), from the Department of Interior's land and conservation fund, and from the state's natural resources account. Since requests for federal grants nationally are expected to total three or four times the amount of money available, the importance of the Council's role is obvious.

In some respects the scope of the Council is limited. While it has the ability to influence the location of certain public capital investments through its review power, it cannot initiate such plans, nor has it the authority to control private capital investment. With regard to transportation it is the newly created Metropolitan Transit Commission that has the

authority to develop a transit plan and program coordinated with the Metropolitan Development Guide (see page 7), to acquire rights of way, and to experiment with improved transit service, all of which have a major impact on future development.

Specifically, the Council agreed to focus its initial work on five major subjects:

- (1) adoption of a Metropolitan Development Guide;
- (2) sewage disposal for the seven-county area;
- (3) mass transportation needs—a cooperative project with the Metropolitan Transit Commission;
- (4) the metropolitan zoo and open space needs;
- (5) problems caused by local consent requirements in highway projects.

By mid-1968 the Metropolitan Council is expected to approve a Metropolitan Development Guide for use as its point of reference when reviewing development plans. In the interim the Council will use the draft guide prepared by the Joint Program for Land Use and Transportation Planning, an organization which included the Metropolitan Planning Commission and its advisory groups of citizens and elected officials, the state highway department, and 13 agencies of local government in the Twin Cities and surrounding counties. This draft sees constellation cities as the pattern of growth that residents would prefer for the future. Each city would be an area of several star-like clusters of development. Present downtowns would be important, half again as large as today, but there would also be 20 to 30 large mixed retail/office centers, roughly similar to the total Southdale complex, providing focus and identity for outlying communities. An additional 40 to 60 medium-large retail centers similar to Har Mar, Sun Ray or Knollwood would supplement the mixed centers. The basic unit for industrial development would be the medium-sized industrial park of 200 to 600 acres, located near to but not on the same site as the retail/office centers.

SOME IMPORTANT FORCES INTERACT

LAND USE IN THE TWIN CITY METROPOLITAN AREA

In older countries such as England highly centralized control of land use is accepted because urban land is obviously in short supply. In the Twin Cities metropolitan area there is not this obvious land shortage.

Historically Americans have been expeditious "users" of land. We pioneered westward, able to allow our more adventurous immigrants land for settlement, while the most recently arrived "cheap labor force" led a tolerable existence in the cities. We also moved out of the cities when we needed and could afford a better environment. We left behind the logged-over land and the city slum.

As the population in our own area spirals, accessible land becomes increasingly valuable. There is a growing awareness of how directly space is related to the environment; not

space for buildings alone, but space for people to live the kind of life they wish. Does the physical environment have pleasing contrasts? Are jobs, shopping and schools convenient? Can each person readily find the kind of recreation he needs? And perhaps closest to most individuals, what are the available choices of housing? Adding considerations of convenience, aesthetic values, standards of safety and health, and other factors to our space needs changes the equation. If the area is to accommodate its projected growth satisfactorily, the amount of land suitable for every activity is far from limitless.

Terrain is the initial shaper of land use. Although no barrier to expansion, the area's three great rivers, their valleys, and the hundreds of lakes channel development simply by the geographical fact of their existence.

Private capital investment continues to influence land use trends. In Thomas Jefferson's agrarian America, he considered the "small landholders the most precious parts of the

state." Today it is the large corporate investment that most directly affects the development of an area, while individual housing plays a follower's role. This is particularly easy to see in suburban areas, where a leapfrogging development may transform a cornfield into a good-sized village, or a shopping center of major importance, or an industrial plant. Furthermore, current land use plays an important role in determining the use of adjacent land.

Government has three tools available for influencing the character of land use:

REGULATION is the oldest, including building codes, subdivision regulation, zoning, and more recently, planning and federal loan eligibility.

TAXATION can be a potent instrument for bringing about desirable development, but only insofar as the authority to tax it coterminous with the area to be developed.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT ACQUISITION is a large shaper of land. Parks, schools, airports, highways, and public housing can define an area and determine its future use.

The three government tools are by no means held in one hand.

