

FOUR CASE STUDIES IN METROPOLITAN REGIONAL PLANNING

by

Paul Raymond Griffin

Thesis submitted to the
Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of
Urban and Regional Planning

APPROVED:

~~Ann D. Watts~~
Ann D. Watts
Chairperson

~~Richard E. Zody~~
Richard E. Zody

~~Judson L. James~~
Judson L. James

May 1979
Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is grateful for the assistance, encouragement, and dedication of the faculty committee: Dr. Ann D. Watts, Chairperson; Dr. Richard E. Zody; and Dr. Judson L. James. Without their constructive advice and criticism, this thesis would not have been completed.

The writer also wishes to express his gratitude to Mrs. Deborah Bryson, whose typing assistance allowed the writer to stay one day ahead of the deadline, for the most. Special thanks are also extended to Frank Tamberrino, SCRIPT consultant, who helped the writer stay one step ahead of the system.

Finally, most wholehearted thanks are given to the writer's wife, Debbi, daughter Heather Lynn, and Schultzie the Weiner Dog for providing the support and inspiration necessary to see this thing through.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOUR CASE STUDIES IN METROPOLITAN REGIONAL PLANNING . . . i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

Chapter page

I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM 1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 14
III. A REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL LEGISLATION 45
IV. THE CASE STUDIES 67
V. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS 128

BIBLIOGRAPHY 153

Chapter I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

In 1970, approximately 69 percent of the 205 million people living in the United States resided in 264 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. In fact, during the decade of the 1960-70, nearly 85 percent of the total population increase for the nation occurred within these SMSAs.¹ Each SMSA is by definition a metropolitan area which exhibits a substantial degree of internal locational interdependence in terms of labor market dynamics, commerce and trade, and social identity. Within the geographic limits of the SMSA, however, one typically finds an extremely fragmented and atomized arrangement of governmental entities.

There were more than 16,000 general purpose local governments in the officially designated SMSAs in 1970.² Thus, a typical SMSA in 1970 consisted of two counties, 13 townships, 21 municipalities, 18 school districts, and 31 special purpose districts.³ Each of these entities was involved in exercising whatever limited powers it had for decision

¹Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Regional Decision Making: New Strategies for Substate Districts, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 2.

²Ibid., p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 2.

making, allocating resources, and engaging in limited planning activities largely independent of the other governmental entities. Obviously, many of the decisions being made in this highly fragmented and geographically limited area involve issues of mutual concern to neighboring units of government.

The fragmented governmental structure of the SMSA created unfortunate and unnecessary difficulties in finding solutions to those problems which extend beyond the boundaries of the independent units.* In many cases where local units sought cooperative solutions to area wide problems the concern over territorial imperative, or not giving up one's authority to another existing unit of government, resulted in the creation of even more single function special purpose districts within the metropolitan region. Cooperation thus frequently added to the complexity of the governmental structure of the metropolitan area rather than to its simplification.

While they have not occurred with any great regularity or frequency, there have been a number of attempts over the past quarter of a century to reorganize the governmental

*Richard E. Zody, "The Politics of Decision Making: Impact on the Wichita Area", in Metropolitan Wichita Past, Present, and Future, Glenn Miller and Jimmy M. Skaggs, (Lawrence, Kansas: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1978), p.171-173.

structures of metropolitan areas to make them more responsive to issues and problems of areawide concern. These attempts at reorganization have included city-county consolidation as in the case of Indianapolis-Marion County, the federated approach of Metropolitan Dade County, and the multi-purpose umbrella agency such as the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area. Each of these reorganizations embodies a number of unique and advantageous characteristics as well as certain drawbacks or disadvantages. Much can be learned from studying these examples of governmental reorganization in metropolitan areas.

Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of this study to evaluate the viability of specific areawide planning functions within the structure of various examples of metropolitan government. Four case study governments have been selected: Metropolitan Dade County, Florida; the consolidated government of Indianapolis-Marion County, Indiana; the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota; and the Portland Metropolitan Service District in Portland, Oregon.

Within each of these metropolitan governmental organizations five federally sponsored planning programs will be

evaluated. These programs are: Areawide Comprehensive Planning Assistance; Areawide Comprehensive Health Planning; Manpower Planning; A-95 Review; and Urban Transportation Planning. Each of these programs represents a direct federal inducement for regional planning, and within the context of this study, metropolitan regional planning specifically. The extent to which these programs, as representative examples of federally initiated inducements to regional planning, have been incorporated within the aggregate planning effort of the metropolitan governments to be studied, will be indicative of the viability of these structure arrangements for metropolitan regional planning.

There are several specific characteristics which will be utilized to define whether or not a specific planning organization is viable within the metropolitan regional context. They are as follows:

1. **Autonomy** - The metropolitan organization should function as the primary planning organization for issues of metropolitan or regional concern. In addition, the metropolitan or regional planning concerns should be the primary focus of the organization's planning efforts. Metropolitan issues should be the first and foremost concern, not local, municipal issues.
2. **Comprehensiveness** - The metropolitan organization should incorporate a broad range of planning functions within its scope of operations. Although the planning section may not function as actual planning arm for all aspects of the metropolitan organization, it should have mandatory review and comment responsibilities for all planning functions within the metropolitan organization.

3. Coordination - The planning section of the metropolitan organization should have primary responsibility for coordinating the discrete planning operations of sub-metropolitan governmental entities as well as metropolitan departments and authorities. Mandatory review and comment of plans and growth programs would provide for this coordinating function.
4. Implementation - The metropolitan organization should have the capacity, the authority and the fiscal power to engage in the active implementation of planning decisions. This is not to say that the planning section of the metropolitan organization will have implementation powers itself, but rather that the larger governmental organization of which it is a part, will be so empowered.

These four characteristics are intended to differentiate metropolitan regional planning operations within a reorganized metropolitan governmental setting from the planning activities carried out by special purpose districts of metropolitan scale, as well as from the more common and traditional regional planning activities in the highly unstructured, fragmented governmental settings which exist in metropolitan areas. Metropolitan autonomy and comprehensiveness of scope differentiate the case studies from special purpose districts, and the coordination function and implementation capabilities set them apart from traditional regional planning activities.

Importance of the Study

This study will look at two very significant but different aspects of regional planning in metropolitan settings. First, it will provide a general overview of a mix of federal programs which were intended to provide financial incentives for states and localities to organize regional planning bodies to function as a forum for review and discussion of issues of mutual concern to local governments, and to provide a means for coordinating efforts to resolve mutual problems. Secondly, it will provide a detailed analysis of several different case examples of state and local initiatives aimed at simplifying governmental organization in metropolitan areas.

The general reluctance or inability of local units of government to come to grips with problems of mutual concern resulted in growth and development decisions being made, and implemented with little coordination and even less concern for potential areawide impacts. Local responses to the pressures and challenges of rapid population growth and rapid technological change during the 1950's were largely inadequate.⁵ The apparent ambivalence of state and local

⁵Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, The Challenge of Local Governmental Reorganization, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p.128.

governments to seek structural and organizational solutions to the problems of intergovernmental coordination, pulled the federal government into a major leadership role in defining and encouraging multi-jurisdictional planning and coordination.⁶ Many of the federal programs developed during the 1960's in response to these problems were aimed at building institutional bridges between state and local governments, and between units of local government.

Unfortunately, in a great many cases, the federal initiatives resulted in the establishment of one or more additional layers of government which served primarily administrative, review and comment roles for local grant-in-aid applications. There was not a major redefinition and reassignment of local governmental processes and functions. Those examples of local governmental reorganization which did occur, such as the cases to be utilized in this study, were undertaken independent of federal initiatives as a result of state and local actions.

One of the problems that has resulted is that in a number of cases and in a number of ways, the federal initiatives and the local government reorganization efforts have not been well synchronized. The federal programs which fund the

⁶Ibid., p. 128.

regional planning efforts do not appear on the surface to fit well within the restructured metropolitan organizations. This study will analyze the problems associated with the interfacing of federal efforts to support regional planning and local and state initiatives to reduce governmental fragmentation in metropolitan areas.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis to be tested for the purposes of this study is as follows:

The federally funded planning programs which were intended to initiate and provide financial support for regional planning activities, and the various state and local responses to the need for local government reorganization in metropolitan areas, have been largely uncoordinated, have failed to produce viable metropolitan regional planning organizations, and in many cases have proven to be antithetical.

There are a number of factors, both programmatic and organizational, which should come to the forefront during the course of this study to either support or refute the hypothesis. The first of these pertains to the compatibility or consistency of the federal planning programs them-

selves. In some instances the legislative definitions and requirements for things such as eligibility and the composition of the governing board or commission, appear to present complications relative to the criterion of comprehensiveness.

A second factor to be considered relates to the scale of governmental reorganization which occurs in the metropolitan area. In some instances, the governmental reorganization involves the entire domain of the SMSA as defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. In other instances it involves only a portion, albeit the most populous portion, of the SMSA.

The third and final factor involves the nature of the reorganization effort itself. Of particular interest in this area is the shifting of governmental functions from one unit to another. In some cases the integrity of the individual local units is not compromised at all. All of the existing units of local government retain their autonomy but transfer designated responsibilities and functions to an areawide organization. In other cases, units of local government are merged together, thus eradicating a certain amount of the complexity within the structure of local government.

Each of these factors represents a potentially significant feature in the rather complex fabric of metropolitan regional planning in this country. The study design is intended to help clarify some of the issues identified above by indicating the relationships among these factors for existing metropolitan planning efforts.

Methodology

This research effort involves case studies of four metropolitan regions which exhibit one form or another of regional government including a metropolitan planning function. Background data associated with each case study area have been collected and analyzed to provide a more detailed understanding of the distinctive characteristics of each organization. The case studies selected are different from one another in form and function and it is the comparison of some of these differences, as well as some similarities, that forms the basis for this study.

The data collected and analyzed for the case study governments concern not only the structure and organization of the metropolitan entity, but specific information related to the planning activities undertaken. Some of the relevant questions to be answered include:

1. What is the status of the planning function within the larger organizational framework of the government?
2. How much of the SMSA is included in the planning jurisdiction of the metro agency?
3. Are there any other regional planning operations with jurisdiction over all or part of the SMSA?
4. What are the primary sources of funding for the planning activities which are being undertaken?
5. In which of the five identified federal planning programs does the metropolitan organization participate?
6. Are there any direct linkages between the planning operations of the organization and the capital outlay programs of the various operating departments of the organization?
7. What are the relationships of the planning functions of the metropolitan organization to other local or regional planning activities in the metropolitan area?

The responses to these questions will provide a framework for evaluating the planning activities of the metropolitan organization relative to the viability criteria established earlier. This data will provide a clearer understanding of the planning functions, activities and organizational structure of each of the case study governments. Each case study government represents a different format for metropolitan governmental reorganization and the assignment of metropolitan planning responsibilities. These differences may be indicative of a number of the problems related to the failure to coordinate federal funding mechanisms with state and local efforts at reorganization.

In addition to this type of analysis, the five federally funded planning programs will also be evaluated in some detail. In order to assess the the compatibility of the designated federal programs in relation to the planning viability criteria, it is important to determine whether or not the federal funding strategies encourage the streamlining of the metropolitan governmental organization or the proliferation of unifunctional special purpose districts and agencies. As a result, the examination of each case study includes efforts at addressing the following questions:

1. What types of areas or regions are eligible for funding?
2. How are these areas designated?
3. What types of agencies are eligible for funding?
4. What are the requirements for local (regional) representation on the governing board on commission?

The data related to the five planning programs have come primarily from various government documents and legal volumes. Both the Congressional Record and the U.S. Code Book provide detailed data on the specific legislation and the administrative guidelines for each of the programs. For the case studies, the data have come from the individual organizations themselves for the most part. Copies of enabling legislation, work programs, and interviews with staff personnel have been utilized extensively.

The analysis of the data concerning the specific organizational parameters of the case study governments and the legislative specifics of the five federal planning programs may provide valuable insights toward clarifying which organizations or agencies are eligible for which types of funding; which organizations or agencies are involved in which types of planning programs; which organizational format best fulfills the definition for viable metropolitan regional planning; and which organizational format, if any, is most compatible with federal initiatives for regional planning in metropolitan areas.

In all there are five chapters in this study. Chapter II provides a review of the literature, primarily related to the evolution of planning from a municipal to a metropolitan concern, and also including an overview of the issue of metropolitan reorganization. Chapter III presents the basis information on each of the five federal planning programs utilized in this study. Chapter IV presents the data on the case study organizations themselves and their individual planning programs. The analysis and conclusions for the federal programs and the case study governments are presented in the final chapter, Chapter V.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Perhaps the basic, underlying premise upon which this study is based is that there is an inherent value in having the planning function of government organized in such a way that it be responsible to a single governmental entity. Obviously, this is not the case for the great majority of regional planning efforts in this country.⁷ Planning efforts at the regional level attempt to integrate areawide concerns into the daily affairs of local government. Thus, the success or failure of these efforts may depend for the most part on the coordination of the independent decision making forces of the various separate governments in the region.⁸ Planning decisions made at the regional scale can easily be scuttled by one or two obstinant local governments which are more concerned with their own competitive advantages in the region than with the process of orderly regional development as a whole.

⁷David C. Ranney, Planning and Politics in the Metropolis, (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969), p.102.

⁸Ibid., p.104.

The Initiation of City Planning

Planning has been recognized as a legitimate function of local government since the era of the City Beautiful Movement during the earliest years of the twentieth century.⁹ Although the planning function at the outset was organized largely in a citizen elite format, removed from the evils of machine politics and the influences of city government, the perceptions of the early reformers as to the proper place for planning within the community power structure were soon altered. The Chicago Plan Commission learned early on that it had to "surrender a certain independence for a closer relationship to the legislative and administrative agencies of municipal government."¹⁰ The emerging leaders of the city planning profession developed an awareness that the only means by which they would be able to influence the ongoing planning activities within city hall would be through a general acceptance of comprehensive planning by the municipal bureaucracy.¹¹

⁹Anthony Catanese, Planners and Local Politics (Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1974), p. 17.

¹⁰Mel Scott, American City Planning Since 1890 (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, Ltd., 1969) p. 141.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 141-145.

There was hardly a stampede by local governments to embrace the new profession as an official part of the municipal organization. Very few states authorized cities to appoint planning commissions during the first two decades of this century. Thus, many of the early advocates of professional planning, men such as Frederick Law Olmstead and Nelson P. Lewis, emphasized the need to educate both the citizens as a whole and the municipal officials to the need for and desirability of planning.¹² Although the institutionalization of planning within local government continued to move forward at a snail's pace, the primary proponents of planning developed a model enabling act for the creation of a Department of City Planning within the municipal organization by 1913.¹³ The model act suggested an advisory role for the planning function but one with clear and established linkages to the decision making structure of local government.

As the planning responsibility of local government slowly began to gain credence during the 1920's, a number of large cities such as New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Los Angeles also had adopted a view of planning which exceeded the boundaries of a single municipality. The

¹²Ibid., p. 142.

¹³Ibid., p. 143.

physical development aspects of city planning during this time emphasized the 'city efficient' concept of urban growth.¹⁴ The nation was in the midst of a social and economic boom period and the concerns of the early city planners, while still valid social concerns, were not viewed with the same fervor as when the planners were closely aligned with the urban reformers at the turn of the century.

Suburbanization and Governmental Fragmentation

The dramatic rise in the popularity and use of the automobile created enormous problems for large and small cities alike. First, city streets were not designed to accommodate the traffic that was generated thereby. The tremendous prosperity which enabled so many urban residents to purchase autos was now threatened by crippling congestion in the central business districts.¹⁵ A second major impact of the automobile was the opening up of access to suburban areas to even larger numbers of people, at greater distances from the urban center. The convenience of the automobile made it "the most effective device for spreading the city over a vast territory that history had ever seen."¹⁶

¹⁴Ibid., p. 183-269.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 186.

The problems generated by the automobile and the rapidly growing urban population created a demand for facility planning in a number of specific functional areas. Street improvement and transportation systems plans were the most pressing need, both for the downtown circulation systems and for the major linkages between the urban centers and the burgeoning suburbs.¹⁷ In addition to planning for street systems, there also were pressures for the development of plans relating to water supplies, sewerage facilities, and recreation and open space facilities for the expanding growth areas. The problems of unplanned and poorly coordinated growth that had fueled much of the fervor for city planning at the turn of the century were now beginning to crop up in the suburban areas beyond the city boundaries.¹⁸

The broadening of the concept of planning to incorporate a more regional or metropolitan perspective seemed inevitable to many planners of the time, because it seemed obvious to them that the municipal boundary was meaningless for planning purposes in an industrialized society.¹⁹ According

¹⁶Ibid., p. 186.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 187.

¹⁸Paul Studenski, Government of Metropolitan Areas (New York: National Municipal League, 1930) p. 31, 32.

¹⁹Mel Scott, op. cit., p. 192.

to these planners, individual plans for adjacent and contiguous local units of government should be based not primarily on the parochial concerns of the individual unit alone, but on a more wholistic or comprehensive notion of the growth issues and characteristics of the region as well. By and large, the issue was not one of coordinating the independent planning activities of the separate jurisdictions, for in most cases the suburban areas were unincorporated territories²⁰ and, few if any of these areas were involved in planning activities.

During the latter half of the 19th century, it was common practice for eastern cities to annex the rapidly developing areas adjacent to their borders. This was not only the primary means by which municipalities expanded their area, it also was the means through which urban services and the urban infrastructure were expanded into the developing fringe areas.²¹ Toughened state annexation laws dramatically reduced the pace of annexation after the turn of the century, reflecting a growing resentment and resistance on the part of the residents of the fringe areas.²² These same

²⁰John C. Bollens, Henry J. Schmaridt. The Metropolis: Its People, Politics and Economic Life, (New York: Harper & Row, 1965) pp. 280-297.

²¹Ibid., p. 281.

²²Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the

phenomenon also occurred in midwestern and western cities to a smaller degree, but later during the century.

