

HOUSING IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

STUDY RESULTS OF THE TWIN CITIES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

FINAL REPORT I

MARCH, 1970

Under Contract With

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS

Washington, D.C.

FOR RELEASE THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1970 2:00 PM

Preparation of this report was financed through a Federal grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under the Urban Planning Assistance Program authorized by Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PART I: SUMMARY OF STUDY RESULTS	
A. Opportunities and Constraints in Relating Housing Development to Comprehensive Planning	1
B. Short-Term and Long-Term Actions to Be Undertaken By Local Jurisdiction in Implementation of the Study Findings	3
C. General Recommendations Concerning the Housing Element As Part of the Comprehensive Planning Functions	6
D. Recommendations As to How State Government Can Assist the Planning-Housing Relationship	7
E. Recommendation of Changes or Additions to Federal Housing and Urban Development Legislation to Expedite the Comprehensive Planning-Housing Relationship	8
PART II: MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	
A. Goals Specified in the Contracts	11
B. Work Program Elements	
A. & B. Metropolitan Housing Goals and Documentation of Their Development	12
C. Obstacles and Constraints on Low and Moderate Income Housing in the Metropolitan Area	18
D. Development of Techniques for Coordinating the Housing Activities of Private Builders and Developers with Metropolitan Housing Goals and Comprehensive Planning	32
E. The Relationship of Model Cities Program and Community Renewal Program to Comprehensive Planning and Urban Development On the Metropolitan Level	39

Table of Contents (continued)

Page 2

	<u>Page</u>
F. Housing Aspirations and Neighborhood Values of Various Socio-Economic Groups	48
G. The Relationship of Major Metropolitan Growth Shaping Systems to Low and Moderate Income Housing	58
H. Improved Techniques for Matching Metropolitan Growth Systems with Housing Goals	65
 PART III: THE HOUSING ELEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PLANS	
I. Housing Component of the Metropolitan Council's Development Guide: The Twin Cities Metropolitan Housing Plan	70
II. Recommended Programs	78
 PART IV: DETAILED CITATION OF PAPERS AND CONSULTANT WORK	
A. Consultant Papers	92
B. Major Staff Paper	95
C. In-House Staff Working Papers	97

PART I

SUMMARY OF STUDY RESULTS

A. Opportunities and Constraints In Relating Housing Development to Comprehensive Planning

The objective of the Metropolitan Council is to ensure that an adequate supply of safe, sanitary and varied housing is developed in the region in a manner that will provide residential environments which maximize opportunity for coordinated regional development, access to public and private services and facilities, and provide all residents in the region with choice in the location of housing, employment, education, shopping, recreation and other services. Toward this end this study has delineated major constraints and opportunities in achieving this kind of housing and environmental system, socially, economically and physically.

At the outset of the study the Council staff and its Technical Advisory Committee set out to develop a set of housing goals to establish a common staff and committee framework for discussing the research and planning problems, to target major issues to be studied in detail, and to redefine previous metropolitan housing goals and policies.

Early in the study it became increasingly evident that the relationships of public agencies involved in planning and programming for housing were insufficiently coordinated to address themselves to regional scale solutions to providing adequate housing for low and moderate income people. The responsibility for housing in the region is badly fragmented, with 196 municipalities,

15 HRA's, 2 Community Renewal Programs, and 2 Model Cities Programs, FHA and various other federal programs and over 130 local planning commissions. Because of jurisdictional and financial limitations, existing agencies and programs all too often find it technically and politically difficult to assist other jurisdictions in providing the technical assistance, planning and financial aid that are required to construct and maintain the housing and environmental services required to meet the low and moderate housing needs of the region in a manner that is coordinated with other aspects of regional development.

It seems clear that at a minimum greater coordination should be developed to organize the diverse housing and housing related activities at the metropolitan level. The adoption of the housing component of the Metropolitan Development Guide will certainly work towards this end, as well as having housing-related policies in the other components of the Guide. However, many housing programming and planning activities will be unaffected by the metropolitan plan as they are not reviewed or implemented at the metropolitan level. Technical assistance, land aggregation, region-wide housing development programs, and financing of housing exemplify these implementational activities that are not currently regional activities.

It is suggested that more direct implementative powers are necessary at the regional level if low and moderate income housing is to be developed in sufficient quantity, with an adequate choice of residential locations accessible to employment opportunities, shopping, etc., and if housing is to be effectively coordinated with other regional developmental activities.

Private development of housing is, at best, indirectly coordinated with public regional developmental activities. The most important tools which the Metropolitan Council has currently for coordinating private residential development with regional planning and development is through the review of local community and special district plans and programs and through the planning and operation of the sewers, open space and transportation systems with their impact on regional development.