REGULATION presents perhaps the most irregular pattern of the three, as it occurs on several levels. Most municipalities in our area have local zoning ordinances; counties (except Hennepin and Ramsey) may plan and zone in their unincorporated areas. The Metropolitan Council was charged with the dual responsibility of planning in the seven-county area and of reviewing plans within the area which are metropolitan in effect.

TAXATION as a tool to influence land use has been referred to as an instrument of disunity with just two rules: local autonomy and winner-takes-all. Fiscal zoning through which a town seeks to lure a particularly lucrative shopping center, public utility, or industry, carries implications on two levels: land use and the financing of local services. The Minneapolis TRIBUNE (Sept. 12, 1967) commented, "In our metropolitan area . . . every separate municipality competes vigorously for industrial and commercial tax base. The result: industry is scattered throughout the area, often located on land better reserved for other purposes." The present low taxes on land and higher taxes on improvements of property have led to speculative land purchases and conversely to the neglect of city property resulting in slum deterioration. (If you improve that older house, your taxes may go up.)

DIRECT ACQUISITION is similarly the prerogative of agencies on several levels although plans which have an areawide impact must now be reviewed by the Metropolitan Council.

The land use cycle diagram below shows how important public acquisition of highway land might be. The way land is used (1) generates trips (2); the need to take trips creates transportation needs (3); the construction of a highway or other transportation facility (4) provides accessibility (5); accessibility permits people to get to a site, which affects the

value of the land (6); and the value of the land is a consideration in deciding what it is to be used for (1).

LAND USE - TRANSPORTATION CYCLE



SOURCE: "TRANSPORTATION AND THE CITY," ARCHITECTURAL RECORD, OCTOBER 1966, PAGE 58

FINANCING PUBLIC SERVICES

Financing of governmental services continues to be one of the most perplexing facets of any discussion concerning the provision of those services. Costs continue to spiral upward as population and demand for services increase. And most costs are met by taxes.

Metropolitan areas present special problems of financing. We must simultaneously consider (1) the political jurisdiction in which the decision-making power should appropriately be lodged, (2) the need for services, (3) the ability to pay for them, and (4) the benefits received by the citizens of the area. We must then try to choose the method of financing which would best achieve the desired goals of the metropolitan community. The whole picture is complicated by an amazing overlap of governmental units. In the Twin Cities metropolitan area we have more than 300 political jurisdictions, each with its own separate decision-making and taxing authority. We live in one political jurisdiction, educate our children in a separate taxing jurisdiction (school district), go to work or shop in still different jurisdictions, and drive our cars on roads provided by the state, the county, the city or federal government.

The property tax has been almost the only source of revenue for local units of government in Minnesota. Consequently competition for high-tax-producing facilities is a critical problem and source of conflict between municipalities within our metropolitan area, as was pointed out. Decision-making on land use at the local level of government often is strongly influenced by commercial interests. Municipalities fight for shopping centers, office buildings and industrial complexes because they provide the property tax to support the municipal

services needed. Under today's tax policies, a local official is compelled to go all out for the tax base in order to be re-elected. Likewise it is to a community's advantage to restrict housing development and to zone so that only expensive, high-tax-producing units are built.

This works well for some suburbs — if they happen to be located at the intersection of two freeways, or perhaps if they have a large utility installation in their back yard — but how about the other municipalities, the "have-nots"? Should the caliber of a child's education depend upon whether or not large taxpaying industries are located in their school district? How about the central cities with their special welfare problems and as much as 1/4 of their property off the tax rolls in public buildings, religious institutions, parks, roads, schools?

One of the most interesting features of Minnesota's 1967 Tax Reform and Relief law is its feed-back arrangements whereby 1/4 of the revenue from the sales tax goes to local units of government, including school districts, on a per capita basis. In cities of the first class (over 100,000 population) 3/5 of the new revenue goes to city government and 1/5 to city school districts. In other cities, villages, towns and townships, 1/2 goes to school districts and 1/2 to local governments. This might lessen inter-municipal warfare. However, to some extent there are still differences in wealth relative to needs among

the various units and we are still faced with the problem of equalizing assessments.

A METROPOLITAN TAXING DISTRICT?