With annexation proceedings reduced substantially, the tremendous increase in accessibility due to the automobile, and the dramatic population shifts toward urban areas during the first half of this century, the unincorporated areas at the urban fringe experienced very large increases in population. Since these areas were not going to be annexed by the existing municipalities they began to establish their own governments and petition the states for formal incorporation with the granting of autonomy and the full range of municipal powers.²³ Incorporation became a means for avoiding or mitigating the threat of annexation as well as a means of establishing legitimate and necessary government operations. Unfortunately, the laxness of many state laws regulating incorporation allowed and even encouraged the proliferation of extremely small municipal corporations, adding greatly to the fragmentation of governmental structures in metropolitan America.²⁴

Challenge of Local Governmental Reorganization, (Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974) p. 82.

²³Bollens and Schmandt, op. cit., p. 282.

²⁴Ibid., p. 284.

None of this is intended to indicate that central city annexation of the suburban fringe would have been a preferred alternative to the present situation. There are limits, both physically and economically, beyond which annexation and the one-government concept should not go. "The boundaries of a single jurisdiction cannot be expanded indefinitely with the spread of urban development without eventually losing the advantages of local government."²⁵ Thus, the problem of metropolitan governmental organization cannot summarily be resolved by one form or another of governmental unification. In some cases this may be an acceptable and appropriate solution. In others, however, it may not be. Such determinations are highly dependent upon the particular characteristics of the area including problem definition, the size of the metropolitan area, the relationships between state and local governments, and other issues of this type. Integration of metropolitan governments does not necessarily entail placing all responsibility in one authority but in harnessing the actions of many authorities at several levels to focus on common or compatible goals.²⁶

²⁵Annmarie Hauck Walsh, The Urban Challenge to Government, (New York, Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1969), p. 42.

²⁶Ibid., p. 42.

By and large, the independent municipalities within the metropolitan environment have sought to assert and strengthen their independence from the central city, and from each other, rather than adopting a more cooperative attitude. As a result, there exists a great deal of variation within any given metropolitan area in terms of the municipal regulations in force in different sections of the metropolis, in the standards of services maintained, and in the sectional treatment of various problems which are essentially metropolitan in character.²⁷ The important decisions concerning development issues within the highly integrated social and economic fabric of the metropolis were, and still are in many cases, being made on the basis of individual municipal outlooks. The actors, both institutional and individual, operate within the narrow perspective and specific concerns of their own particular institutional base.²⁸ For a long time, there existed no organizational base, and little institutional support, for consideration of areawide problems at the metropolitan level. There was certainly no decision making process which was structured to deal with metropolitan issues.²⁹

²⁷Paul Studenski, op. cit., p. 29.

²⁸Norton Long, "Who Makes Decisions in Metropolitan Areas," in Michael N. Danielson, ed., Metropolitan Politics: A Reader, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1966), p. 102.

In many cases, communities that were engaging in various physical planning activities found their efforts thwarted or neutralized by the actions of neighboring jurisdictions.³⁰ For example, the location of an industrial plant in one community may ruin a planned residential area in the neighboring community. Inadequate street development and maintenance in one area may shift traffic to the street system of another jurisdiction which is ill prepared to handle the additional traffic flow. Wastes from neighboring jurisdictions may pollute the air and water resources of a relatively pristine community.³¹ These external impacts of localized decision making related to community development also have served to discourage local planning activities in the past. Local officials within the metropolis were cautious to see that the burden of action to remedy the common ills would not fall too heavily on their own jurisdiction.³² Their independent actions in the area of community planning were not only affected by external diseconomies, but often

²⁹Ibid., p. 100.

³⁰Studenski, op. cit., p.30-31.

³¹Citizens Advisory Committee of the Joint Committee on Urban Area Government, Legislature of the State of Washington, "Too Many Governments" reprinted in Michael N. Danielson, Metropolitan Politics: A Reader, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1966) p. 128.

³²Ibid., p. 129.

provided external benefits to neighboring jurisdictions without the capacity to assess them a portion of the cost. As the Citizens Advisory Committee in Washington put it: "(F)ragmentation in the metropolitan areas separates benefits and burdens in ways which are often basically unfair."³³

Early Developments in Areawide Planning

There were a number of examples in the 1920's of communities in metropolitan areas bonding together to form unofficial organizations to confer on various planning issues. The Niagara Frontier region of Western New York State, the Los Angeles area, and the Twin Cities area of Minneapolis - St. Paul are three such examples.³⁴ These agencies were powerless to take any action, they acted in a merely advisory capacity, and initially they had no budgets or staff. Representatives of local government simply utilized these forums to convene periodically and discuss issues of mutual concern. Within a short time, however, the organizations in Los Angeles and the Niagara Frontier were granted official status by the state legislatures, and began receiving local governmental funding.³⁵ Although these were significant

³³Ibid., p. 129.

³⁴Studenski, op. cit., p. 53.

steps in metropolitan regional planning, neither organization was particularly successful in establishing a comprehensive and effective problem solving mechanism for the member governments.

The Natural Resources Planning Board, which was a creation of the Depression era Roosevelt Administration, strongly encouraged the development of regional planning activities in metropolitan areas.³⁶ By 1950, however, fewer than 35 of the nations 168 standard metropolitan areas had established agencies specifically charged with metropolitan planning responsibilities.³⁷ One reason for this appears to have been the general lack of awareness that that there was a need for metropolitan integration. For many jurisdictions the initiation of official metropolitan planning functions was perceived as a threat to autonomy, and thus was intensely resisted. Even the strictly advisory function of planning at the areawide scale was viewed by many of the suburban units as an attempt by the central city to dominate its neighbors.³⁸

³⁵Ibid., pp. 53-54.

³⁶Betty Tableman, Governmental Organization In Metropolitan Areas, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1951), p. 47.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 53-54.

While areawide planning activities were being viewed with suspicion in many areas, the political forces in local government were not so opposed to jurisdictional cooperation as to reject proposals for joint development and operation of more commonly accepted local government service functions. The clear economies of scale that would result from such arrangement were generally persuasive, especially in cases where service provision or expansion would be economically infeasible for a single local unit. When excess service capacity could be shared, as well as the costs of providing that service, interlocal agreements have provided a means for overcoming the constraints imposed by jurisdictional borders. Sewer and water supply systems, pollution control, solid waste disposal and transportation facilities are commonly dealt with in this manner.³⁹

Interlocal Agreements and Special Purpose Districts

Interlocal agreements have been popular because they do not disturb the existing governmental structure. They consist of transferring specific functions between higher- and lower-tier governments, usually from municipalities to counties, or creating joint service provision by units of the

³⁸Ibid., p. 48.

³⁹Bollens & Schmandt, op. cit., p. 163-170.

same tier.⁴⁰ These types of arrangements are generally flexible and involve the active participation of the units of government involved. A more formal intergovernmental arrangement, the special purpose district, also has been utilized extensively to deal with metropolitan problems.

The special purpose district is an independent unit of local government. Unlike interlocal agreements which provide services within the structure of the existing local units, the special purpose district is a single purpose governing organization with its own jurisdiction and its own capacity to raise revenues to finance its operations.⁴¹ Special purpose districts are a means for providing services or operating facilities which are divorced from the control of regularly constituted city and county governments. Local governmental responsibilities are not transferred to other general purpose municipal governments as in the case of interlocal agreements, but are transferred instead to a duly constituted independent public corporation. Transferring functions to a neutral authority, rather than a neighboring government, impinges less on the ingrained political traditions in the area.⁴²

⁴⁰ACIR, The Challenge of Local Governmental Reorganization, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

⁴¹Tableman, op. cit., p. 56.

For the most part, special purpose districts are organized to perform a particular function within a designated area.⁴³ Boundaries may be flexible so that the jurisdiction can be expanded to coincide with the growth and development of the metropolitan area. The individual municipalities and the interlocal agreement approach do not offer this type of flexibility. Thus the special purpose districts have been able to provide the linkage between jurisdictional autonomy and the coordinated development of urban services.

A second salient feature of special purpose districts is their fiscal self-sufficiency.⁴⁴ The ability to obtain their own revenues from bonding, intergovernmental transfers, user charges, special assessments, or even independent property tax authority, allows these districts more latitude to make decisions independent of the revenue spending priorities of the various local governments. Service recipients and direct beneficiaries usually bear the financial burden.⁴⁵

⁴²Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Regional Decision Making: New Strategies for Substate Districts, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 21.

⁴³Ibid., p. 21.

⁴⁴Howard W. Hallman, Small and Large Together Governing the Metropolis, (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1977), p. 40.

⁴⁵ACIR, Regional Decision Making: New Strategies for Substate Districts, op. cit., p. 21.

The relative advantages encompassed by the special purpose district make them very attractive solutions to regional problems, including metropolitan regional problems. Various federal grant-in-aid programs encouraged the development of single purpose districts and by the early 1960's there were a number of federal aid programs which bypassed the local governments completely in favor of the districts.⁴⁶ Needless to say, these factors combined to generate a tremendous expansion in the utilization of special purpose districts.

In 1972 there were 8,054 special purpose districts in the 265 SMSA's,⁴⁷ accounting for 36 percent of all governmental units within the metropolitan areas, and making them the most numerous type of local government. Between 1952 and 1972 special purpose districts increased in number by more than 93 percent.⁴⁸ Although this growth rate has slowed considerably since the late 1960's, the popularity of this particular mechanism for dealing with areawide problems remains high.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 22.

⁴⁷Hallman, op. cit., p. 40.

⁴⁸ACIR, Regional Decision Making: New Strategies for Substate Districts, op. cit., p. 23.

Special purpose districts have been a mixed blessing. Because special districts exist as separate units of governments, they face the problem of integration with other governmental units. Despite their successes, they embody at least one major drawback; they have added to the confusion and complexity of metropolitan governmental organization by creating another layer of government. In addition, while the proliferation of single purpose districts may have provided a more efficient and equitable means of delivering urban services and developing public facilities, it failed to provide a means for coordinating the development decisions of the individual municipalities or of the independent special districts.⁴⁹ The fragmentation of local government was accelerated by the special districts and this has further compounded the problem of achieving coordination of government programming in metropolitan areas. As Berry and Steiker stated:

While single purpose metropolitan authorities may reduce geographic fragmentation, they often intensify functional fragmentation with the result that each service is considered an end in itself by each agency and the capabilities of the general political system to allocate resources to various projects and service categories according to comprehensive priorities are severely limited.⁵⁰

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 2-15.

⁵⁰Berry and Steiker, "The Concept of Justice in Regional Planning: Justice As Fairness". Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 40, No. 6, November 1974, p.

The essential element that was lacking and that seemed to remain so elusive was one form or another of centralized, comprehensive organization to coordinate the activities of the independent units. The special purpose district provided the mechanism for more orderly development of the urban infrastructure and delivery of urban services. The major task of government in metropolitan areas thus became the development of policies consistent with the integrated character of the metropolitan community.⁵¹ This situation called for a planning function at the metropolitan scale similar to the planning being undertaken by the local governments.

The Expansion of Metropolitan Planning Functions

Bollens and Schmandt describe the local planning process as being "a method for reaching decisions about what specific objectives are to be pursued and what specific action is to be undertaken . . . (by) providing inputs for the policy choices which involve consideration of the future."⁵² A complementary planning function at the metropolitan regional

66.

⁵¹Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 6.

⁵²Bollens and Schmandt, op. cit., p. 228.

scale would be able to provide the policy framework necessary for coordinating the development decisions of the various component government units. The orientation necessarily would be related only to those functional elements of metropolitan significance including transportation systems, regional sewer and water systems, regional parks and open space areas, and drainage and flood control, rather than the specific land use decisions under the authority of the local units.⁵³ By 1962 there were sixty-three metropolitan planning commissions in the United States and in 1970 the total was approximately 175.⁵⁴ These figures include councils of governments which performed planning functions.

One of the primary factors in the growth of metropolitan regional planning commissions was the incentive provided by the federal government. In 1964, only five federal grant-in-aid programs for community development included a requirement for the consideration of areawide concerns.⁵⁵ There were twenty-four such grant-in-aid programs as of 1972.⁵⁶ Although local participation in the various grant

⁵³Charles M. Haar and Associates, "The Promise of Metropolitan Planning", in Michael N. Danielson, ed., Metropolitan Politics: A Reader, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1966), p. 358.

⁵⁴Bollens and Schmandt, op. cit., pp. 242-243.

⁵⁵ACIR, Regional Decision Making: New Strategies for Sub-state Districts, p. 168.

programs, and hence metropolitan regional planning, is strictly voluntary, hundreds of millions of dollars in capital and operating program funds are directly tied to the federal commitment toward regional planning.⁵⁷ The federal government has utilized the familiar 'carrot and stick' approach to encourage local participation in these regional planning programs. Additional seed money was made available for creating and staffing regional planning organizations, and there also was the threat that implementation monies for hardware and service provision would be withheld from non-participating units.

While federal incentives of these types were generally effective in encouraging local participation in metropolitan planning activities, they in no way assured that participation would be sincere. Many communities participated in name only, and only to assure that other federal money they coveted would not be jeopardized.⁵⁸ Generally there has been little opposition to programs designed specifically to aid the development of an areawide planning function.⁵⁹ Indeed,

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 168.

⁵⁷Leonard E. Goodell and Donald P. Sprengel, The American Metropolis, (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1975), pp. 46-49, also; ACIR, Regional Decision Making: New Strategies for Substate Districts, p. 168.

⁵⁸Goodell & Sprengel, op. cit., p.

there was a relatively widespread acceptance of the desirability and utility of areawide planning.⁶⁰ There was considerably more consternation on the issue of implementation of regional plans.

Metropolitan regional planning activities, as organized and funded throughout the 1960's, provided a very weak forum even for the purely advisory planning function. Although these agencies were formed for the purpose of policy making at the metropolitan level, they lacked an adequate institutional base, legal authority and direct relationship to a metropolitan constituency to resolve problems and implement solutions within a metropolitan setting.⁶¹ Implementation of areawide development plans remained largely in the province of the independent jurisdictions of local governments and special purposed districts. Even when a few of these units of government did agree on joint issues or coordinated programs, their efforts were easily nullified by others choos-

⁵⁹David C. Ranney, Planning and Politics in the Metropolis, (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969), p. 80.

⁶⁰Thomas P. Murphy and Charles R. Warren, Organizing Public Services in Metropolitan America, (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1974) p. 103, also; Bollens and Schmandt, op. cit., p.

⁶¹ACIR, Metropolitan America: Challenge To Federalism, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

ing not to cooperate.⁶²

The organizational inadequacies which exist at the regional level inhibited the capacity for implementation of areawide plans. For the most part, metropolitan planning agencies did not have operating responsibilities which enabled them to bring even minor portions of the regional plans to fruition.⁶³ They had to rely instead on their powers of persuasion in dealing with local governments and public authorities. Successful planning occurred in those situations where professional planning skills were matched with considerable political acumen.⁶⁴ When there exists no identifiable areawide political representation, and no regional constituency, mustering the necessary political support becomes that much more difficult. According to a number of people in the field, the inadequacy of the structure of government in metropolitan areas is not so much a contributing factor to the inability to solve areawide problems, as it is the key problem in metropolitan areas.⁶⁵

⁶²Ibid., p. 7.

⁶³Ibid., p. 112.

⁶⁴Goodell ' Spengel, op. cit., p. 189.

⁶⁵Frank J. Munger, "Community Power and Metropolitan Decision-Making," reprinted in Michael N. Danielson, Metropolitan Politics: A Reader, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1966) p. 110.

There is no longer any question that planning is a reasonable and justifiable responsibility of municipal government. Through the impetus of various federal and state programs, as well as a more enlightened view of governmental responsibility at the local level, municipal planning is widespread and meeting with varying success in different areas.⁶⁶ Even as the focus of planning activities began to evolve toward a more metropolitan regional perspective, as noted previously, there was general agreement from a conceptual or philosophical perspective that these types of coordinated and cooperative efforts were positive and necessary. The success of these efforts, however, has largely been lacking. One of the most common criticisms offered as an explanation for such failures is that the great majority of regional planning activities in metropolitan areas are divorced from the politics and political realities of the metropolis.⁶⁷

From the outset of the planning movement in this country, when the planners were closely linked to the municipal reform movement, there has been something of an aversion to

⁶⁶Melvin R. Levin, Community and Regional Planning, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977), Introduction by George Blackwood, pp. xi-xxiii.

⁶⁷ACIR, Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism, op. cit., pp. 110-113, also; Bollens ' Schmandt, op. cit., pp. 242-250.

politics on the part of planners.⁶⁸ As time passed, however, planners sought to get plans off the shelves and implemented. It became obvious, however, that politics could not be completely ignored. Implementation requires a community or regional commitment to an uncertain future which may necessitate present self-sacrifice in return for some projected future benefit.⁶⁹ This requires the support of political leaders who must make commitments for public expenditures and for consistency in the application of development control mechanisms. Very few planners today would deny the importance of politics in the planning process.⁷⁰ Alan Altshuler has concluded that contemporary planners find it both ethical and necessary to play the political game.⁷¹

Metropolitan Governmental Reorganization

For more than a decade now there have been increasingly strong recommendations from a number of different sources for a general reorganization of local governments within

⁶⁸Ranney, op. cit., p. 35.

⁶⁹Bollens & Schmandt, op. cit., p. 249.

⁷⁰Ranney, op. cit., p. 41.

⁷¹Alan Altschuler, The City Planning Process (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965) pp. 355-356.

metropolitan areas, as well as for adjustment and reassignment of specific functional and financial powers. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made such recommendations as early as 1966.⁷² At that time, its recommendations included: simplified requirements for municipal annexation, stricter standards for new incorporations, stricter control on the formation of special districts, broader authorization for interlocal contracting, and authorization and encouragement for the establishment of more areawide planning and service commissions to provide areawide governmental services.⁷³ Without doing these things, ACIR warned, it would be extremely difficult to deal with the problems of social and economic disparity in metropolitan areas.⁷⁴

There have been a number of examples of metropolitan governmental reorganization in this country both prior to and since ACIR's report on Metropolitan America. The four case study governments analyzed in this study are examples of different types of areawide reorganization. For the most part, however, reorganization of general purpose local gov-

⁷²ACIR, Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism, op. cit.