The non-profit or limited-profit developer of housing operating under the FHA assistance programs is inadequately coordinated with the other housing planning and developmental activities in the region as well as the other major regional development. Recommendations addressing this problem are noted elsewhere. The regional coordination and technical assistance program to be implemented by the Metropolitan Council will attempt to overcome these problems as much as possible operating within the Council's current authority.

It is clear, finally, that the metropolitan region must turn to the state for both aid and enabling legislation if the major constraints on housing are to be overcome. The recommendations made in this study suggest much that the State of Minnesota can and should do in both areas. The state role is not, however, seen as a direct developer of housing in the metropolitan area. Rather it is felt that developmental activities should be organized on the regional level in order that maximum coordination and political responsiveness can be achieved.

B. Short-Term and Long-Term Action To Be Undertaken By the Local Jurisdiction
In Implementation of the Study Findings

Short-term recommendations

In making these recommendations, consideration was given to:

1. Housing problems in the region
2. Constraints affecting the development of adequate housing and residential environments in the region.
3. The current authority of the Metropolitan Council to deal with housing problems and constraints.

The short term program focuses on the Council's authority and capabilities to stimulate and coordinate development in the region, to establish and affect implementation of regional development goals, policies, and programs, and to engage in research, planning and demonstration efforts designed to improve the quantity and quality of housing coordinated with regional needs and development.

The implementation of the recommendations will be contingent upon adequate financial and staff resources to support the programs.

Six major short range Metropolitan Council programs are recommended to help meet current and future regional housing needs within a comprehensive developmental framework and improve the quality of residential environments. These programs include: (1) regional coordination and technical assistance to stimulate development of housing within the region; (2) major centers and housing development; (3) strengthening of the Metropolitan Council's review function to encourage the development of low and moderate income housing; (4) legislative program to work toward achievement of long range goals; (5) increasing the flow and availability of housing information in the region; and (6) on-going regional housing planning program designed to accelerate planning for housing and related services and the implementation of housing plans in the region.

Long-term recommendations

Long-term recommendations have two major objectives:

1. To continue to strengthen the effectiveness of tools currently available in the region to provide adequate housing and residential environments for all area residents, including low and moderate income people.
2. To establish a publicly based coordinated regional level planning, development and delivery system that will provide a continuous supply of low and moderate income housing to meet the needs of the region in suitable, well-serviced neighborhoods and communities.

To achieve the second objective requires, as a minimum, changes in state legislation and federal administrative and organizational structures and procedures. State legislation recommended by the staff includes a broadening of regional level authority in the coordination and implementation of housing and related development, with corresponding legislation in the areas of taxation, housing finance, land use regulations, and land assembly and development.

Minimally, to provide housing for those low and moderate income residents living in areas where housing assistance is not available, there should exist regional authority to provide or assist in the provision of housing that is coordinated with other developmental programs and services, both locally and regionally.

To guarantee that sufficient land in undeveloped portions of the region will, as developed, be made available for low and moderate income housing, and to provide sufficient capability for public and private cooperation in

developing low and moderate income housing and related development in existing urbanized portions of the region, it is recommended that additional developmental functions be assigned at the regional level. Such authority would include the ability to acquire land for sale or lease for purposes of residential, public, commercial and industrial development in accordance with a comprehensive plan for the area, and to build or contract to build housing and other support facilities.

These short and long term recommendations are presented in detail in Part III.

C. General Recommendations Concerning the Housing Element As Part of the Comprehensive Planning Function, Including Recommendations For Other Jurisdictions, Changes in Federal Legislation or Administration of This Planning Element

The inclusion of the housing element as a requirement for all federal comprehensive planning assistance is a good beginning but it certainly will not solve the national or regional low income housing problems. While it will focus continuing local, regional and state planning attention on housing to a greater degree, it is not likely to have a substantial impact directly on the activities of local communities in the region without additional implementational powers.

The housing element requirement will simply not reach enough of the local communities in the region. Most even slightly urbanized communities in the region have already completed their comprehensive plan. Ten years

ago the requirements of the housing element would have been extremely valuable and productive. However, today relatively few communities in the region are making application for comprehensive planning assistance.

If the housing element is to have a real impact, local communities should be required to update their comprehensive plans and include a housing element when they apply for all federal funds. After sufficient notification, applications for funds for sewers, open space, highways, etc. should not be accepted unless accompanied by a current housing element. Future federal funds should not be awarded unless the objectives detailed in the initial housing element have been met or some very real effort has been demonstrated by the community that it has attempted to meet those objectives.

A second problem with the housing element is that applicants can be allowed to make some generalized responses, which would be hard to evaluate at regional, state, and federal levels. The kind of 3-5 year planning activities which the element requires will add enormously to the knowledge of and planning for housing, but it seems rather unlikely that it will result in any additional low income housing or remove the most basic constraints which operate on the production of low and moderate income housing.

A discussion of the plans for specific implementation of the housing element by the Metropolitan Council is found in Part III.