One controversial proposal calls for a metropolitan taxing authority. This would make possible uniform assessment practices throughout the metropolitan area and provide for some degree of equalization in assessment procedures. Also under discussion in Minnesota, by groups such as the Citizens League, are proposals to tax major commercial and industrial property on an areawide basis (metropolitan or state) and let the local units of government share the money on a user basis or a population basis instead of the present winner-take-all fashion.

Toronto, Canada, has established a metropolitan taxing district which pledges the full faith and credit of the tax base of the whole area behind bond issues for school and other local governmental purposes. Their crisis in local financing was a major reason for the establishment of a metropolitan government. For them, the taxing district has saved large amounts of money through lower interest rates. Is this applicable to Minnesota? What would be the effect upon each municipality? The pros and cons of this topic are on the agenda of the state legislature's Metropolitan and Urban Affairs Committee of the House.

OTHER METROPOLITAN AREAS ADAPT IN VARYING WAYS

Local governments in metropolitan areas are being adopted in many ways to meet the problems of providing services to ever increasing populations. No single method will work every time or in every locale; each plan must be designed to fit the circumstances and events peculiar to a given area. The following is a brief rundown of some of these adaptations.

URBAN COUNTY METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT

To operate under the urban county plan, the state legislature must first confer home rule status on the county. The county then moves from its traditional role as an administrative subdivision of the state to a position in which, while still an agency of the state, it provides a significant number of services of a municipal character within its jurisdiction.

EXAMPLE: Metropolitan Dade County, Florida (including Miami) is governed by a 13-member Board of County Commissioners, 5 elected at large, 5 by districts, and 1 each from Miami, Miami Beach, and Hialeah.

CITY-COUNTY REORGANIZATION

This method is closely related to Urban County, but requires a more complete structural change. The use of either plan is generally limited to those metropolitan areas where most of the land lies within a single county.

EXAMPLE: The Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee plan is similar in many ways to the strong mayor form of city government. The executive head has administrative authority. He and 5 of the Council Members are elected at large and 35 are elected from districts. There are two service districts: the general district (covering the whole area) finances and provides such services as police, health and welfare, assessments, schools, the urban district (Nashville city limits) handles solid waste disposal, water supply, etc.

SPECIAL DISTRICTS

Of all forms of local government adaptations, special districts created by state legislatures have grown most rapidly in numbers in recent years. They are of two types: the single- or limited-purpose district which is the most prevalent, and the multi-purpose district.

Board members may be elected or appointed; they have authority to issue bonds, collect fees, and levy taxes. The use of special districts poses many problems such as the method of representation, coordination between them and related units of local governments, and the diminishing importance of general purpose local government that accompanies the proliferation of special districts. Although special districts may obtain federal grants for special purposes, they now need to clear these plans through an areawide agency responsible for regional planning.

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT, FEDERATION TYPE

Federation is an extended use of functional transfer (see Other Adaptations below). Some functions are administered by the "Metro" while others are administered by the political subdivisions of the metropolitan area. In their advanced stage of development, the urban county and multi-purpose metropolitan district resemble the federated plan.

EXAMPLE: The Metropolitan Council of Greater Toronto, Canada, has authority to make decisions on its own, to execute them, and to levy against each of the constituent municipalities an equitable share of the cost of metropolitan operations. The Council is composed of representatives from duly elected councils of each municipality within the area. These representatives have a dual function in that they serve their local municipality and council one week and the following week they apply their attention to regional problems as members of the Metropolitan Council. The Metropolitan Toronto Act of January 1, 1967 consolidated the 13 former municipalities into 6 new ones, changed the council constitution to provide representation on the basis of population, and broadened metropolitan functions to include all welfare, solid waste disposal, and ambulance service. The policy-recommending body is the Executive Committee, composed of a chairman, six local municipal mayors and two senior councillors plus two aldermen of the Toronto City Council.

METROPOLITAN COUNCILS OF GOVERNMENTS (COG's)

These councils are voluntary associations of elected public officials from most or all of the governments of a metropolitan area, formed to seek a better understanding among the governments and officials of the area, to develop a consensus regarding metropolitan needs, and to promote coordination in solving their problems. Critics of COG's ask, how useful are they in areas of serious controversy? How effective are they in providing services? How adequate is their financing? How much authority do they have?