⁷³Ibid., p. 163.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 164.

ernments has had a minimal affect on metropolitan governmental fragmentation. The reason is that there have been very few general reorganizations of this type. Single purpose functional transfers and consolidations have been much more common.⁷⁵

City-county consolidation has been utilized in several metropolitan areas as a means for reorganizing local government. Since 1962 there have been eleven city-county consolidations, six of which occurred in metropolitan areas with populations of 200,000 or more.⁷⁶ These consolidations have merged the county government with one or more of the municipal governments within the county borders forming a single unit of government. All six of these were incomplete consolidations in that not all of the municipalities in the counties participated. Thus, even in these cases some governmental fragmentation still exists. The single county has been the scale for the consolidations which have occurred, and it would seem that more single county SMSA's would consider utilizing this approach to reorganization. As of 1970, however, only three of the 127 single county SMSA's in the nation were consolidated city-counties.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ACIR, The Challenge of Local Government Reorganization, op. cit., p.91.

⁷⁶Ibid., p.91.

While the consolidation approach to reorganization has the advantage of simplicity of form, in that it creates a single layer of government with an areawide focus, it is extremely difficult to implement from a political standpoint.⁷⁸ In nearly all of the consolidation attempts since World War II, with Indianapolis being the notable exception, a public referendum has been necessary to approve the consolidation proposal. In the great majority of such cases the public has voted no.⁷⁹ The primary reason given is that the public, most often the suburban public, does not want to relinquish local governmental autonomy in favor of decentralized governmental control.⁸⁰

The alternative to the one-layer approach is a two layer approach based on the theory of federalism.⁸¹ Under this concept, areawide functions are delegated to an areawide government while purely local functions and responsibilities are retained by local units of government. Local autonomy

⁷⁷Ibid., p.91.

⁷⁸Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Regional Governance: Promise and Performance, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p.2-3.

⁷⁹Ibid., p.3.

⁸⁰James F. Horn and G. Thomas Taylor, Jr., Experiments In Metropolitan Government, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977), p.xii-xix.

⁸¹Ibid., p.xiv-xix.

over local issues is protected under this arrangement, and local resistance to areawide government is reduced to some extent. The county is frequently utilized as the areawide government when proposals of this type are presented because it does not require the creation of yet another unit of government. This would seem to be especially inviting to single county SMSA's or SMSA's which are highly concentrated in a single county.

Adoption of such federated systems has been inhibited by a number of factors, however.⁸² In most states a constitutional amendment is required for legal authorization to expand the county government's powers, and statewide support is often difficult to get. In addition, many county officials feel that their political security is threatened by what they perceive to be a power grab by the urban center, and they oppose the change. There are also questions about the financial powers and organizational inadequacies of most county governments relative to their capabilities to provide the necessary services. Although successful adaptations of this approach have been scarce, Metropolitan Dade County is generally held up as an outstanding example of how such a system can and should function.⁸³

⁸²Ibid., p. xvii.

⁸³Ibid., p. 98-105.

Another variation on the two-layer approach is the creation of an entirely new level of government in a federated system. This alternative is primarily applicable to multi-county SMSA's where the county level of government does not have sufficient jurisdiction to undertake areawide concerns. As in the single county federation, local functions would still be performed by municipal units. Implementation of this type of federated system has been extremely limited, due to the reluctance of the state and local governments to support proposals creating an additional level of government between them.⁸⁴ The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area is the best known example of this approach.

City-county consolidations and federated systems of local government have not been employed on a broad scale for metropolitan governmental reorganization. Even taken as a whole, these reorganizations have had little impact on the aggregate level of governmental fragmentation. The most common type of reorganization remains that of merging or consolidating duplicate special purpose districts within the metro area. This, however, merely consolidates related functional districts, but does not deal with the larger problem of uncoordinated municipal operations.

⁸⁴Ibid., p.xix.

The provincialism of local units of government in metropolitan areas has severely weakened the best attempts of federal and state government to induce voluntary cooperation and participation in regional planning activities. Without the requisite metropolitan political base to leverage the adoption of planning studies, the majority of existing metropolitan regional planning organizations have been unable to do more than pay lip service to the development of areawide policy plans to guide and control the development decisions of the participating units of government. The tremendous potential for areawide problem solving in the metropolis created by the greatly expanded federal role in regional planning activities has largely been allowed to slip away.

There have been inconsistencies in the federal legislation in some cases, and in others the response from the state level was less than wholehearted. The key problem, however, remains the lack of power and authority on the part of metropolitan planning organizations due to the lack of a political entity to which they could be linked. The true potential of the combined federal, state, and local efforts to establish effective and meaningful metropolitan regional planning can only be assessed where the planning function is directly linked to a more wholistic or complete governmental

organization with greater than merely advisory powers. These are the types of metropolitan planning activities this study will analyze.

Chapter III

A REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Introduction

Five federal planning programs have been selected for analysis in this study. They are Areawide Comprehensive Planning Assistance, Comprehensive Health Planning, A-95 Review, Urban Transportation Planning, and Manpower Planning. These particular programs were selected in order to provide a balance in the analysis of the case study governments. Comprehensive Planning and Urban Transportation Planning were selected as two of the primary physical planning programs funded by the federal government. Health Planning and Manpower Planning are two of the major federal thrusts in the social planning arena. Taken together, these four program areas cover a fairly wide spectrum in terms of the aggregate areawide thrust of federal planning legislation. A-95 Review was included because it is the official federally sponsored mechanism for providing improved program coordination and integration at the metropolitan or regional level. As a whole these five programs provide for a diverse program mixture, sponsorship by several different federal departments, and yet a reasonable scale for evaluating the case study organizations.

This chapter will not provide a detailed evaluation of each of these programs. Such an undertaking is beyond the scope of this study. Rather, this chapter will bring to the forefront a few major points relative to each of the programs which are relevant to the stated study objectives. A brief recital of the historical background and legislative evolution of each program is included. In addition, information related to eligibility criteria, procedural requirements, and areawide agency designation are provided. These latter points are included because these are the factors which exert the greatest influence on the potential for broad based program integration at the metropolitan scale. These are the factors which will determine whether or not the case study governments qualify for program designation.

The purpose of this chapter is informational rather than analytical. It is intended to present the relevant characteristics of the federal programs, not to evaluate or analyze the underlying intent or implications of the information presented. Although this would certainly provide valuable insights into the program structure, it too is beyond the scope of the present effort. The analysis of the five programs, in terms of their relationships to each of the case study governments, is provided in Chapter V.

Areawide Comprehensive Planning Assistance

The comprehensive planning assistance program of the federal government is commonly referred to as the 701 planning assistance grant program. This is a reference to Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, which was the initial federal enactment providing planning grants to a broad range of state and local planning programs.⁸⁵ It was the stated purpose of this act to facilitate urban planning in smaller communities, those with populations of less than 25,000, which were generally lacking in planning resources.⁸⁶ Although the program emphasized the expansion of planning activities in smaller communities, grants also were available for metropolitan and regional planning agencies which were duly empowered under state law to perform such planning activities. The initial funding level was \$5,000,000.

Since 1954 a number of changes have been made to the 701 program reflecting the changing emphasis of federal programming in the area of community planning. There has been evidence of an increasing awareness of metropolitan and regional issues which needed to be addressed through the planning process. In the 1959 amendments to the Act, the

⁸⁵Housing Act of 1954, sec. 701, 68 Stat. 640, 40 USC.

⁸⁶Ibid.

intent of the program was reworded in such a manner as to provide increased assistance to state and local governments for "solving problems resulting from increasing concentration of population in metropolitan and other urban areas."⁸⁷ The heavier emphasis on metropolitan and regional planning along with local community planning activities required a reorientation of existing planning programs. The desire was to establish, to the maximum extent feasible, planning activities which would cover entire urban areas having common or related urban development problems.⁸⁸ Grant applicants were encouraged to utilize the available financial aid to provide technical assistance for such areawide planning, as well as to organize and staff the necessary metropolitan planning agencies.⁸⁹

Throughout the 1960's and 1970's, additional amendments were adopted each time the Congress voted to extend the 701 program funding. The legislative emphasis continued to be regional planning, especially metropolitan regional planning. In 1965, wording was added to authorize grants to organizations composed of public officials representing the political jurisdictions within a metropolitan area or urban

⁸⁷Housing Act of 1959, sec. 419, 73 Stat. 678, 40 USC.

⁸⁸Ibid.

⁸⁹Ibid.

region. Metropolitan Councils of Government thus became eligible for funding under the comprehensive planning program and as a result, began to grow in popularity as a means of conducting areawide planning. It was during this time that federal financial assistance for planning reached its peak. The 1965 Act appropriated \$230,000,000 for comprehensive planning assistance.

Amendments passed in 1974 expanded the funding eligibility to include urban counties and areawide organizations in metropolitan areas designated with A-95 review authority.⁹⁰ In addition, a need was identified for the development and improvement of management capabilities to implement the plans as part of an ongoing planning process. This included an institution building capacity for "achieving modernization, simplification and improvement in governmental structures."⁹¹

While the program increasingly has emphasized areawide planning activities, counties, small cities and other areas remain eligible for funding. The key to funding eligibility is authorization under state planning enabling legislation to undertake the types of programs which the grant money can

⁹⁰Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, sec. 401, 88 Stat. 686, 40 USC.

⁹¹Ibid.

sponsor. For metropolitan areas, eligible agencies include regional planning agencies, organizations of public officials, joint city-county planning commissions, and counties of over 50,000 population.⁹² Membership on the planning boards or commissions which govern these agencies must be elected local officials or their designees. Eligibility for representation, for the purposes of funding, is determined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development on a case by case basis in accordance with state statutory guidelines and Departmental rules and procedures.

Areawide Comprehensive Health Planning

The federal government has a long history of involvement in various public health services programs but it only recently become involved in broad based health systems planning. In 1966, the Congress passed the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966,⁹³ providing the initial mechanism for health planning assistance. It was the stated purpose of this legislation to promote and assist the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and to provide for more effective use

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³ Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, 80 Stat. 1180, 42 USC.

of available federal funds for health related programs.⁹⁴ The program included funding for planning in the three primary areas of health services, health manpower, and health facilities. Congress also indicated that success in this effort would require "an effective partnership involving close intergovernmental collaboration, official and voluntary efforts, and the participation of individuals and organizations."⁹⁵

The focus of the program was state level health systems and the development of statewide comprehensive health plans. This included establishing or designating a single state agency for supervising and administering the state's health planning functions under the state plan, as well as setting forth policies and procedures for coordinating the development of health systems and facilities throughout the state.⁹⁶ Project grants for comprehensive regional and metropolitan health planning also were available on a limited basis to state approved regional agencies in accordance with approved state plans. Additional amendments passed in 1967 increased the funding allocation by 50% to accommodate additional capital expenditures for replacement, modernization,

⁹⁴Ibid.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶Ibid.

and expansion of facilities according to the state plans.

The most significant changes in the federal health care planning program came about with the passage of the National Health Planning and Resource Development Act of 1974.⁹⁷ This legislation revamped the entire federal effort in order to pull together the efforts of local, regional and state health planning activities in accordance with national health planning policy. The linkage between the federal and state governments was strengthened, and new linkages developed to facilitate regional implementation of state plans. Maldistribution of health care services and facilities, and skyrocketing health care costs became the primary targets of federal action.⁹⁸ One of the most important means for dealing with these issues was the development of a system for health planning which brought together both public and private health service providers to discuss not only areawide health system needs, but also cost sharing for the necessary support services as well.

Regional planning and implementation is conducted through a system of Health Systems Agencies (HSA) within each of the states. The service area of each HSA is determined on the

⁹⁷National Health Planning and Resource Development Act of 1974, 80 Stat. 2225, 42 USC

⁹⁸Ibid.

basis of population and the availability of health service resources.⁹⁹ The population criteria established a minimum area of 500,000 people and a maximum of 3,000,000. To the greatest extent possible, the boundaries of the HSA's coincide with the boundaries of existing regional planning areas, and sub-state administrative areas. Due to the population criteria, however, this often has meant that one HSA has jurisdiction over several regional planning districts. Each SMSA also is included entirely within one HSA, with the exception of the really huge population centers, which greatly exceed the upper population limit, such as New York, Chicago and Los Angeles.

Health Systems Agencies are designated by the Governor of each state after consultation with various state officials in health related areas, municipal officials, and representatives of comprehensive regional or metropolitan planning agencies.¹⁰⁰ HSA's must be nonprofit corporations which are not subsidiary to any other public or private corporation, and which engage only in health planning and development functions.¹⁰¹ Regional planning agencies can be designated as HSA's only if the board is composed of a majority of -----

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

elected officials of the member units of general government. Where this is the case, the existing regional board can not function as the HSA board. A separate governing board must be established for health planning according to the legislation.¹⁰²

A majority of the members of the governing body must be consumers of health care who are not health care providers, and at least 40% must be health care providers, all of whom must be residents of the HSA region.¹⁰³ Local elected officials, representatives of governmental authorities, and representatives of both public and private health care agencies must be included in this group. The capacity to coordinate the various aspects of public and private development related to health care, both social and physical, is designed to be greatly enhanced through this rather complex representative system.. Sub-regional health planning boards can also be created by the HSA's to improve local coordination and local project review.

¹⁰²Ibid.

¹⁰³Ibid.

The A-95 Review Process

The title 'A-95' is a reference to Office of Management and Budget Circular Number A-95, a regulation issued to promote improved coordination of federal assistance programs with each other and with state, regional and local plans and programs. Circular A-95 was first issued in July of 1969 as a means of implementing Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.¹⁰⁴ There have been revisions to Circular A-95 since that time, primarily to clarify some of the requirements and for the purpose of broadening the scope of the programs and activities covered by the review process.

Although the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 is the basis for A-95 review, there is an equally important predecessor: section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 required that applications for federal assistance construction grants for a wide variety of public facilities (including hospitals, sewer and water development, transportation systems, etc.) in metropolitan areas be accompanied by the comments of the areawide comprehensive planning agency. The stated purpose was to

¹⁰⁴Office of Management and Budget, "A-95: What It Is - How It Works", (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976), p.2

determine the "extent to which the project is consistent with comprehensive planning developed or in the process of being developed for the metropolitan area or the unit of local government."¹⁰⁵ This process became the basis for the Project Notification and Review System under A-95, which expanded the state, regional, and local review of applications for various forms of federal assistance.

In addition to Project Notification and Review there are three other major parts to A-95.¹⁰⁶ Part II, Direct Federal Development, provides for consultation with state, local and federal government officials on direct federal development projects. Part III, State Plans, assures gubernatorial review of state plans mandated under certain federal grant programs. Part IV, Coordination of Planning in Multijurisdictional Areas, promotes coordination of federally assisted planning at the regional level. Part IV is very closely linked to Project Notification and Review, and these two aspects of A-95 are the most significant ones from the standpoint of metropolitan regional planning, in that they pull together areawide and municipal grant proposals and provide the opportunity for better integration.

¹⁰⁵Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, sec. 204, 80 Stat. 1262, 40 USC.

¹⁰⁶Office of Management and Budget, op. cit., p.2

The purpose of A-95 review is to provide a mechanism for facilitating closer coordination and integration of the myriad of federal assistance programs to state and local governments. Title IV of the legislation states that "to the maximum extent possible all federal aid for development purposes shall be consistent with and further the objectives of state, regional and local comprehensive planning."¹⁰⁷ Project Notification and Review and the Multijurisdictional Coordination element provide an early warning system to facilitate this coordination by requesting comments on specific projects from affected governments prior to grant approval. This is accomplished through state and areawide clearinghouses which, when notified of pending federal grants, provide general information about the proposal to local governments and solicit their comments and concerns. These are reviewed by the clearinghouse, a recommendation concerning the fate of the proposal is made, and the comments are forwarded to the appropriate federal agency.

The state clearinghouse is designated by the governor, and is the state comprehensive planning agency in most cases.¹⁰⁸ The governor also designates the areawide clear-

¹⁰⁷Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, sec. 401, 82 Stat. 1103, 40 USC.

¹⁰⁸Office of Management and Budget, op. cit., p.10

inghouses. Areawide clearinghouses are comprehensive planning agencies covering one or more counties except in metropolitan areas. In metropolitan areas, OMB designates the clearinghouses under authority of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. OMB has no established criteria for designating these clearinghouses except that they be comprehensive planning agencies with areawide scope. There also are no membership criteria concerning jurisdictional representation or participation in areawide planning activities.¹⁰⁹ Each governor establishes his or her own criteria for non-metropolitan clearinghouses, and OMB seems to be flexible with respect to interstate variations in designating the metropolitan clearinghouses.

Urban Transportation Planning

The federal government's role in urban transportation planning has been primarily in the provision of financial assistance for the development of streets and highways, and more recently in the provision of capital grants for mass transportation. There also has been substantial federal involvement in airport construction and some belated support for railroads. For the purposes of this study the highway

¹⁰⁹Ibid.

funding and the mass transportation programs are the most significant.

Federal support for highway development dates back to the decision to construct the federal defense highway system in the middle 1950's.¹¹⁰ Billions of federal and state dollars have been spent since that time on the construction of the primary system, the interstate highway network, and over the years there have been additions to the types of facilities eligible for federal aid designation. Since 1976 there have been designations for a federal aid secondary system in the rural areas and a separate federal aid urban system as well. This new urban system includes high volume arterial and collector routes as well as access roads to other types of transportation terminals which were not formerly included in the system.¹¹¹ Local officials in project areas have been granted an expanded role in route selection under both the secondary and urban systems programs. This is intended to provide increased conformance with established community goals and objectives. Previously, the state Departments of Transportation were primarily responsible for route selec-

¹¹⁰Rowland, Howard S., The New York Times Guide To Federal Aid For Cities and Towns, (New York: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1971), p.771-772.