EXAMPLES: METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (MWCOG) is one of the most active COG's. It is a regional organization of the major local governments and their elected officials, plus the area members of the Maryland and Virginia legislatures and the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives—164 members in all. Working through an executive committee drawn from the larger assembly, MWCOG attempts to develop solutions to such regional problems as air and water pollution, transportation, crime, water supply, etc. In addition, it is the regional planning organization for Metropolitan Washington. MWCOG is an independent organization supported by contributions from its 15 local governments, federal grants, and transportation planning funds from the two state governments. It recently expanded membership has established a system of weighted voting to give large jurisdictions a voice more equal to their populations.

THE ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS (ABAG), in the San Francisco area, consists of elected officials from each member city and county in the nine-county area. Membership is voluntary and ABAG is financed by annual assessment, special assessment by the state legislature, and grants. A California state legislative committee, now studying the proliferation of special districts within the state will report to the state legislature in January, 1969 with recommendations on ABAG's request for limited governmental and financial powers. ABAG proposes to go "operational" by being reconstituted as a multi-but limited-purpose regional government with the power of eminent domain, the power to tax and to issue general obligation bonds (with 60% voter approval), revenue bonds, and special assessment bonds.

METROPOLITAN ATLANTA COUNCIL OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (MACLOG) in Georgia; MID-WILLAMETTE VALLEY

COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (M-WYCOG), Salem, Oregon; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG) in Los Angeles, are similar voluntary associations of elected officials. Among committees recently established by MACLOG is "Metropoli", a unique organization endeavoring to upgrade law enforcement. M-WYCOG, reorganized in July, 1967, now has a regional planning function.

OTHER ADAPTATIONS

Other means of adapting local governments to deal with metropolitan problems include:

EXTRA-TERRITORIAL POWERS, which must be granted by the state legislature, enabling a city to regulate activity outside its boundaries.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS, making possible the joint exercise of powers and the letting of contracts for the performance of a particular service.

FUNCTIONAL TRANSFER TO A HIGHER LEVEL, involving the moving of a local government function to a higher level of government, usually the state, which then performs the function.

ANNEXATION AND CONSOLIDATION, absorbing a unit of government into a neighboring unit, or combining several to form a new unit.

JOINT POWERS (under Minnesota Joint Powers Act). Of interest in Minnesota is the Joint Powers law, whereby the state government allows local units of government to combine in providing any service which each local unit has the authority to provide alone.

REGIONAL AGENCY, multi-state agencies concerned with problems such as transportation, water and air pollution, and water supply.

FEDERAL IMPACT ON THE LOCAL COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

Federal aid programs have helped foster the creation of formal, areawide cooperative bodies around the nation. In particular, the following federal acts have had great impact on the local cooperative movement.

HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962: Includes requirements for the coordination of all transportation and land use planning in urban areas and for coordination between the Housing and Home Finance Agency (now part of HUD, Housing and Urban Development), and the Bureau of Public Roads (now part of the Department of Transportation).

1945 AMENDMENT (SECTION 701g) TO THE HOUSING ACT OF 1954: The planning grant program is expanded to make eligible "organizations composed of public officials . . . representative of the political jurisdictions within a metropolitan area . . ."

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966 (Model Cities Act): SECTION 204 provides that after June 30, 1967 most applications for federal grants related to metropolitan programs must be reviewed by an areawide agency responsible for regional planning, composed of, or responsible to, elected officials.

SECTION 205 provides that to qualify for an extra bonus grant, the area must have adequate metropolitan-wide planning and programming; adequate metropolitan institutions for coordination; and that projects that have a major impact on the area must be carried out in accord with metropolitan planning and programming.