¹¹¹Federal Aid Highway Program, sec. 104, Title 23 U.S. Code, (1976).

tion.

The expanded participation of local officials in the highway related transportation planning process is a direct result of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962.¹¹² Section 134 of that act, and subsequent amendments in 1970, established a broader framework for transportation planning embracing various modes of transport in a more systematic and wholistic manner. The objective was to develop "long range highway plans and programs which are properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation and which are formulated with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development"¹¹³ of the urban areas they serve. Section 134 also established the first requirements for a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process between state and local governments for all forms of surface transportation.¹¹⁴

Although federal highway development and federal mass transportation programs have moved closer together since 1970, the mass transportation program remains separate. Initiated under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964,

¹¹²Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, 76 Stat. 1148, 23 USC.

¹¹³Federal Aid Highway Program, op. cit.

¹¹⁴Ibid.

the mass transportation program sought to overcome the problems of deteriorated and congested urban transportation facilities by providing alternatives to increased reliance on the automobile.¹¹⁵ From the outset, the program was directly linked to the transportation element of the comprehensive development plan for the urban area. Funding eligibility is contingent upon the existence of such an areawide planning process.

The highway program and the mass transportation program are still being funded and administered as separate and distinct programs under the direction of two different federal agencies. The former is administered by the Federal Highway Administration while the latter is under the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. In spite of this, the two programs have been integrated to a great extent due to the requirements for a cooperative and comprehensive planning process. Under section 104 of the Federal Aid Highway Program, the governor of each state is to identify a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) in each metropolitan area for the purpose of coordinating the comprehensive transportation planning process mandated under section 134 of the Federal Aid Highway Act.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, sec. 2, 78 Stat. 302, 49 USC.

These metropolitan planning organizations also are responsible for coordinating the mass transportation planning activities with other ongoing planning activities in the area. Because mass transportation planning is usually conducted by the operating agencies which will be responsible for running and managing the system, the role of the MPO as the lead agency for coordinating all forms of surface transportation planning becomes even more important. Each governor and state transportation agency establish their own criteria for designating the MPO's. UMTA and FHWA accept these designations for the most part, although if the choice fails to function properly FHWA and UMTA can request a change from the governor and even withhold funds in an effort to force the change.

Manpower Development and Training

There have been a great number of federal aid programs oriented toward manpower and employment problems over the past two decades. Most of these programs grew out of the familiar urban problems: inadequate housing, poverty, unemployment, and a growing sense of frustration and entrapment on the part of the inner city residents.¹¹⁷ This is not to

¹¹⁶Federal Aid Highway Program, op. cit.

¹¹⁷Rowland, op. cit., p.270

say that these problems were found exclusively in cities, for they were not, but cities generally had the greatest concentrations of these problems. A common thread which seemed to run through troublesome issues in both urban and rural areas, was the lack of job opportunities, and thus the opportunity for a better life, for a sizable portion of the American public.

The federal response to these problems was the creation of a multitude of manpower and employment programs in every conceivable department of the federal bureaucracy. The Departments of Labor, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education and Welfare were all involved.¹¹⁸ The activities of the agencies covered a wide range of programs from job counseling and job creation, to education and skill training.

Unfortunately, in their haste to do something affirmative about the lack of job opportunities, Congress and the federal bureaucracy allocated little time and effort to establishing comprehensive goals and program objectives. Disjointed incrementalism is the best description of the piecemeal federal approach which evolved during the 1960's. President Johnson recognized the shortcomings and wasteful

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 270-273

nature of this type of effort and attempted to remedy the situation by issuing an executive order. Executive Order Number 11422, issued in August of 1968, created the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System.¹¹⁹ This was a system of local, state and federal coordinating committees to assure cooperative planning and execution of manpower training and support service programs. Although this action clarified the policy and intent of the federal government, what was necessary to effectively pull the diverse program elements together was a major overhaul of the legislative package. This did not come about, however, until 1973.

In December, Congress passed the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. The act provided for an orderly transition of responsibilities and functions from the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 into a single unified program under the Department of Labor.¹²⁰ The consolidated program then established a decentralized planning system aimed at the state and areawide level in order to provide comprehensive manpower services in troubled labor market areas. The program includes training,

¹¹⁹Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System, 33 F.R. 11739, (August 20, 1968).

¹²⁰Cooperative Employment and Training Act of 1973, 87 Stat. 839, 42 USC.

education, job creation and the provision of necessary support services to enable individuals to secure and retain employment at their maximum capacity.¹²¹

The basis of the program is the identification of prime sponsors at the state and sub-state level. A prime sponsor can be the state itself, a unit of general local government with a population of 100,000 or more, or a consortium of units of general local government including at least one with a population of 100,000 or more.¹²² Especially hard-pressed labor market areas which do not meet the population criterion can be qualified by the Secretary of Labor. Once identified, the prime sponsors must do two things to be eligible for funding. First, it must establish a planning council consisting of representatives of the client community, community based organizations, labor, business, and educational and training facilities. Second, it must also submit an annual comprehensive manpower plan indicating the goals, policies and procedures of the programs to be funded. Funding eligibility is reviewed on an annual basis, based on the annual plan submitted and a review of previous program successes and failures.

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Ibid.

Summary

It is obvious from the data presented in this chapter that the five planning programs selected for this study have evolved independently of each other. Each one is administered by a different federal department or agency. Each also has a separate set of criteria for defining the type of region within which it is to function, and for designating the planning agency in those regions as well. These are all factors which influence potential and actual program content, structure, and organization in regional planning agencies. Exactly how these factors have influenced the planning activities of the four case study governments will be outlined in the following chapter.

Chapter IV

THE CASE STUDIES

Introduction

This chapter will provide an understanding of some of the more salient characteristics of the planning programs and the organizational structures of the selected case study governments. The presentation will be concerned more with pertinent data related to the case studies than with an analysis of the relative merits of each organization. The analysis of these organizations and their planning functions, is undertaken in Chapter V.

The four governments that were selected for this study were chosen because each represents a different variation on the theme of metropolitan reorganization. Each government has specific organizational and structural characteristics which help to differentiate it from the others. Metropolitan Dade County is representative of a federated approach in which specific functions are transferred from one tier of the governmental hierarchy to another. Indianapolis-Marion County is an example of city-county consolidation in which most of the local units of government have become part of the larger city structure. The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area is a prototype of the multi-purpose

umbrella agency. Portland's Metropolitan Service District is a smaller scale umbrella agency which was created specifically to unite planning and service delivery under one agency. While it probably would be inaccurate to consider the development of these separate agencies as an evolutionary process, it is reasonable to assume that the more recent reorganizations took note of, and drew lessons from the preceding ones in order to create an organization that better fulfilled their particular needs.

The information presented for each case study is fairly basic and straightforward. First, general background information is provided relative to the organization itself. This includes the scope and scale its jurisdiction, a brief review of the evolution or development of metropolitan concerns and areawide governmental organizations, and other descriptive information concerning the organization. Second, a brief chronology of the major events and institutional actions leading to the reorganization is presented. Finally, the planning program of the organization is reviewed in general, as well as specifically in relation to the five federally funded programs described in the preceding chapter. The prime responsibility for each one of these programs within the metropolitan area, and the interrelationships between these program activities and the compre-

hensive planning arm of the metropolitan organization are the key factors considered in this section. This information provides the basis for the analysis and evaluation of the cases in Chapter V.

METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

General Background

The Miami, Florida area's experiment with metropolitan government was undertaken initially in 1957, when a home rule charter for Dade County was adopted by county residents. The result was the creation of a single county, metropolitan regional government with jurisdiction over an area in excess of 2000 square miles and a population, at that time, of more than 750,000. Today the population of Dade County includes more than one and one-quarter million permanent residents, and somewhere in the neighborhood of seven million tourists annually.¹²³ Just as the population has grown in the past two decades, so too has the authority, responsibility, and power of the Metro Dade County government.

¹²³Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Regional Governance: Promise and Performance, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p.6.

Even prior to the home rule charter referendum, the structure and organization of local government in Dade County was relatively simple. In 1957, there were 26 incorporated municipalities, a countywide school district, a housing authority in Miami, and the Dade County Port Authority, in addition to the county government.¹²⁴ By comparison, Sofen reports that 18 other metropolitan areas of comparable size averaged more than 120 units of local government each.¹²⁵ One reason for this relative simplicity is that population growth in the Miami area was generally slow until after World War II so there was little impetus for the creation of local governments. A second, and more important reason, is that in 1949, following the incorporation of numerous small areas with populations of less than 1000, the Dade County legislative delegation "secured the enactment of a measure that foreclosed further incorporations in Dade County under the general laws of Florida."¹²⁶ Thus, as the metropolitan area experienced extremely rapid growth during the 1950's, very substantial portions of that growth occurred in the unincorporated areas of the county. This factor served both to reduce some of the provincial resistance to

¹²⁴Edward Sofen, The Miami Metropolitan Experiment, (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1966), p.9-15.

¹²⁵Ibid., p.10

¹²⁶Ibid., p.14

metropolitan government and to provide a constituent group strongly in favor of expanded county authority.

There had been a number of efforts to simplify and unify local government in Dade County prior to the 1957 charter. During the 1940's, ten school districts were consolidated to form a single countywide district.¹²⁷ In 1943, a countywide public health system was organized to supplement municipal health agencies.¹²⁸ In addition, there were various types of mutual aid arrangements between municipalities and the unincorporated areas related to such public safety issues as police communications and fire fighting. There were other, more significant overtures toward general governmental coordination as well.

In 1945, Mayor Leonard K. Thomson of the City of Miami suggested a plan to combine all municipalities in Dade County into a single 'City and County of Miami.'¹²⁹ The proposed consolidation was strongly opposed by the other municipalities and never moved beyond the talking stage. The Dade County legislative delegation refused to introduce the

¹²⁷C.J. Hein, Joyce M. Keys, G.M. Robbins, Regional Governmental Arrangements In Metropolitan Areas: Nine Case Studies (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p.129.

¹²⁸ACIR, op. cit., p.6-7.

¹²⁹Sofen, op. cit., p.28.

proposal and the necessary constitutional amendment for consideration in the state legislature. In 1947, a second consolidation proposal was offered. This one, which proposed the merger of Dade County, the City of Miami, and four other small municipalities, was introduced in the state legislature.¹³⁰ The alignment of pro- and anti-consolidation forces was basically the same as it had been earlier and the countywide referendum, which would have placed a constitutional amendment enabling the reorganization on a statewide ballot, was rejected by the voters.¹³¹ The next attempt at consolidation occurred in 1953, when a proposal to abolish the City of Miami and transfer its functions to the county was suggested by the Dade County legislative delegation. The proposal was defeated in an extremely close vote, 50.8% against and 49.2% in favor. This slim defeat was a major factor in the ensuing campaign to establish a home rule charter for Dade County.¹³²

The Creation of Metro Dade

¹³⁰Ibid., p.29.

¹³¹Hein, Keys, Robbins, op. cit., p.129.

¹³²Ibid., p.129.

The narrow defeat of the 1953 consolidation referendum made both proponents and opponents alike recognize that metropolitan governmental reform was inevitable for Dade County. In order to deal with this reality in a more constructive and less divisive manner, the Metropolitan Miami Municipal Board was organized to study the municipal and county governments in Dade County and draft a plan for their "consolidation, merger, federation, or reorganization."¹³³ The study was coordinated by the Government Department of the University of Miami and when completed it was presented to the Board.¹³⁴

The recommendation was for a federated system of government in which each of the municipalities would continue to be responsible for local functions, with minimum standards established by the county government, and a reorganized and expanded county government which would take over areawide functions.¹³⁵ The recommendation necessitated the adoption of a constitutional home rule amendment by the state, and the approval of a specific home rule charter by the Dade County electorate. The amendment was approved by 70% of the voters in a statewide referendum in 1956. Six months later,

¹³³Sofen, op. cit., p.37.

¹³⁴Ibid., p.38.

¹³⁵Hein, Keys, Robbins, op. cit., p.130.

in May 1957, the home rule charter was narrowly approved by the county. Only 26% of the registered voters went to the polls and the margin of victory was only 1784 votes, or 2% of all votes cast.¹³⁶

The home rule charter designated a number of specific areawide, metropolitan level functions which were to be performed by the new county government. These included health and welfare, social action programs, pollution control, enforcement of building codes, regulation of sewer and water systems, areawide comprehensive planning, and traffic control, roadways and public transportation systems.¹³⁷ In addition, Metro Dade established areawide property tax assessment to provide for more equitable financing of metropolitan services. This measure provided a degree of financial relief to Miami and several other cities which were beginning to feel the squeeze of shrinking tax bases relative to the developing suburban areas.

¹³⁶Sofen provides a fairly detailed account of the issues and occurrences surrounding both the drafting of the amendment and the charter, as well as events related to the vote itself in chapters 4-7 of The Miami Metropolitan Experiment.

¹³⁷Heins, Keys, Robbins, op. cit., p.134.

One of the more significant aspects of the charter is the provision that Metro Dade may take over any municipal service which logically and legally can be construed as a reasonable metropolitan service.¹³⁸ The charter gave the County Commissioners nearly unlimited power to perform municipal governmental services, thereby granting Metro Dade a great deal of flexibility and description for defining its role as an areawide government. City officials have the authority to transfer to the county those local services which for one reason or another they deem to be too costly to maintain on a local level.¹³⁹ As a result, various local services have been transferred to Metro Dade on a piecemeal basis such that the county has accrued a substantial service burden for police and fire protection, municipal courts, libraries, parks, and the provision of sewer and water to most municipalities.¹⁴⁰

Planning Responsibilities Under Metro Dade

The importance of planning at a metropolitan scale was something that the leaders of the movement toward governmental reorganization recognized early in the process. During

¹³⁸ACIR, op. cit., p.8.

¹³⁹Ibid., p.8.

¹⁴⁰Hein, Keys, Robbins, op. cit., p.134-136.

the early 1950's many community leaders shared the view that a countywide planning agency was imperative "if the debilitating effects of a fragmented approach to urban growth were to be avoided."¹⁴¹ In fact, when the charter was drawn up, a department of planning was one of only four departments which were specifically required as a part of the organization.¹⁴² The charter not only specified that there would be a department of planning, but that the county would prepare and enforce comprehensive plans for the development of the county.

Metropolitan planning existed in Dade County before much of the federal regional approach was enacted. As early as 1960, the planning department was involved in the preparation of a land use plan for the whole metropolitan area to serve as a framework for many of the growth decisions facing the area. Upon adoption of this plan in 1965, the planning department directed its attention to the preparation of metropolitan areawide functional plans for transportation, parks and recreation, sewer and water systems, and community facilities.¹⁴³ These plans, even when adopted, are merely

¹⁴¹ACIR, op. cit., p.8.

¹⁴²Metropolitan Dade County, Home Rule Charter, sec. 4.01, in Sofen, op. cit., p.295.

¹⁴³Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department, "Area-Wide Planning Organization: Authority, Organization and

advisory in nature, but the preeminent position of planning as a cornerstone in the foundation of Metro Dade has meant that the plans are generally adhered to at the county level.¹⁴⁴

Metro Dade functions as the municipal planning department for the unincorporated areas of the county, as well as the metropolitan planning agency for the entire jurisdiction. It thus exercises both local and regional planning functions. Coordinating local and areawide planning in the unincorporated sections of the county has been a simple matter of in-house, intra-departmental coordination. For the incorporated areas things have not always been as easy. The planning department has review authority over the municipal systems of planning, zoning and subdivision regulation. Thus far, however, it has not seriously challenged the zoning power which has been retained by the cities.¹⁴⁵ Instead, Metro has attempted to use communication and persuasion as the best means of gaining compliance. Success under these circumstances has been more difficult to come by, and the results have been mixed.

Jurisdiction", an unpublished working paper on the operations of the planning department.

¹⁴⁴Ibid.,

¹⁴⁵Ibid.,

Eighteen of the area's municipalities have prepared their own comprehensive plans, and the three major cities--Miami, Miami Beach, and Hialeah--have all adopted plans which reinforce the Metro Master Plan.¹⁴⁶ For those areas which do not engage in their own planning, Metro provides local planning services at cost. This has proven to be a highly effective means of securing local comprehensive planning which is consistent with areawide planning programs.

As an urban county with metropolitan planning authority, Metro Dade has been able to take advantage of millions of dollars in federal grants-in-aid for comprehensive planning purposes. Much of this has come in the form of HUD 701 Planning Assistance grants to the county itself, and additional pass-through monies which were granted to the individual municipalities but contracted to Metro in return for comprehensive planning services.¹⁴⁷ When the federal government was making the transition toward a stronger emphasis on regional planning during the Johnson Administration, Dade County was a favored area for planning assistance grants because it already had a reputation for having a competent metropolitan planning organization.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶Reginald R. Walters, Metro Dade Planning Director, personal letter, March 15, 1979.

¹⁴⁷Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department, op. cit.

Comprehensive planning at the county level is tied in directly with the Metropolitan Capital Improvements Program. Although the operating departments of Metro Dade do their own facilities planning for future needs, the actual capital improvements program is prepared by a Capital Improvements Technical Committee.¹⁴⁹ Two members of the planning department serve on this committee along with other management personnel, in order to provide better coordination among the capital improvements program, the operating budget and the comprehensive development master plan. Although the planning department does not have final review authority over the capital program, it does provide input during the developmental stages.

Comprehensive Health Planning services for the metropolitan area are provided by the Health Systems Agency of South Florida, an entity which is completely independent of Metropolitan Dade County.¹⁵⁰ The HSA includes both Dade and Monroe Counties in its jurisdiction and has a completely separate governing board. Due to the specificity of the HSA's planning concerns there is no official liason relationship

¹⁴⁸ACIR, op. cit., p.13.

¹⁴⁹Reginald R. Walters, op. cit.

¹⁵⁰Simon Ruddeman, Principal Planner for Metro Dade, interview conducted during a visit to the Metro Dade Planning Department during March, 1979.

between the planning department and the HSA. The Dade County Health Department has a much closer working relationship with the HSA than does the planning department. The most frequent official communication between the Planning Department and the HSA agencies results from the fact that the HSA is under contract to the County to provide A-95 review for health facility proposals for the planning department.¹⁵¹

Metro Dade's planning department is the designated Metropolitan Areawide Clearinghouse for the Miami SMSA. The South Florida Regional Planning Council (SFRPC) serves as the non-metropolitan areawide clearinghouse for the larger three county southeast Florida region.¹⁵² As discussed in chapter III, it is not uncommon to have overlapping A-95 review agencies in metropolitan areas. Since A-95 review pre-dates the existence of substate regional planning districts in Florida, the planning department was grand-fathered in as an A-95 review agency. Independent rather than joint project reviews are conducted separately by SFRPC and Metro Dade. Separate reports are filed with the State Clearinghouse and with the appropriate federal agencies. Neither agency's review and comment authority supercedes the

¹⁵¹Ibid.

¹⁵²Reginald R. Walters, op. cit.

other's. They are separate but equal review processes under the law.

Transportation planning for Metro Dade is broken up among three different groups.¹⁵³ The Department of Traffic and Transportation has planning responsibilities related to streets and highways, or those programs funded by the Federal Highway Administration. Mass Transportation planning is under the authority of the Office of Transportation Administration. This latter office also is responsible for the coordination of all ground transportation planning activities within the metropolitan government. In addition, there also is the State designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

The Metropolitan Dade County Board of County Commissioners is the designated MPO for the area. Because the County Commission is the official governing body of the county, it sits as the board of the MPO while the actual planning activities are conducted by the Technical Coordinating Committee¹⁵⁴ (TCC). Fourteen departments and agencies of federal, state, regional and local governments participate on this committee. These include the Department of -----

¹⁵³Alan C. Wulban, Grants Liaison Officer for Metro Dade, personal letter, March 1, 1979.

¹⁵⁴Walters, op. cit.

Planning, the Department of Traffic and Transportation, the Metropolitan Transit Agency, SFRPC, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), and the Florida Department of Transportation. The comprehensive planning program of the department of planning provides the necessary land use framework for the development of the 3C (continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive) transportation planning process. Although land use planning and transportation planning are conducted by separate agencies, the participation of the planning department on the TCC provides the opportunity for policy coordination of these two major planning efforts. A-95 review authority also assures that the views of the planning department will be heard regarding any proposal for transportation improvements.

Manpower planning for Dade County is conducted by the South Florida Manpower Planning Consortium, a coalition of Dade and Monroe Counties and the cities of Miami, Miami Beach and Hialeah.¹⁵⁵ It is the task of this agency to administer and coordinate the manpower programs for the entire two county area. In addition, Dade County was one of six areas selected by the U.S. Department of Labor for an experimental Comprehensive Manpower Project based upon the

¹⁵⁵Ibid.

concept of manpower revenue sharing.¹⁵⁶ Under this program the county created a Manpower Area Planning Council composed of representatives of business, professional and client communities. The Council is part of the administrative organization of the County Manager's Office and is responsible for the distribution of Dade County CETA funds. The planning department has no official relationship with either of these agencies and does not get involved in manpower planning activities. The Manpower Consortium remains the primary agency for program coordination in the region, but the Council has its own professional staff and generates its own program initiatives for the CETA money it controls.

Overall, Metro Dade is involved in a very broad based planning effort on both the local and regional (county) levels. Frequently the planning activities are conducted by agencies other than the planning department due to their specialized professional capabilities. In such cases there are often executive coordinating committees established to provide program integration, (transportation planning is a good example of this). In other cases, such as health planning, independent agencies conduct the planning activities with little official program integration relative to other ongoing planning activities.

¹⁵⁶Ibid.

INDIANAPOLIS - MARION COUNTY, INDIANA

General Background

The City of Indianapolis and Marion County, Indiana consolidated their governments on March 13, 1969 when the Governor officially approved the Consolidated First-Class Cities and Counties Act.¹⁵⁷ Indianapolis thus became the largest city in this country in which a successful city-county consolidation had occurred during this century. The city moved from 26th place in the national ranking of cities, with a population of 475,000 to ninth place with a population of more than 793,000. The city limits were expanded from 82 square miles to approximately 400 square miles.

Unlike the other city-county consolidations that had occurred in the 1960's (Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee and Jacksonville-Duval County, Florida), the Indianapolis case was one that took much of the nation by surprise. Indianapolis, and Indiana in general, were hardly in the forefront of the local government reform movement.¹⁵⁸ There was no fanfare of special study commissions or charter commis-

¹⁵⁷Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Regional Governance: Promise and Performance, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p.48.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p.48.

sions because the entire period of popular discussion and debate related to the reorganization was concentrated into a period of three or four months.¹⁵⁹ There was no referendum on the issue because such an exercise has no legal meaning in the State of Indiana. Under the Indiana State Constitution, cities are created by the General Assembly and function only as prescribed by the laws passed by that body.¹⁶⁰ Changes in the form or function of city government can occur only as a result of state legislative action.

The State of Indiana, through its constitution, has placed very strict limits on the borrowing capacity of the municipal corporations. This restriction has created numerous problems for cities and towns in terms of their capacity to provide an expanding complement of urban services which their residents demand. In order to get around this restriction, special purpose districts have proliferated. Many of these units have their own independent borrowing authority based on the assessed valuation of the area included within their jurisdiction.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p.48.

¹⁶⁰Office of the Mayor, City of Indianapolis, "Questions Most Frequently Asked About Unigov", a public relations pamphlet, June 1976, p.7.

¹⁶¹ACIR, op. cit., p.49.

At the outset, many of these special districts coincided with the boundaries of the individual general purpose units of local government. In time, however, the economies of scale available to multi-jurisdictional special districts became more obvious. As a result, a number of special purpose districts providing the same or similar services were merged and new districts were formed utilizing the larger geographic base.¹⁶² In the Indianapolis area, these efforts marked the beginnings of a more metropolitan focus toward service delivery and governmental problem solving.

The first major legislative adjustment of this type occurred when the city's Sewer and Sanitation Department was made a separate taxing district with authorization to exercise extraterritorial jurisdiction.¹⁶³ Many of the more densely settled suburban communities adjacent to Indianapolis joined this service district. In 1951, the state created a separate municipal corporation encompassing all of Marion County, with jurisdiction over all public health and hospital activities.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶²Ibid., p. 49.

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., p. 50

A rather unique piece of legislation was passed in 1955 which established a countywide planning commission for Marion County and transferred to it all authority over land use planning, zoning, and subdivision controls which had been held by the individual communities.¹⁶⁵ Additional functions were transferred to, or established at, the county level throughout the 1960's including parks and recreation, a capital improvements board, and a transportation authority.¹⁶⁶ By 1968, when the initiative for government consolidation began to gather steam, the Indianapolis metropolitan community had already undertaken a piecemeal reorganization of many of the more important functions of local government at the countywide level.

The Consolidated Government of Indianapolis - Marion County

Despite the existence of several areawide governmental functions for the Indianapolis area, metropolitan coordination and program integration largely were lacking. The ad hoc, function by function evolution of countywide service resulted less from concerns about political responsibility than from concerns about fiscal autonomy.¹⁶⁷ The county

¹⁶⁵Indiana Code 18-7-2, Chapter 2, Metropolitan Planning Departments in Counties having Cities of the First Class.

¹⁶⁶Office of the Mayor, op. cit., p.4.

government was ill equipped to deal with such municipal governmental responsibilities because it had neither the legislative power nor the organizational structure to assume such functions. As a result, the governing format utilized in most instances was that of an appointed board, with membership designated jointly by the city mayor and the county commission.¹⁶⁸ Authority and responsibility were thus widely dispersed over a patchwork quilt of independent agencies.

The great impetus for governmental reorganization occurred as result of a series of surprising Republican Party election victories over a two year period. First, the Republican candidates swept a majority of the county legislative offices, Indianapolis city council seats and even the Mayor's office in 1967.¹⁶⁹ The city traditionally had been a Democratic stronghold and the changeover was conducive to a new spirit of cooperation between the city and county. This included instituting regular meetings by the newly elected leaders to discuss the possibilities of broad based government reform.¹⁷⁰ To compliment these successes, the Republicans won the Governor's office, strong majorities in both

¹⁶⁷ACIR, op. cit., p.51.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., p.51.

¹⁶⁹Ibid., p.52.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p.53.

houses of the State Assembly, and all of the seats on the Marion County legislative delegation in the statewide elections in 1968. The confluence of single party control at the state, county and local levels made it clear to the local politicians that the opportunity to move on the reorganization issue was at hand.

Following the elections in 1967, the leadership of the city and county began meeting on a regular basis to discuss the possibilities of a large scale reorganization of local government for Indianapolis and Marion County. Although these meetings were not publicized and the discussions were largely kept secret, they could not be characterized accurately as a clandestine operation by the political leadership.¹⁷¹ To many of the suburban communities this is just what it was, however.

By the time the statewide election results were in one year later, a general consensus had been reached by this policy group concerning the central components of its reform proposal. When the General Assembly went into session in January, 1969, a draft bill was ready for submission. Less than two months later, on March 5th, the bill had been approved by both houses of the Assembly and was passed on to

¹⁷¹Ibid., p.53

the governor for his consideration.

The consolidation bill that passed was not a complete unification of municipal and county governments. Four of the 23 cities and towns within the county were not included in the reorganization. It was widely known that most of the small municipalities within the county were opposed to the consolidation and were angered by the secrecy during the formative stages of the proposal. In order to dampen some of the criticism and public outcry, the bill was written in a manner that excluded the largest of these municipalities, those with populations of 5000 or more, from consolidation.¹⁷²

The eleven existing school districts in the county were also unaffected by the change. Even three countywide agencies, the Health and Hospital Corporation, the Capital Improvements Board, and the Airport Authority, remained autonomous, primarily due to the desire to protect their independent bonding authority.¹⁷³ The structure of government remains highly pluralistic rather than unitary. By and large the Unigov act, as the consolidation is commonly known, was much less an act of geographic centralization

¹⁷²Ibid., p.56.

¹⁷³Office of the Mayor, op. cit., .p4.

than an act of administrative integration.

The new government has a strong mayor, strong council format, which has substantially increased local representation for both the old city and the county. All residents of the county, even those living in the incorporated areas with their own governments, have the right to vote for Indianapolis' Mayor and Councilmen. The governmental organization also has been simplified by incorporating all of the functions of the new government into six departments: Administration, Public Safety, Public Works, Metropolitan Development, Transportation, and Parks and Recreation.¹⁷⁴ Within this simplified format, the consolidated government professes to have eliminated the confusion, duplication, and waste that were prevalent under the old system.

Planning Responsibilities Under Unigov

Planning functions for the consolidated government are conducted by the Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD). This department is fairly comprehensive in scope and incorporates housing, planning and zoning, urban renewal, buildings, and code enforcement under one roof.¹⁷⁵ The prep-

¹⁷⁴Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁷⁵ACIR, op. cit., p. 63.

aration of a comprehensive general land use plan for the consolidated city was one of the first major assignments undertaken by the planning division.

In many respects the government consolidation did little to change the functions and operations of the existing Metropolitan Planning Department. Chapter 8 of the Consolidated First Class Cities and Counties Act, which legally created DMD, merely transferred the planning and zoning powers of the Metropolitan Planning Department over to DMD.¹⁷⁶ No new powers related to planning and zoning were conferred upon DMD as a result of the consolidation. The new responsibilities related to the other divisions and functions of DMD. Significantly, however, the existence of a unified city-county government may have been a major factor in facilitating the inflow of tremendously increased quantities of federal financial support for Indianapolis, including support for the expansion of planning programs.¹⁷⁷

Shortly after the consolidated government was instituted, Indianapolis began using its clout as a metropolitan government and its position as one of the nation's largest cities with a Republican Administration to secure increased federal

¹⁷⁶Indiana Code 18-4-8, Chapter 8, Consolidated First Class Cities and Counties Act.

¹⁷⁷ACIR, op. cit., p.69-70.

funding from the Nixon Administration. The city was also able to gain increased discretion in the use of the available funds.¹⁷⁸ Indianapolis was the first city in the country to receive funding for a Unified Planning Program which combines land use planning, transportation, parks and open space planning, and a number of social planning programs as well. Under this program, the city submits an integrated grant application to a number of federal agencies, combining the needs and justifications for the various grants into a single, multi-faceted local program.¹⁷⁹

In 1970, the Bureau of the Census expanded the Indianapolis SMSA from one county to eight counties, and the DMD, as the existing metropolitan planning agency, incorporated portions of this larger area into several of its planning programs. The flexibility of funding under the Unified Planning Program allowed DMD to function as the regional planning agency for transportation, manpower and water quality.¹⁸⁰ This expanded program focus was short-lived, however, as federal regulations relating to jurisdictional representation and participation in ongoing planning activities threatened continued funding for regional planning. Section

¹⁷⁸Ibid., p.70.

¹⁷⁹Office of the Mayor, op. cit., p.12.

¹⁸⁰ACIR, op. cit., p.70.

701 funds in particular were in jeopardy. Pressure from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development brought about the creation of the Indiana Heartland Coordinating Commission (IHCC) in 1972.

IHCC was formed for the sole purpose of functioning as an Areawide Planning Organization as defined by federal HUD.¹⁸¹ As such, it was not created under the auspices of the state statute authorizing regional planning commissions, but under a more general statute known as the Interlocal Cooperation Act. Authorization to conduct planning studies was extremely limited and at the outset the commission was totally dependent on the professional staff of the consolidated city. Although the agreement forming the commission has been amended by the member governments to incorporate a professional planning staff, the functions of the commission remain limited to those deemed to be necessary to meet the federal requirements for designation as an APO and little more.¹⁸²

¹⁸¹Ibid., p.66.

¹⁸²Indiana Heartland Coordinating Commission, Amended Agreement for Formation and Operation of a Multi-Jurisdictional Coordinating Commission, 1976.

The very narrow assignment of responsibilities to the IHCC in favor of DMD has resulted in some minor sanctions against DMD by federal HUD. Discretionary 701 planning funds, which had been abundantly available to the city, have recently been directed more toward the IHCC as a means of expanding and strengthening its regional planning capabilities.¹⁸³ Section 701 funding is still being granted to the city for comprehensive planning purposes. However, Community Development Block Grant money now provides the bulk of the federal grant money utilized for planning.

Comprehensive Health Planning services for the Indianapolis area are provided by the Central Indiana Health Systems Planning Agency.¹⁸⁴ This agency is the designated HSA for the eight county SMSA and is completely independent of the consolidated government. The Health and Hospital Corporation of Marion County, which is not a part of the consolidated government, is an active participant in the regional health systems planning effort. DMD plays no role in the health planning activities of the area and the city's official participation is through the mayor's office. The

¹⁸³Information relating to the dispensation of 701 planning grants was obtained through telephone interviews with DMD staff members Sweson Yang and P.J.Hayes.

¹⁸⁴Sweson Yang, Principal Planner, personal letter, March 30, 1979.

mayor is a member of the HSA board.

The DMD is the designated metropolitan clearinghouse for A-95 review but does not exercise A-95 review for the eight county SMSA. The IHCC is the regional clearinghouse and also functions as the lead agency for metropolitan review and comment.¹⁸⁵ Due to the consolidated structure of the city government, however, DMD is considered to be a 'quasi-metropolitan' planning agency and has been granted limited review and comment authority. This is limited to grant applications for jurisdictions within Marion County. Rather than being an independent review, however, these comments are passed along to IHCC for inclusion in its review process. DMD can best be described as a limited function, junior partner to IHCC for this particular program.

Transportation planning is conducted by DMD as part of the city's Unified Planning Program. Although the city has a separate Department of Transportation, this department does not include a planning division. City DOT is primarily responsible for such functions as street maintenance, street engineering, snow removal, and traffic signing and signalization.¹⁸⁶ The planning division of DMD is responsible for

¹⁸⁵Department of Metropolitan Development, Overall Work Program, 1979, p.0-7.

¹⁸⁶Office of the Mayor, op. cit., p.9.

the 3C transportation planning process for the Indianapolis area. DMD also functions as the MPO for the region, having been so designated by the governor.

While DMD provides the professional staff expertise for transportation planning, policy decisions are coordinated through the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Planning Council. This council is composed of elected officials from two neighboring counties, several neighboring municipalities, the four independent municipalities in Marion County, and representatives from FHWA, UMTA and the State DOT. In addition to setting planning policy for all forms of ground transportation in the metropolitan area the council also coordinates the metropolitan A-95 review for federal aid transportation grants.

The City of Indianapolis is a prime sponsor under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and thus has responsibility for the development and operation of employment and training programs for Marion County. The CETA program is the responsibility of the Division of Employment and Training in the Department of Administration. DMD plays no role in the programmatic activities of the CETA effort, but has assisted in the past in the areas of data collection and needs assessment for portions of the manpower planning effort.

Since the inception of the consolidated government, the City of Indianapolis has seen its role as a major metropolitan regional planning organization change substantially. In some areas, such as comprehensive planning, it has seen its funding and authority shrink in favor of a larger regional emphasis. In other programs, such as transportation, its role as the lead planning agency has been greatly enhanced. Many of these changes are the result of the continuing evolution of regional and metropolitan planning in the state and at the federal level. About the only thing that is certain is that the evolution is not yet complete and other structural, organizational, and functional changes are likely to occur. Now that the parameters of the SMSA are more settled, perhaps future changes will be smaller in scale.

THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL OF THE TWIN CITIES AREA
 MINNEAPOLIS - ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

General Background

The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area is one of the broader and more comprehensive experiments in area-wide governance to be undertaken in this country. It is not a consolidation of local units of government nor a city-county reorganization in the traditional sense of transferring functional responsibilities to an existing but upper tier level of government. Rather, a whole new level of government was created between the state and the cities and counties without eliminating any of the existing units of general purpose government.¹⁸⁷

The Metropolitan Council is a regional, representative, general purpose policy making body for the seven county Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. In all, the metropolitan jurisdiction includes more than 3000 square miles and a 1970 population of 1.8 million people. In addition to the seven counties, the region includes 60 townships, nearly 140 municipalities, and several dozen school districts and spe-

¹⁸⁷Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Regional Governance: Promise and Performance, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p.114.

cial purpose districts.