TWIN CITY AREAWIDE SERVICES

WHO HANDLES THEM NOW	HOW THEY ARE FINANCED	HOW HANDLED UNDER METROPOLITAN COUNCIL	COMMENTS
AIR AND POLLUTION The legislature created a state air and water pollution control board, the Minnesota Pollution Control Commission, with the authority to regulate air and water pollution.	New Minnesota Pollution Control Commission (MPC) was allocated \$969,083 for the 1967-69 biennium.	Information of standards in most areas will be handled by the Minnesota Pollution Control Board. It will conduct studies of air and water pollution.	The PCA is almost self-sufficient in the state of Minnesota waters, establishing clean-air standards and studying solid waste disposal.
SEWER DISPOSAL The Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District provides sewer disposal for the city of Minneapolis and the city of St. Paul. The district is the 1st and 2nd largest in the country.	Sanitary district financed by user charges.	Met. Council will appoint a non-voting member to the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District. The district will determine the construction or expansion of sewer treatment plants but it can determine the routing of major conduits.	This is a single-purpose district with a 7-member governing board. These members are elected by the city of Minneapolis and one from outside the met. area. No suburban representatives on the board.
MOBILE CONTROL Metropolitan Council District (special purpose district).	\$50 per person (except Corner Co.).	same as below.	
TRANSIT The legislature passed a bill creating a 9-member Metropolitan Transit Commission (Met. Council). It may conduct transit studies, subsidize private bus firms in experimental operations and extension of related services. The Met. Council is to be established to the next legislative session.	Financed by a \$1 fee on all vehicles. In the metropolitan area. Estimated revenue is \$650,000 annually.	The Met. Council will appoint a non-voting member to the Transit Commission. It will have the power to review and suspend, pending action by the legislature, any portion of a long-term transit plan.	All transit in the Twin Cities area is now handled by privately owned transit companies. The Commission is a 9-member body made up of representatives from the city of Minneapolis, the city of St. Paul, and a new mode of transportation and a new mode of transportation are required to coordinate its activities with the Met. Council.
AIRPORT Metropolitan Airport Commission (special purpose district).	Property tax levy 1.43 mills in St. Paul and Minneapolis only. User charges.	Under its plan-revision power, the Met. Council will be asked the existing agency to study the airport. The Met. Council will have the power to review and suspend, pending action by the legislature, any portion of a long-term transit plan.	Service charges make it self-supporting. Taxes pay off bonds.
METROPOLITAN HIGHWAYS Responsibility for highways falls on State Highway Dept. and to a lesser extent on County Hwy. Dept. An integrated location plan for the Met. area was developed by the State Highway Dept. A report of highways is being coordinated with overall met. planning by means of this plan.	State and federal gas taxes, license fees and property taxes.	Under its plan-revision power, the Met. Council will be asked the existing agency to study the highways. The Met. Council will have the power to review and suspend, pending action by the legislature, any portion of a long-term transit plan.	
PARKS OPEN SPACES Responsibility for acquisition and development of parks and open spaces is shared by the Met. Council and the state government and to a limited extent with state government.	With voter approval Met. Council is financed by bond issue (levied on home taxes) and state funds (levied on home taxes).	The Council will review power over local requests for federal assistance for parks and open spaces. The Met. Council will have the power to review and suspend, pending action by the legislature, any portion of a long-term transit plan.	Parks and open spaces have been met. federal efforts for grant (Land and Water Conservation Act) and the criteria of the state recreation and open spaces. The Met. Council will have the power to review and suspend, pending action by the legislature, any portion of a long-term transit plan.

QUESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

What do you see as the ultimate role for the Metropolitan Council? Should it operate areawide services, and if so, what services? Should it have separate taxing power, and if so, what kind? Should its members be elected or does the appointive process suit it better?

POWERS

Should the Metropolitan Council be a coordinating body or an operating agency? If we assume that some services must be provided on an areawide rather than a local basis, one question at issue is whether each such service should be operated by a special-purpose district or whether all of them should be operated by one multi-purpose agency. Advocates of the single-purpose district maintain that the service (for example, parks or transit or libraries) gets more concentrated attention and has more expertise brought to bear on it than it would if it were one of several services operated by a multi-purpose agency. They also believe the service has a better chance of being adequately funded than it would if it had to depend on its share from a common pot. Opponents of the special district approach claim that this form of government is undemocratic and irresponsible to the electorate because the decision-makers usually are not elected, and with the proliferation of special districts it becomes more and more difficult for the citizens to know who serves on which board, when meetings are held, etc. Economists point out that since special districts have the authority to issue bonds, collect fees, and levy taxes they are simply one more factor contributing to tax inequities in metropolitan areas.