The development of an identification with regional issues in the Twin Cities began during a period of rapid suburbanization in the early and middle 1950's. Neither Minneapolis nor St. Paul was eager to provide the new suburban communities with urban services such as sewer and water.¹⁸⁸ While this created some minor inconveniences in developing areas, primarily the utilization of individual wells and backyard septic tanks, it did little to slow the overall growth rate. By 1959, however, nearly half of the home wells were being contaminated by nitrates from the septic tank systems.¹⁸⁹ There were immediate cries for the development of central sewer and water systems for the suburban areas. Municipal water systems were provided without much difficulty over the next few years, but the sewage problem remained unresolved for more than a decade.

The confusion that resulted from the sewage issue was indicative of the larger issue of local development decisions being made on a piecemeal basis where regional consequences were involved. The emerging sub-regional sewer districts were costly, poorly planned, ill coordinated, and too

¹⁸⁸Ibid., p. 114-115.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., p. 115.

small in scale to provide the necessary capacity for additional growth and orderly development.¹⁹⁰ There were heated debates in the state legislature in 1961, 1963, and 1965 regarding the merits of creating a fully metropolitan sanitary district verses the continued reliance on the smaller district systems.

Throughout the 1960's, although the issue of haphazard development of urban services in the suburban areas continued to stand in the forefront, a whole range of issues relating to water pollution, uncoordinated development, urban sprawl, and the speculative subdivision of valuable agricultural lands began to merge together. More and more, local officials, civic associations, and the state legislature were becoming aware that the most critical need in the Twin Cities area was for the creation of some sort of regional policy body to coordinate local, regional and state development decisions.¹⁹¹

One of the leading proponents in the battle for the creation of an areawide policy body was the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC). This agency had been

¹⁹⁰C.J. Hein, Joyce M. Keys, G.M. Robbins, Regional Governmental Arrangements In Metropolitan Areas: Nine Case Studies, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p. 29.

¹⁹¹Ibid., p. 30.

created in 1957 by an act of the legislature to provide a regional dimension to the discussion and analysis of urban growth issues in and around the Twin Cities.¹⁹² While the MPC was able to add this regional dimension, it was primarily composed of representatives of local government and was unable to deal in any consensus manner with issues involving local interest conflicts.

The MPC was well aware of its lack of power to deal with controversial issues, so it used its limited authority to inform and educate the citizens of the region of the need for coordination of the entire metropolitan development process. Prior to the 1967 legislative session and as a result of its experience in a major regional transportation-land use study, the MPC developed and submitted a position paper which called upon the legislature to disband and replace the MPC with a stronger, reorganized metropolitan entity.¹⁹³

The Creation of The Metropolitan Council

¹⁹²ACIR, op. cit., p.115.

¹⁹³Heins, Keys, Robbins, op. cit., p.29.

Throughout the summer of 1966, representatives of a number of civic and political organization including the League of Minnesota Municipalities, the various local Chambers of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, and issues task forces of the two major political parties discussed the merits of specific proposals for regional policy coordination. The fervor with which this group, (called the Metropolitan Affairs Committee) attacked the issues, carried over into the fall gubernatorial and legislative campaigns.¹⁹⁴ There was a broad acknowledgement of the need for major legislative action in the 1967 session. By late fall a general consensus had been reached by the Committee that planning for major sewerage works, major open space, transit, metropolitan airports, and the zoo were appropriate functions for the areawide body.¹⁹⁵ By and large these were functions which had never been handled and were not sought by the individual municipalities.

A group of Twin Cities Legislators introduced a bill early in the 1967 session proposing the creation of a 30 member, elected metropolitan council responsible for the identified regional functions.¹⁹⁶ A counter proposal was

¹⁹⁴ACIR, op. cit., p.115.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., p.115.

¹⁹⁶Ibid., p.116.

then submitted by a group of out-state legislators calling for a smaller council, with membership appointed by the Governor, responsible for planning and coordinating the operation of existing and future state created regional agencies.¹⁹⁷ The essential difference between the two proposals was not in the designation of functions and responsibilities, but in the role that the state legislature could play in the development of growth policies for the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Throughout the long, tough legislative battle neither side was able to generate sufficient support to break either bill out of the deadlocked Metropolitan Affairs Committee. Toward the end of the session, however, the urgent need for some type of regional structure allowed the out-state proposal to prevail, with one major concession. Even though the membership on the Metro Council was to be appointed rather than elected, the appointments were to be made on the basis of state legislative districts rather than at-large.¹⁹⁸ The amended proposal passed by slim margins in both houses of the legislature, and the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area was officially created.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., p.116.

¹⁹⁸Heins, Keys, Robbins, op. cit., p.30.

The Metro Council is made up of 16 members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each Council member represents a multi-municipal jurisdiction of approximately equal population, composed of two adjacent state senatorial districts. The Governor also appoints the Chairman of the Council. The Council has its own tax base through a property tax mill levy and it also receives funds through a variety of state and federal grant programs. Under the initial enabling legislation, the Metro Council had responsibility for planning the metropolitan sewer, transportation, and park systems. It also must approve the capital improvements proposals and operating budgets for the Metropolitan Parks, Waste Control, and Transit Commissions.¹⁹⁹ The Council also has review and veto authority over the plans of the independent special purpose districts.

The creation of the Metropolitan Council was not an attempt to tidy up the regional structure with respect to local government or to existing areawide special districts. By establishing the coordinating function as the primary focus for Metro activities, the legislature was indicating its belief that the existing agencies were performing their

¹⁹⁹Minnesota Statutes, Sec. 473.1, Metropolitan Council Act as amended, 1976.

assigned tasks with competence, and were in need, not of reorganization, but of a general, regional policy framework to guide their independent decisions.²⁰⁰ What resulted was a blending of planning and decision making at the regional level which has produced no plans, but guidelines and policy directives for state, local and regional agencies.

The legislature has been cautious not to assign implementation or program operation functions directly to the Metro Council. Instead, separate but subordinate regional agencies have been created to carry out Council policy. Consistency with policy in implementation and operations is induced through direct Council control over the approval of operating budgets and capital improvements programs for these subordinate regional commissions.²⁰¹ The Metro Council also is responsible for appointing the board members who sit at the head of the various commissions.

Planning Responsibilities Under the Metropolitan Council

The legislative mandate established for the Metro Council upon its inception was the preparation and adoption of a

²⁰⁰ACIR, op. cit., p.118.

²⁰¹Minnesota Statutes, op. cit.

comprehensive development guide for the entire seven county area. The guide was to be much more than a general master plan for the region, as it was to include policy statements, goals, standards, and programs prescribing strict guidelines for the orderly and economic development of the metropolitan area.²⁰² As it happened, however, the more immediate and pressing problems in the functional areas such as sewage and transportation received the greatest attention during the first years. Once the Council did undertake the development framework planning process in 1972, it became the central focus of all Council activities.

The development framework provides the Metro Council with a growth management tool which is not based on absolute growth rates, but on a system of coordinated goals and policy statements aimed at protecting and enhancing the quality of life in the Twin Cities area. The building blocks of this strategy are the capital improvements plans of the various regional commissions and the comprehensive plans of the local communities. As indicated earlier, the Council exercises substantial control over the capital programs and plans of the commissions. In addition, a 1976 state law mandated local comprehensive planning in the Twin Cities

²⁰²Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area, "The Politics and Planning of a Metropolitan Growth Policy for the Twin Cities - An Executive Summary", 1976, p.3.

area.²⁰³ This legislation also provided the necessary linkage between municipal planning and the metropolitan development framework by granting the Council review over all municipal plans to assure consistency with regional objectives.

Comprehensive planning assistance grants from the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development have been the primary source of funding for both the regional and local comprehensive planning efforts. Section 701 funds were utilized extensively during the process of producing the development framework, which functions as the regional comprehensive plan.²⁰⁴ HUD 701 funds continue to be a major source of financing for the municipal planning efforts. The Council utilizes the 701 money it receives to provide local planning assistance and to increase the capabilities of the local units to develop their own planning capabilities.²⁰⁵ The Council also provides assistance to local units of government in filing grant applications with the federal government for planning purposes. As a result, the Council receives pass-through money from the local units in the form of 701 monies granted directly to the individual municipali-

²⁰⁴Metropolitan Council, op. cit., p.1.

²⁰⁵Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area, 1977 Annual Report, p.20.

ties by HUD and then contracted to the Council in exchange for comprehensive planning services.²⁰⁶

The Metro Council has been active in comprehensive health planning for nearly a decade. The Metropolitan Health Board was formed in 1970 to coordinate the capital expansion programs of the public and private health institutions in the Twin Cities area.²⁰⁷ When the federal health planning legislation was changed in 1974, the Metropolitan Health Board was designated as the regional HSA and the composition of the Board was altered to coincide with the federal requirements. Since that time a regional Health Systems Plan has been prepared, and in 1977 it was adopted as part of the development framework.²⁰⁸ Current efforts are aimed at updating the plan and the annual implementation plan while undertaking a long-range hospital planning program to help determine long-range capital needs for the area's 37 hospitals.

A-95 review functions for the region are provided by the Metro Council as well. The Council has been the designated clearinghouse for both areawide and metropolitan reviews

²⁰⁶Ibid., p.20.

²⁰⁷ACIR, op. cit., p.121.

²⁰⁸Metropolitan Council, 1977 Annual Report, p.12.

since it was created.²⁰⁹ Due to the unique structure and powers of the Council, especially concerning control over the regional commissions, the A-95 review process in the Twin Cities area has more teeth than in most other areas. The Council can control not only the comments relative to the regional grant applications, but also the availability of matching funds and operating budget items. With respect to the individual municipalities, the A-95 review process relies on consistency with the development framework. A-95 for health systems funds also can be monitored closely by the Council due to the structure of the Health Systems Board in relation to the Council.

Transportation planning has been one of the Council's long standing functions. When the Council was created in 1967, the Metropolitan Transit Commission, the first of the independent regional commissions, was created by the legislature.²¹⁰ This agency engages in transit and mass transportation systems planning as well as supervising the operation of the existing bus and transit systems. In addition, there is a Transportation Planning Division within the Metro Council staff organization. This division is involved in other forms of land based transportation planning including

²⁰⁹Ibid., p.4.

²¹⁰ACIR, op. cit., p.116.

streets and highways, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities.

The Council is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization with responsibility for the 3C transportation planning process. The policy coordination group which advises the Council on matters relating to the integration of the component parts of the transportation planning programs is the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee.²¹¹ As is the case in many other areas, this committee is composed of management personnel from the local and regional planning programs, and representatives from State DOT, FHWA and UMTA.

While the other planning activities have been developing a much more coordinated and integrated program format, the manpower planning activities in the Twin Cities area have been moving in the opposite direction. There are no less than five prime sponsors within the Metro Council jurisdiction.²¹² Hennepin and Ramsey Counties each function as a sponsor for their suburban areas, and their respective central cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul, are prime sponsors. The fifth prime sponsor is the Quad-County Manpower Consor-

²¹¹Metro Council, 1977 Annual Report, p.35.

²¹²Gary Levene, Director of CETA Intake and Referral Services for the City of Minneapolis, telephone interview, March 19, 1979.

tium composed of Carver, Anoka, Scott, and Washington Counties. With the exception of the A-95 review requirements, the Metro Council does not participate at all in the manpower planning programs. The five prime sponsors themselves disbanded an executive coordinating committee which was attempting to coordinate their individual program activities because it was, as one participant described it, "an abysmal failure."²¹³

The umbrella agency approach has provided the Metro Council with a broader range of programs than most metropolitan regional planning agencies would have. The inclusion of health planning under the umbrella is a good example of the breadth of scope available within the Twin Cities' approach. Another factor which is important relative to potential program content is the size of the jurisdiction served. The seven county area allows the Council jurisdiction to qualify as a region according to the diverse criteria established for a broader range of federal programs. This latitude provides the opportunity to incorporate a more comprehensive package of planning programs within the scope of services of the Metropolitan Council.

²¹³Ibid.

THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT - PORTLAND, OREGON

General Background

Portland's Metropolitan Service District (MSD) is the most recent example of metropolitan, areawide governmental reorganization in this country. The newly created MSD has only been in operation since January 1, 1979, and is still seeking to establish its identity in Metropolitan Portland. The MSD includes most, but not all, of the Portland SMSA by encompassing portions of three northwest Oregon counties. Clark County, Washington also is part of the SMSA, but was excluded from the MSD because of the difficulties involved in establishing inter-state service districts of this type.²¹⁴

While the creation of the new MSD did not affect the existing structure and organization of local units of government in the three county area, it does represent the consolidation of two existing multi-jurisdictional agencies: the old Metropolitan Service District and the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG).²¹⁵ The old MSD had been established in 1970 by the state legislature as a

²¹⁴The Metropolitan Service District, An Information Sheet, p.2.

²¹⁵Ibid., p.1.

special district with responsibility for providing solid waste disposal, sewerage, public transportation services, and control of surface water for the three Oregon counties in the Portland SMSA.²¹⁶ Although the MSD did exercise limited planning functions in these specific areas, it was, as the name would indicate, primarily a service district.

CRAG, the association of governments, was the regional planning agency for the SMSA, and it included Clark County, Washington as part of its planning area. Participation by all local governments in the tri-county Portland area was required under a state law passed by the Oregon legislature in 1973 as a means of strengthening the planning capabilities of CRAG.²¹⁷ Mandatory participation expanded the local technical assistance aspects of CRAG's operations and provided the opportunity for more meaningful review and comment related to local comprehensive plans. Both CRAG and the old MSD had governing boards which were appointed by local government officials.

In addition to these two areawide agencies, there are two other areawide agencies or special purpose districts that should be mentioned. Both serve to further illustrate the

²¹⁶Ibid., p. 1.

²¹⁷Shelton Edner, Assistant Professor, Portland State University, personal letter, February 21, 1979.

development of a metropolitan structure for problem solving and service delivery in the Portland SMSA. Tri-Met is the metropolitan transit district which provides areawide bus service as well as mass transportation planning.²¹⁸ As the name indicates, Tri-Met serves the three county area around Portland. There is also the Boundary Commission for the region, which has authority over all municipal annexations and proposals for special district boundary changes.²¹⁹

Neither one of these agencies was directly involved in the regional consolidation, but both could be incorporated into MSD according to the legislation. Tri-Met can be taken over by a majority vote of the MSD board, while consolidation with the Boundary Commission would require a general referendum in the tri-county area.²²⁰ Considering the fact that the Boundary Commission exercises control over proposed boundary changes for MSD, the consolidation of these two agencies could substantially increase the likelihood that MSD would expand to encompass the entire Oregon portion of the Portland SMSA. Such a consolidation is not likely in the immediate future, however, for this very reason.²²¹

²¹⁸Citizens Committee for Efficiency in Local Government, "Ballot Measure 6" a pro MSD pamphlet and information bulliten.

²¹⁹Edner, op. cit.

²²⁰Ibid.

Although the new MSD consolidated the two most important areawide agencies into a unified planning and service delivery organization, the significance of the Portland case goes far beyond this. In merging CRAG and the old MSD, the new service district structure did away with two sets of appointed regional officials and replaced them with a single, popularly elected board and an elected executive director. The new organizational structure resembles that of a strong mayor-council format of local government.²²² The board members are elected from districts that resemble pie wedges, such that each district, except one, has a portion of Portland as its base and a broad spectrum of suburban communities in its overall composition. This was done intentionally to make sure that the districts would not follow the boundary lines of the counties, the City of Portland, or the state legislative districts. In this way it was believed that a less parochial, more regionally oriented constituency would be created.²²³

²²¹Ibid

²²²Ibid.

²²³Ronald C. Cease, "The Creation of an Elected Regional Council in Portland Oregon", a paper presented at the ASPA National Conference in Baltimore, Maryland, April 3, 1979, p.11.

The Consolidation of CRAG and the MSD

In late 1975, the Portland Metropolitan Area Boundary Commission submitted a grant proposal to the National Academy for Public Administration for the funding of a commission to study the possibilities for a reorganization of the structure, delivery and financing of urban public services in the Portland area.²²⁴ The grant was awarded and the Tri-County Local Government Commission was formed to conduct the study. The Commission included 65 citizens who were local government officials, businessmen, members of organized labor, representatives of neighborhood groups, state legislators, academics, media people, and representatives of various civic organizations. With the \$100,000 Academy grant and \$50,000 in local match money from government and business, the Commission adopted an 18 month budget and work program and hired a small staff to work on the study.

The Commission undertook the study in three distinct phases: Orientation and Problem Identification, Development of Alternative Solutions, and Recommendation and Implementation. Although the Commission called itself a local government commission, its focus quickly narrowed to metropolitan issues and areawide governmental solutions.²²⁵ Early

²²⁴The Metropolitan Service District, op. cit., p.2.

deliberations made it clear that the Commission would not likely recommend the creation of a totally new metropolitan government, but would seek instead to improve the existing institutions. One of the interim reports produced during the second study phase stated that the Commission was determined "to address the problems of proliferating government at the areawide level and effectively provide for reducing their number and achieving better coordination of those that remain."²²⁶

Along with the concern expressed about the functional fragmentation and lack of effective comprehensive planning at the areawide level, dissatisfaction was expressed with the degree of political accountability in regional decision making. These two factors, more than any others, provided the basis for determining acceptable solutions. Policy-making control within a general multi-purpose unit of areawide government, with non-partisan elected representation was the consensus recommendation of the Commission.²²⁷

²²⁵Cease, op. cit., p.3.

²²⁶Ibid., p.4.

²²⁷Ibid., p.4.

The Commission intended to include the entire tri-county area and all four existing regional agencies in the reorganization proposal, but the legislative process changed many of the Commission's recommendations. The boundaries were contracted to include only the urbanized and urbanizing portions of the area in order to remove the outlying rural areas from metropolitan control.²²⁸ This district gerrymandering was also felt to be necessary in order to eliminate opposition to the proposal in the public referendum on the issue. The rural residents of the tri-county area were the problem. Proponents of consolidation feared that the rural population would strongly oppose the proposal if their land was included in the new MSD jurisdiction. By drawing the boundary lines so that these people would remain outside the MSD's jurisdiction, it was thought that their opposition could be blunted, and that the proposal would stand a better chance of being approved in the public referendum. As things turned out this was a sound strategy.

The compromise bill passed with substantial majorities in both houses of the legislature, and the measure was placed on the ballot in May, 1978. Voter turnout was extremely light even for a primary election, especially in the outlying areas, and the measure passed by a 55% majority. The

²²⁸Ibid., p.7.

executive director and board members were elected during the November general election and a MSD - CRAG transition team was established to prepare the way for a smooth transfer of functions effective January 1, 1979.

The Planning Programs of the MSD

Because the MSD has only been in existence for a matter of months, its total planning program is still in the formative stages. MSD has not yet submitted its first full annual budget, nor has it found out exactly what types of federal grant-in-aid programs it will receive during the upcoming fiscal year. The existing program orientation is largely what has been inherited from the old MSD and CRAG. On the basis of these programs, and some additional information from the enabling legislation and the MSD staff, it is possible to provide a picture of the anticipated program focus, especially as it relates to the five federal planning programs being reviewed in this study.

CRAG was abolished when the new MSD began operations in January, and all comprehensive planning functions for the region were transferred over to the new jurisdiction. Federal HUD approved the transference of the CRAG 701 funds to MSD for completion of the current fiscal year's work program.²²⁹

HUD has also officially recognized MSD as the comprehensive planning organization for the region. Thus the continued availability of 701 funds for the region appears fairly certain.

While the size of the region itself is smaller than under CRAG, the areawide comprehensive planning effort should be substantially strengthened. MSD's enabling legislation establishes a stricter review process for local comprehensive plans in terms of their conformance with areawide goals, objectives, and growth policies.²³⁰ The district council can recommend or require cities and counties to make changes in their plans to assure conformance with areawide plans. CRAG had only review and comment authority, and could legally compel no change in any local plans.

Comprehensive health planning is provided by the Northwest Health Systems Agency, an independent health planning council for the region.²³¹ The jurisdiction of the HSA includes several additional Oregon counties which are not part of the Portland SMSA. MSD contracts with the HSA for A-95 review of health related grant and project applications

²²⁹The Metropolitan Service District, op. cit., p.5.

²³⁰Oregon Statutes, Chapter 268, Metropolitan Service District Act, sec. 17.

²³¹Edner, op. cit.

for the tri-county area. At the present time this is the extent of the relationship between the two agencies. MSD currently has no planning or service functions in the human health area and has not indicated any desire to move into this area.

MSD is the designated A-95 clearinghouse for the Portland SMSA. This includes both metropolitan and areawide designations which were inherited from CRAG when its functions were transferred to MSD.²³² The A-95 region no longer includes Clark County, Washington, having been reduced to the tri-county area when CRAG was abolished. There is currently some uncertainty as to the status of the areawide clearinghouse designation because only the urbanized areas of the three counties are included in the MSD.²³³ There is no existing regional agency at the present time to take over this responsibility, so it might be temporarily assigned to the state clearinghouse if a change were necessitated. It is unlikely that a decision will be forthcoming on this issue in the immediate future.²³⁴

²³²The Metropolitan Service District, op. cit., p.5.

²³³Edner, op. cit.

²³⁴Ibid.

Transportation planning is one of the primary functions assigned to MSD in the enabling legislation. Streets and highways planning is the primary focus at the present time, although its role in mass transportation planning has been expanded.²³⁵ Tri-Met, the metropolitan bus service operation, has primary responsibility for mass transportation planning, but the enabling legislation has opened the door for an increased role for MSD and a cooperative planning arrangement is evolving. One of the primary reasons for this is the fact that MSD is the MPO for the area and thus has responsibility for coordinating the UMTA and FHWA programs. There is a likelihood that Tri-Met and MSD will combine forces more fully in the future, after MSD gets a better handle on its current operations.²³⁶

Manpower planning for the tri-county area is conducted by four separate prime sponsors.²³⁷ The City of Portland is a prime sponsor for its residents, the Multnomah-Washington Counties Manpower Consortium is the sponsor for the suburban areas of these two counties, and Clackamas County has its own program as well. The MSD is not involved in these plan-

²³⁵The Metropolitan Service District, op. cit., p.5.

²³⁶Edner, op. cit.

²³⁷Carol Chislett, Information Officer, Portland Human Resources Office, telephone interview, April 12, 1979.

ning efforts, except as the areawide A-95 clearinghouse. The four prime sponsors have not had much success at coordinating and integrating their own programs, due to what one prime sponsor characterized as the divergent program needs and orientations of the individual sponsors.²³⁸

The MSD is in the curious position at the present time of straddling the old program focus of its predecessor agencies and trying to establish a base of its own. The relative security of the established programs should provide MSD with a stable base upon which to build and develop. It is not a full regional government yet, but the enabling legislation has given it a great deal of freedom to fill in gaps at the regional level as these develop. As the current planning programs evolve into a more formidable and broad based service orientation, the MSD should begin to resemble more the regional umbrella agency it was envisioned to be.

SUMMARY

Table IV-1 provides a brief summary of the program content of each of the case study governments. It is provided

²³⁸Ibid.

Table IV-1

Planning Program Content
for the Case Study Governments

Federal Planning Programs / Case Study Governments	Areawide Comprehensive Planning	Areawide Comprehensive Health Planning	A-95 Review	Urban Transportation Planning	Manpower Planning
Metropolitan Dade County	Direct Participant	Non-Participant	Direct Participant	Direct Participant	Non-Participant
Indianapolis-Marion County	Direct Participant	Non-Participant	Direct Participant	Direct Participant	Direct Participant
Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area	Direct Participant	Direct Participant	Direct Participant	Direct Participant	Non-Participant
Portland Metropolitan Service District	Direct Participant	Non-Participant	Direct Participant	Direct Participant	Non-Participant

in order to pull together some of the major points presented in the chapter, related to the compatibility of the federal planning programs and the structural organization of each of the case studies. The detailed comparative evaluation of the four organizations is presented in Chapter V.

The table highlights several interesting points. First, none of the case studies participates directly in all five of the federal programs, despite the fact that all five programs exist in each of the four metropolitan regions. This is indicative of the problem of conflicting definitions of what actually constitutes a metropolitan region. Second, three programs (comprehensive planning, health planning, and A-95 review) are common to all four of the case studies. To some extent this results from the emphasis at the federal level for coordination of various federally assisted physical planning programs. Similar coordination is not evident for socially oriented programs. Third, the scope of the jurisdiction of the case study governments appears to be a factor relative to participation in the two social planning programs--health planning and manpower planning. For the three non-participants in health planning, the HSA which administered the program encompassed a region larger than that of the case study government. For two of the three non-participants in manpower planning, the prime sponsors'

jurisdictions were a great deal smaller than those of the case studies.

The significance of these points is addressed in greater detail in Chapter V. In addition, Chapter V also evaluates the five federal programs discussed in Chapter III in some detail. By evaluating these two issue areas together and identifying the relationships between them, a clearer more accurate appraisal of the compatibility between the federal planning programs and the metropolitan governments should result.

Chapter V

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The material presented in the preceding chapters offers an overview of the historical development of the planning function of government from the municipal to the metropolitan level as well as five specific federal programs intended to encourage the furtherance of a broad range of planning programs at the regional and metropolitan level. Chapter IV showed how these programs fit into the metropolitan planning orientation of the four case study governmental organizations. It has been suggested that the five programs do not necessarily coexist within a particular organization, or even within a particular region. It also has been shown that the operational definition of metropolitan or areawide government differs from one place to another and from one program to another. A further clarification of some of these points is in order. First however, the viability of the four structural arrangements as metropolitan regional planning organizations must be considered on the basis of the criteria established in Chapter I.

ANALYSIS OF THE CASE STUDY ORGANIZATIONS

In Chapter I of this study, four criteria were established for assessing the viability of the particular case study organizations as metropolitan planning vehicles. To reiterate, they are as follows:

1. Autonomy - The metropolitan organization should function as the primary planning organization for issues of metropolitan or regional concern. In addition, the metropolitan or regional concerns should be the primary focus of the organization's planning efforts. Metropolitan issues should be the first and foremost concern of the organization, rather than being secondary to local or municipal issues.
2. Comprehensiveness - The metropolitan organization should incorporate a broad range of planning functions within its scope of operations. Although the planning section may not function as the actual planning arm for all aspects of the metropolitan organization, it should have mandatory review and comment responsibilities for the five specific programs analyzed in this study.
3. Coordination - The planning section of the metropolitan organization should have primary responsibility for coordinating the discrete planning operations of sub-metropolitan governmental entities as well as metropolitan departments and authorities. Mandatory review and comment over plans and growth programs would provide for this coordinating function as would participation on policy making committees for the other programs.
4. Implementation - The metropolitan organization should have the capacity, the authority and the fiscal power to engage in the active implementation of the planning decisions. This is not to say that the planning section of the metropolitan organization will have implementation powers itself, but rather that the larger governmental organization of which it is a part, will be so empowered.

Table V-1 on the following page, summarizes the assessment of each of these characteristics for the four case study governments. Each metropolitan government has been given a rating for each criterion, from very good to poor, as well as an overall rating based on all four criteria. As

Table V-1
 Planning Program Ratings
 for the Case Study Governments

Evaluation Criteria Case Study Governments	Autonomy	Comprehen- siveness	Coordin- ation	Imple- mentation	Overall Rating
Metropolitan Dade County	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Good	Moderate
Indianapolis- Marion County	Poor	Good	Moderate	Good	Moderate
Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area	Very Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Portland Metropolitan Service District	Very Good	Moderate	Poor	Moderate	Moderate

can be seen from the table, three of the case studies were rated as being only moderately in compliance with the viability criteria. The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area is the only one given a good overall rating. An explanation of the particular basis for the comparative ratings for each case study is provided on the following pages.

Autonomy

The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area and the Portland Metropolitan Service District are both rated as very good in terms of metropolitan autonomy. The Metro Council and the MSD were created specifically to be responsible for areawide planning and the development of areawide service delivery systems. Neither one has any legal responsibility for the provision of local planning services, although both can engage in local assistance planning activities. How this will be handled by MSD is uncertain because it is too new to have a track record. The Metro Council, however, provides local planning services at cost to the municipalities, and does so in accordance with the areawide goals, policies and programs it has established.

For the most part, in both the Twin Cities area and the Portland region, local planning activities remain in the

hands of the localities. The Metro Council and MSD exercise their review, comment and revision functions to assure compliance with areawide plans, but the primary focus of their activities is metropolitan in scope. The Portland area's commitment to metropolitan autonomy is underscored by the methodology employed in drawing up the sub-district council boundaries. Municipal, county, and state legislative district lines were ignored in the belief that by mixing these, a less parochial, more functionally regional representation would be possible.

Metro Dade County and Indianapolis are rated lower in autonomy because both have legal responsibilities for local planning activities which reduce the commitment to areawide planning as the primary program focus. Metro Dade has local planning responsibilities for the unincorporated areas of the county, and thus a clearly stated local/regional split in focus. Indianapolis' planning responsibility is to the consolidated city and to the other areas in Marion County. Unfortunately, this does not include the whole of the metropolitan area. The Census definition of the SMSA, which is eight counties, is much larger than the immediate metropolitan area, but the single county orientation of the Metropolitan Planning Department ignores portions of the metro area. Thus, the planning activities of the consolidated government

are more municipal than metropolitan in scope. For these reasons, Indianapolis was rated poor and Metro Dade moderate in autonomy.

The definition of autonomy was interpreted strictly in the evaluation of the case studies. This resulted in a low rating for Metro Dade based solely on the dual planning focus it utilizes, which may or may not have been unfair. Such a dual focus may have benefits in terms of drawing local and regional issues together, and as a means for coordinating local and areawide plans. This relationship is unproven, however, and could just as easily work to dilute the regional focus. For this reason a clear distinction was made between the existence of an areawide focus and a dual local/regional focus.

Comprehensiveness

None of the case study governments is involved in all five of the planning programs evaluated in this study. Therefore, none has total comprehensiveness. Only two of the organizations are involved in four program areas, these being the Metro Council and Indianapolis. Metro Dade and the MSD are engaged in only three apiece. In all cases the program or programs that are lacking are social rather than

physical in orientation. The planning efforts of Metro Dade and Portland's MSD are primarily physical in nature, and neither one includes either health planning or manpower planning in its responsibilities. For the Twin Cities area and Indianapolis as well, the missing program is one or the other of the social planning programs.

The case study organizations do not engage in active review and comment responsibilities for those programs with which they are not directly involved. A-95 review authority is contracted out by the three organizations which do not engage in health planning activities, and a similar thing occurs with the manpower programs. Review authority is not used as a means of participating indirectly in a broader range of programs. Comprehensiveness of program scope is thus determined by the programs in which the organization participates directly.

Coordination

The coordination function, as defined here, has two parts; coordination and integration of the five federal planning programs, and coordination of the sub-metropolitan planning activities. The first part is closely linked to the comprehensive criterion, while the latter is more a

function of hierarchical integration. Separate ratings are not given for these different characteristics. A single, aggregate coordination rating is given instead.

The Metro Council is given the highest rating for coordination for several reasons. First, the Council has budgetary and capital program approval power over the areawide, functional operating commissions. Second, it has review and approval authority over local comprehensive and functional plans. Third, the only one of the five programs with which it is not well coordinated is manpower planning, and in this case even the prime sponsors have very poor program integration. Mandatory review and approval over local planning, and budgetary control over the operating commissions are the essential elements of the Council's coordination powers.

Metro Dade and Indianapolis are rated as moderate in terms of coordination. Metro Dade's Planning Department has major responsibilities for coordinating the physical planning and development activities of the other Metro departments. It also participates in countywide capital improvements planning, and has review authority over municipal planning, zoning and subdivision regulation. In the social planning areas, however, Metro Dade engages in minimal coordination. Similarly, Indianapolis' planning department is

strong in terms of coordination with local comprehensive planning and in review of capital planning for other city departments. It is weak in terms of program coordination with health planning and in its relationship with non-consolidated countywide organization including the Capital Improvements Board. The relative strengths and weaknesses of these two organizations average out to a moderate rating.

Portland's MSD receives a poor rating in this area for two reasons. First, its program focus is totally physical, so while it has strong coordination powers over local comprehensive planning, its coordination with the two social planning programs is almost non-existent. The second reason is the uncertainty of the areawide clearinghouse designation for A-95 review. If the areawide clearinghouse designation is withdrawn, the A-95 review will be shared with another agency and the central coordinating function split. This might improve areawide coordination, but it will weaken MSD's base for coordinating sub-metropolitan planning activities.

Implementation

The broadest range of planning implementation powers for any of the case study governments is found in the Indianapolis-

lis and Metro Dade cases. Both of these governments can exercise the full compliment of municipal implementation common to cities of their size. Because Indianapolis is a city of countywide scale, its powers include control over zoning and subdivision regulations, and transportation systems development for all of Marion County. In addition, the city can buy and own land, facilities and capital equipment. Metro Dade has similar authority, but it is limited to the unincorporated areas of the county for zoning and subdivision regulation. It too can buy and own land, facilities, and capital equipment. Both cases are rated as having good implementation capabilities.

The implementation authority of the Metro Council has been assigned in an indirect manner. Subordinate regional commissions exercise implementation authority in such areas as health, transportation, sewer and water, etc. Council exercises budgetary and capital program control over these commissions to assure conformance to Council's areawide development policies. The implementation power is strong, but indirect, and is rated as good. The fourth government, Portland's MSD, is considered to be only moderate in terms of implementation. This is not due to any lack of authority for implementation, but to the rather narrow scope of operations currently assigned to MSD. At the present time imple-

mentation is limited to transportation and comprehensive planning. The link between planning and service delivery is strong, but the purely physical planning orientation weakens the rating on the bases of the criteria established here.

This evaluation highlights a number of significant points. On the whole, the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area was found to be the most viable planning organization of the four which were analyzed. The Metro Council appears to be the best organization or tied for the top rating in terms of each of the four criteria. Both Portland's MSD and the Twin Cities Council are evaluated highly on the autonomy criterion because these two organizations were created specifically to deal with metropolitan regional issues, and do not have overlapping local functions. In the other two cases, existing units of local government were reorganized in some fashion to form the metro organization. In both Indianapolis and Metro Dade this resulted in the problem of a dual local/regional focus. For Metro Dade this means functioning as a municipal planning organization for the unincorporated areas of the county. In Indianapolis, it means that program responsibilities are limited to the Consolidated City and do not even include the immediate metropolitan area.

Jurisdictional scope or scale was a significant aspect of autonomy. The single county organizations were found to be weak in this area. Jurisdictional size was less important relative to the other criterion, however. Both the Twin Cities Area, the largest region, and consolidated Indianapolis, the smallest region, had the same level of program comprehensiveness. Both were engaged in four out of the five programs studied. In the Twin Cities case, the vastness of the region provided the opportunity to engage in comprehensive health planning within the organization. Conversely, the single city scale of the Indianapolis case made it possible for this organization to participate in the manpower program as a prime sponsor. Rather than being a function of jurisdictional scale, comprehensiveness in program scope appears to be more dependent upon the flexibility of state enabling legislation and the whimsical manner in which federal programs define regions.

The coordination criterion proved to be interesting in the four case study organizations. All four were intended to provide improved coordination and program integration at the metropolitan level. For the most part they have accomplished this within the context of the planning programs in which they are actively engaged. Coordination with planning programs being conducted by other agencies and organizations, however, is generally lacking. Rather than utilizing

their coordinating capabilities to engage in broader based policy integration with other agencies, the tendency has been to pay lip service to coordination through A-95 review but to do little else.