Should the function of the Metropolitan Council be to review plans submitted to it by other agencies, or should it be empowered to initiate and directly guide these plans as they develop? Should it have more authority with respect to major zoning and eminent domain? As the Council holds hearings on the proposed metropolitan plan, consider such questions as these: What kinds of controls (or powers) would be needed to put the plan into effect? Could it be done by controlling the timing and location of highways, utilities, and open space? Or would powers of advance land acquisition be needed to acquire land and control its development—particularly at the outer, expanding fringes of the metropolitan area? How could competing development in nearby areas be limited and turned toward cooperative action for regional development? How would this affect the present zoning powers of municipalities? Would the metropolitan area need an industrial authority with urban-renewal-like powers, or could the job be done by private investment? What would happen to the tax base if the commercial and industrial base were concentrated in certain areas? What effects, for example, would this have on school districts?

The 1967 legislature gave the Council review power (and 60-day hold power) over public development having metropolitan impact. Should this power be extended also to the private sector—major capital investments having metropolitan impact? Should the Council be authorized to control the location and timing of all major development?

SERVICES

As you consider what services should be provided at the metropolitan level, consider each service separately (schools, police, parks, public health, transportation, sewerage, etc.) and see where it fits best—under a local unit of government, a metropolitan unit, the state, or the federal government? Weigh the advantages of the local unit where

decisions are made closer to home, perhaps by friends or neighbors, rather than by professionals not accountable to the voter. Weigh this against the advantages of expert knowledge more readily obtainable at a higher level of government. Consider other arguments put forth by those who dissent from metropolitan solutions:

1. Metro is merely another naive panacea, like "non-partisan" elections.
2. This Metro push is all for the benefit of the core city, which must expand or die.
3. Metro might save money in the short run, but it would be more costly in the long run because it would increase services.

FINANCE

How should such services as water, sewerage and transportation be financed? By an across-the-board areawide tax on property? on income? on gross earnings? By an assessment on each municipality? On what basis? ability to pay? a use formula? Or should different services be financed in different ways? Should a distinction be made, for instance, between physical services and those directly connected with the development of human resources? Should education and public health perhaps be supported by state funds and a mass transit system by funds provided at the metropolitan level? If state funds are involved, should the state play a major role or should it make grants with no strings attached? Or do you see the federal government taking major responsibility in certain areas because metropolitan problems are national in scope or because those problems are not being solved at the local or state levels?

REPRESENTATION—

Elected or Appointed?

This question is directly related to the questions of power and financing, but the issue is not immediate. The advantage of the present appointive council is that it enabled the metropolitan area to get an early start with metropolitan decision-making. It was not necessary to wait for the general election of 1968. Another argument for an appointive council is that it makes it possible to keep metropolitan problems out of the potentially divisive political arena. A major factor to the legislature was the potential threat to their own political base which some legislators felt would be present if council members were elected. Also an appointive board permits the use of prominent leaders of the academic and business community on a part-time basis.

The arguments for an elective council are expressed by those who see the Metropolitan Council (1) becoming an operating district and taking a stronger lead in controlling the timing and location of major public and private investments having metropolitan impact; (2) taking a more active role in financing metropolitan services and in lessening tax inequities. In connection with the latter there is also a constitutional question—taxation without representation.

It is plain that all of these "Questions for the Future" are interrelated. Essentially they fall into four broad categories:

- What decisions should be made at the metropolitan level, and what agency or agencies should make them? (powers)
- How should decision-makers be chosen? (representation)
- Who should carry out the decisions? (operation of services)
- How should the costs of services be met? (financing)

**COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN AREA LEAGUES OF
WOMEN VOTERS**

December 1967

Copies available from the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis, 84 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 and the League of Women Voters of St. Paul, 26 East Exchange, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101. The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan organization which works to promote responsibility through informed and active participation of citizens in government.