Both of the umbrella agencies, the Metro Council of the Twin Cities Area and the Portland MSD, have been granted very strong review and comment authority over local comprehensive plans. Both organizations have the authority to require changes in the local comprehensive plans in order to assure consistency with metropolitan areawide plans and growth policies. In both areas this authority substantially strengthens regional capabilities for coordinating local/regional development strategies, as well as for implementing areawide plans. This linkage between local and metropolitan planning is especially important to these organizations because they lack the array of municipal implementing powers which have been granted to both Metro Dade and Consolidated Indianapolis.

The essential difference between the implementation capabilities of the umbrella agencies and the reorganized municipal agencies, Metro Dade and Indianapolis, is the responsiveness of the total organization to the implementation of planning policy. In both the Metro Dade and Indianapolis

cases, the planning function of the organization is but one of many departments lobbying for support from the County Commissioners or the City Council. Policy implementation is thus dependent on a decision making process over which the planning function has little or no control. For the umbrella agencies, however, the planning function is the decision making process. Both the Metro Council and Portland's MSD are planning policy bodies with direct implementation capabilities. This capacity enables such metropolitan planning programs to link planning and implementation without necessitating governmental reorganization.

From the standpoint of metropolitan reorganization itself, jurisdictional scale and the assignment of functional responsibilities appear to be the most important characteristics. Utilizing existing units of local government such as the county as the basis for metropolitan reorganization tends to be a very limiting factor. It generally precludes creating anything larger in scale than a one county metropolitan area. While this may suffice in many of the single county SMSA's throughout the country as a means of simplifying the structural integration of local units of government, it often turns out to be a short lived solution.

Indianapolis provides a good example of this. When it consolidated with the county, it was a single county SMSA with some spillover into the adjoining counties. In 1970, the Census Bureau redefined it as an eight county SMSA. This reclassification is significant only from the standpoint that the eight county area suddenly became the official Indianapolis region for planning purposes, at least for a number of federal programs. What is more important is that the single county government does not represent the entire metropolitan area. This government, as structured, encompasses the largest part of the metro area, but can not encompass the whole metro area. As the area continues to grow, Indianapolis-Marion County will have authority over a smaller and smaller proportion of the metro area. This will threaten the integrity of metropolitan planning functions conducted by the consolidated city.

The Metro Dade situation is somewhat similar. The Miami SMSA has not been expanded recently because it is surrounded by the Everglades on the south and west, the Atlantic Ocean on the east, and the Ft. Lauderdale SMSA on the north. In reality, however, the contiguous SMSA's in Broward and Dade Counties should probably be considered a single metropolitan area. Why they have not been reclassified is uncertain, and there is no assurance that such an event is likely to occur

in the near future. If it were to happen, however, Metro Dade would no longer have metropolitan areawide responsibilities because it would constitute only half of the new metropolitan area. The single county approach, while functional, is limited in that it can not adjust readily to expansion of metropolitan boundaries, whether by Census or functional definition.

The multi-county umbrella agency approach is able to overcome this limitation when its borders are rationally drawn up. The Portland case would be a stronger, more stable situation if the whole of the three county area were included, because this would take in much of the anticipated growth area for the metropolitan region. In time, however, this adjustment can be made, just as other special purpose district boundaries can be flexible in response to changing circumstances and shifting demands. The multi-county orientation also tends to provide for a stricter division of local and areawide functions. The Metro Council and MSD are assigned only areawide responsibilities, while both Metro Dade and Indianapolis retain a significant workload of generally local government functions. Although the two responsibilities have not proven to be incompatible, especially in the case of Metro Dade, the functional overlap does tend to blur the regional focus. When this happens, multi-county

regional planning agencies generally begin to establish a firmer position for conducting regional planning programs. Both the Miami and Indianapolis areas are experiencing some program duplication and competition with regional planning agencies in their area.

THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS

In addition to the influence exerted by the specific jurisdictional and organizational characteristics of the case study organizations themselves, the characteristics of the five federal programs selected also have a bearing on the viability of the planning functions in each of the regions. Once again, jurisdictional scope is one of the central issues. In addition, there are problems associated with the definition of comprehensiveness at the federal departmental level. Finally, there is the difficulty of federal inter- departmental program coordination.

The most troublesome aspect of the existing federal legislation is the lack of a consensus definition for what constitutes a region. The HUD 701 program basically utilizes the census definition of a metropolitan area, the 50,000 population base for the central city, and thus recognizes metropolitan regions as small as a single county or as large

as the multi-county Indianapolis and Twin Cities SMSA's. Health systems agencies, on the other hand, must include a service area of at least 500,000 people, and often, therefore, include a region which is larger than the SMSA itself. In three of the four case study areas, this has necessitated the designation of separate, independent planning bodies for comprehensive planning and health systems planning.

When the remaining programs are added to this mixture an even more complicated picture emerges. Manpower programs tend to favor single municipal jurisdictions and multi-county consortia. Thus, in this study, there are such conflicting situations as the Twin Cities area having five prime sponsors, the Portland region three, and Dade County participating in a two county consortium. Only Indianapolis, the smallest metropolitan organization in scope, participates as a prime sponsor in manpower planning programs.

Since transportation programs are keyed to urban areas, they are better suited structurally to the metropolitan focus of this study than were some of the others. A-95 review is the only program which recognizes that unique metropolitan regions exist within larger multi-county regions. A-95 provides for both metropolitan and broader based regional clearinghouse functions. Overall, however, the

tendency has been for each program to establish separate criteria for defining the planning region, and for this to result in the proliferation of limited, and frequently single purpose, regional planning agencies. The federal legislation has tended to stymie the development of truly comprehensive metropolitan planning organizations even though suitable organizations frequently exist.

Comprehensiveness also seems to be relative to the particular department or program. Despite all the legislative rhetoric concerning comprehensive program orientation and the emphasis on coordination and integration, the federal programs are noticeably lacking in operational interdepartmental program linkages. Excepting A-95, which is itself a mechanism for coordination, only two of the four remaining programs give evidence of meaningful integration. Comprehensive planning and transportation planning were very closely linked in all four case study organizations. These are the physical planning programs, and the comprehensive planning program is the base upon which the transportation plans are formulated. These programs provided an integrated approach to transportation and land use planning.

For the other programs comprehensive has had a different meaning. CETA pulled together a diverse group of manpower

programs, but did not address the need to coordinate this 'comprehensive' effort with other ongoing physical and social planning programs. The same is true for comprehensive health planning. It is comprehensive in terms of health only. Neither one of these socially oriented programs addressed the need for interdepartmental program coordination. As it turns out, comprehensiveness means pulling together a clearer focus for the programs within one's own fiefdom, but ignoring the fact that these programs are the component parts of a larger system.

A-95 review, which should provide the basis for pulling these elements together at the local or regional level, has not been properly utilized to fulfill its potential. All too frequently, the A-95 agency contracts out for A-95 review of those programs with which it is not actively involved. Health systems A-95 review is contracted out in the three case study organizations which do not participate as HSA's. The opportunity to utilize A-95 as a means for developing greater program integration has been underutilized. Part of this may be due to inherent weaknesses in the A-95 program itself, wherein funding decisions are not contingent upon a positive recommendation from the clearinghouse. The comments are considered but are not of primary importance. The process itself lacks teeth that grant

validity to areawide planning policy. There is also the problem of multiple sets of policy guidelines being utilized within a given region. The growth policies of the metropolitan and areawide clearinghouses are not necessarily the same or even compatible. In such circumstances the A-95 reviews are likely to be quite a bit different.

Finally, there is the problem of interdepartmental program coordination at the federal level. With each administrative agency establishing the basic criteria for regional agency designation, it is not surprising that limited purpose federal planning districts overlap one another. Obviously, there will be differences in the jurisdiction contained in a region as the purpose for defining the region changes. It would make a great deal more sense, however, to establish joint planning ventures among existing multi-purpose planning agencies as the need arises rather than to continue the proliferation of highly specialized regional agencies. To accomplish this, however, would probably require Executive or Congressional intervention. As it now stands, it is unlikely that the agencies themselves will overlook their own turf protectionism in favor of a more unified approach.

SUMMARY

By and large, this study has shown that the federal initiatives for regional planning at the metropolitan level and state and local initiatives aimed at metropolitan governmental reorganization have been only moderately compatible. Many of the federal programs are themselves incompatible and thus reduce the prospects for metropolitan areawide program integration. There are cases, such as the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area, where the federal regional designations do overlap to provide a broad program base. In other cases, such as Miami, there is only partial compatibility between the jurisdiction of the areawide organization and the designation of federal program regions; where this occurs, the reorganized local governmental structure may provide a simplified format for local coordination and local service delivery systems, but it provides only marginally improved suitability for federal programming related to metropolitan planning activities.

In many cases, the reorganization efforts have failed to reflect a metropolitan orientation. The partial city-county consolidation of Indianapolis-Marion County constitutes more of a case of municipal reform and reorganization than the

creation of a metropolitan government. In a case such as this, it should not be surprising that the regional planning programs are incompatible with the existing organizational structure. The single county approach to metropolitan reorganization has limited applicability from the metropolitan planning standpoint. It is generally an attractive scale for general purpose governmental reorganization, however. This inconsistency is a perplexing problem because there are rational, sensible arguments on both sides of the issue.

The success of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area as a mechanism for areawide planning, service delivery, and policy coordination provides support for a different school of thought in terms of the proper organizational structure for metropolitan regional planning. Rather than reorganizing local government to create an areawide governmental entity to conduct and implement planning, the Twin Cities established a separate, distinct level of government for metropolitan planning and plan implementation. No local governmental reorganization was necessary. The new government exists between the state and counties levels, and has been assigned a set of particular areawide responsibilities. Planning does not need to be linked to an areawide government with implementation powers, if it is such a government in and of itself.

The major criticism of the Metro Council is that its membership is appointed rather than elected, although this may change in time. When Portland reconstituted its MSD, however, it took note of the Metro Council, and set up a similar, limited purpose organization with planning and implementation powers. Portland established a freely elected areawide governing body as well. Thus, it has taken the Metro Council experience and made a significant alteration in application.

Federal incentives for areawide planning and local concern for governmental reform and reorganization may continue independent of one another. It also may be likely that as the experience of some of the more innovative forms of metropolitan reorganization become clearer, these two efforts will become more closely coordinated. Thus far, federal programs and the local governmental reorganization proposals have not had the same goal orientation, or the same desired end. They have not been incompatible for the most part, but they have not been well coordinated either. Sometimes the federal programs have failed to take advantage of the existence of areawide governments for planning purposes because the jurisdiction did not coincide with same general criteria as those established in the program legislation. In other circumstances, the scale of the reorganization effort at the

local level was insufficient to incorporate an entire metropolitan area. Both sides of the issue have been factors in different cases.

Metropolitan regions are different in scale, complexity, and issue orientation from "regions" in general. For the most part, the federal government has not recognized this uniqueness and has not devised flexible means for dealing with the particular problems, concerns, and opportunities for reform presented by metropolitan regions. Metropolitan regions differ from each other as well, and federal programs should begin to recognize this. In some of the programs studied, the federal departments have been overly rigid in applying the legislative guidelines concerning agency funding eligibility. As a result, some of the existing planning organizations and areawide governmental arrangements have been overlooked for program funding, in favor of creating new, independent areawide planning agencies. Unless the federal agencies begin to exercise more discretion in such cases, and rely less on strict interpretations of general legislative guidelines, compatibility between federal programming and metropolitan governmental reorganization will not be greatly improved. It is also important to recognize, however, that not every governmental reorganization which occurs in a metropolitan area is a reorganization of metropolitan significance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Altschuler, Alan. The City Planning Process. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965.
- Bollens, John C. and Schmandt, Henry J. The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Boyce, Daniel E., Day, Norman D., McDonald, Chris. Metropolitan Plan Making. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute, 1970.
- Catanese, Anthony. Planners and Local Politics. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1974.
- Danielson, Michael N. (ed.). Metropolitan Politics. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.
- Goodell, Leonard E. and Sprengal, Donald P. The American Metropolis. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1975.
- Hallman, Howard W. Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.
- Hein, C.J., Keys, Joyce M., Robbins, G.M. Regional Governmental Arrangements in Metropolitan Areas: Nine Case Studies. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Levin, Melvin R. Exploring Urban Problems. Boston: The Urban Press, Inc., 1971. Community and Regional Planning. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
- Lynch, Kevin. Managing the Sense of a Region. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1976.
- Masotti, Louis H. and Hadden, Jeffrey K. The Urbanization of the Suburbs. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1973.
- Mathewson, Kent (ed.). The Regionalist Papers: Toward Metropolitan Unity. Detroit: The Metropolitan Fund, Inc., 1974.

- Mogulof, Melvin B. Governing Metropolitan Areas.
Washington: The Urban Institute, 1971.
- Murphy, Thomas P. Metropolitcs and the Urban County.
Washington: Washington National Press, 1970.
- Murphy, Thomas P. and Warren, Charles R. Organizing Public Services in Metropolitan America. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1974.
- Polen, Jo John and Flaming, Karl H. Urban America: Conflict and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Ranney, David C. Planning and Politics in the Metropolis. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969.
- Rowland, Howard S. The New York Times Guide to Federal Aid for Cities and Counties. New York: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1971.
- Scott, Mel. American City Planning Since 1890. Berkeley: University of California Press, Ltd., 1969.
- Sofen, Edward. The Miami Metropolitan Experiment. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1966.
- Studenski, Paul. Government of Metropolitan Areas. New York: National Municipal League, 1930.
- Tableman, Betty. Governmental Organization in Metropolitan Areas. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1951.
- Walsh, Annmarie Hauck. the Urban Challenge to Government. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.
- Whyte, William H. The Last Landscape. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1968.
- Young, Kenneth George (ed.). Essays on the Study of Urban Politics. London: Macmillian Press Ltd., 1975.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Berry, and Steiky. "The Concept of Justice In Regional Planning: Justice As Fairness." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 40, No. 6, November, 1974.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND OFFICIAL REPORTS

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Regional Decision Making: New Strategies for Substate Districts. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973. Regional Governance: Promise and Performance. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

The Challenge of Local Governmental Reorganization. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Governmental Functions and Processes: Local and Areawide. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Indiana Heartland Coordinating Commission. "Amended Agreement for Formation and Operation of a Multi-Jurisdictional Coordinating Commission," 1976.

Indianapolis, Indiana, Department of Metropolitan Development. "Overall Work Program, 1979."

Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area. 1977 Annual Report to the Minnesota State Legislature. Minneapolis, St. Paul: Metropolitan Council, 1978.

The Politics and Planning of a Metropolitan Growth Policy for the Twin Cities. Minneapolis-St. Paul: Metropolitan Council, 1976.

Development Framework: Policy, Plan Program. Minneapolis-St. Paul: Metropolitan Council, 1976.

Growth Management in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Minneapolis-St. Paul: Metropolitan Council, 1976.

Office of the Mayor, City of Indianapolis. Questions Most Frequently Asked About Unigov. June 1976.

Portland Metropolitan Service District. Metropolitan Service District. 1979.

LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS

Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System. 33 F.R., 11739, 20 August 1968.

Cooperative Employment and Training Act of 1973. 87 Stat. 839, 42 U.S.L.

Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. Sec. 204, 80 Stat. 1262, 40 USC.

Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962. 76 Stat. 1148, 23 USC.

Federal Aid Highway Program. Sec. 104, Title 23, U.S. Code, 1976.

Housing Act of 1954. Sec. 701, 68 Stat. 640, 40 USC.

Housing Act of 1959. Sec. 419, 73 Stat. 678, 40 USC

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Sec. 401, 88, Stat. 686, 40 USC.

Indiana Code. Consolidated First Class Cities and Counties Act (1969), Chapter 8.

Indiana Code. Metropolitan Planning Departments in Counties Having Cities of the First Class (1975), Chapter 2.

Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. Sec. 401, 82 Stat. 1103, 40 USC.

Minnesota Statutes. Metropolitan Council Act (1976), sec. 473.1

National Health Planning and Resource Development Act of 1974. 80 Stat. 2225, 42 USC.

Oregon Statutes. Metropolitan Service District Act (1978)
Chapter 268.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

Cease, Ronald C. "The Creation of an Elected Regional Council in Portland Oregon." Paper presented at the American Society of Public Administrators National Conference, Baltimore, Maryland, 3 April 1979.

Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department. "Area-Wide Planning Organization: Authority, Organization, Jurisdiction." Unpublished working paper, 1978.

Muse, Philip Douglas. "Heuristic Leaping." Unpublished masters thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976.

OTHER MATERIAL

Chislett, Carol. Portland Human Resources Office, Portland, Oregon. Interview, 12 April 1979.

Edner, Shelton. Portland State University, Portland, Oregon. Personal correspondence, 21 February 1979.

Levene, Gary. CETA Intake and Referral Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Interview, 19 March 1979.

Ruddeman, Simon. Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department, Miami, Florida. Interview, 5 March 1979.

Walters, Reginald B. Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department, Miami, Florida. Personal Correspondence. 15 March 1979.

Wulban, Alan C. Metropolitan Dade County, Miami, Florida. Personal Correspondence, 1 March 1979.

Yang, Swesen. Department of Metropolitan Development, Indianapolis, Indiana. Personal Correspondence, 30 March 1979.

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

FOUR CASE STUDIES IN METROPOLITAN REGIONAL PLANNING

by

Paul Raymond Griffin

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this thesis was to examine the metropolitan regional planning programs of four case study areas in which one form or another of metropolitan governmental reorganization had occurred. The case studies selected are representative of four different types of areawide reorganization.

Five federally funding planning programs, representing both physical and social planning, were selected as the basis upon which the case study planning programs would be evaluated. Within each of the four metropolitan regions the responsibility for each of the five planning programs was evaluated, along with the interrelationships between the various planning agencies. The compatibility of the case study organizations with the federal planning program criteria is the major determinant of the viability of the case study organizations as viable metropolitan regional planning bodies.