D. Recommendation As to How State Government Can Assist the Planning-Housing Relationship

The State of Minnesota must play a critical role if the housing needs of the region are to be adequately met. The state role is not, however, seen

as an operating one, that is, directly involved in developing housing or related services in the metropolitan region. State action is vitally needed in two major areas: enabling legislation and state financial aid programs. In addition, the state can make an important contribution through rendering technical and planning assistance to metropolitan and local housing programs and in the development of state plans and priorities which are responsive to the low and moderate income housing needs of the metropolitan region.

State enabling legislation and financial assistance is recommended in several major areas as follows: (1) assignment of certain housing and development functions to the Metropolitan Council; (2) changes in land use controls; (3) development of a state housing financing agency; (4) equalizing landlord-tenant relations; (5) improving the social services to accompany housing; and (6) suggested directions for fiscal reforms.

Each of these recommendations is detailed at length in Part III.

E. Recommendation of Changes or Additions to Federal Housing and Urban Development Legislation to Expedite the Comprehensive Planning-Housing Relationship

Recommendations are made for changes in HUD legislation or guidelines in six general areas. These changes would increase the coordination of regional housing activities with other comprehensive planning and developmental activities, and would serve to more adequately marshal and direct resources to meet the low and moderate income housing needs of the region.

1. Coordination of housing functions with regional comprehensive planning. At present there are fifteen HRA's in the Metropolitan Area; these HRA's operate independently of each other and regional scale comprehensive planning and development. Likewise, the Federal Housing Administration, the Farm Home Administration, and Veterans Administration, operate in the region independent of regional plans and goals. Therefore, the following changes are recommended:
 - a. Require and appropriately fund federal, state, regional and local jurisdictions for the coordination of the HRA's in the region with regional comprehensive plans and programs.
 - b. Require and appropriately fund for the federal, state, regional and local coordination of other federally funded housing programs, including those of the Federal Housing Administration, the Farm Home Administration, and Veterans Administration Loan programs with regional comprehensive plans and programs. In particular, the FHA moderate income subsidized housing programs should be required to be coordinated with national, state, and regional objectives.
2. Strengthening HUD review of local 701 grant applications. HUD review of local comprehensive plans appears to place considerable emphasis on the form and completeness of 701 plans to the neglect of content and the social and economic implications inherent in the plans. In addition, the relationship between the regional review and the federal review of comprehensive plans should be strengthened. It is recommended to improve the comprehensive planning process that

HUD should develop procedures to:

- a. Insure that use of planning funds will not be inconsistent with federal, state, and regional social, economic, and physical development policy.
 - b. Insure that federal funds do not have consequences in other program areas inconsistent federal, state, or regional intent.
 - c. Increase consideration of regional evaluations in the federal review of local comprehensive plans.
3. Federal requirements for local and county comprehensive plans should be expanded to include all governmental functions, health, education, welfare, recreation, and other social services in addition to housing and traditional physical planning elements.
 4. HUD should require that local and county comprehensive plans must be reviewed and updated by local communities and counties at least every 5 years to be eligible for continued federal funding.
 5. Separate and sufficient funding to state and regional comprehensive planning agencies to develop and maintain adequate and innovative A-95 or equivalent comprehensive review programs.
 6. The establishment of an adequately funded and staffed federal domestic policy agency that will recommend to the executive and legislative branches of the federal government necessary allocations, priorities and planning requirements for domestic federal budgetary investment.

PART II

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

A. Goals Specified in the Contracts

This section will consist of the specific element and page references where this contract requirement is covered elsewhere.

1. Common Goals for All Three Localities

- a. Covered in Part II-B, A and B; pps. 12-18
- b. Covered in Part III; pps. 70-91
- c. Covered in Part II-B, D; pps. 32-39
- d. Covered in Part II-B, G and H; pps. 58-69

2. Special Goals for Individual Jurisdictions; Minneapolis-St. Paul

- 1) Covered in Part II-B, F; pps. 48-58
- 2) Covered in Part II-B, C and G; pps. 18-32, 58-65
- 3) Covered in Part II-B, H and Part III; pps. 65-91

B. Work Program Elements

A & B. Metropolitan Housing Goals and Documentation of Their Development

The starting point of the housing study was to develop a set of housing goals and policies which functioned to focus the study work on critical regional issues and to provide an operational framework for the study.

To begin the goal-making process, a conceptual framework was established to illustrate the dimensions and inter-relationships of the various elements of the housing study. The framework consisted of the following four dimensions: 1) fields, including social, economic, governmental and physical; 2) factors, including house, neighborhood, support services and shaping elements; 3) level, including the individual local community, region, state; 4) time including short and long range. This framework served as a useful tool for identifying, locating, and illustrating, in a general way, the major issues and relationships with which the study would deal.

In addition to the initial conceptual work, five other inputs were involved in the goal-making process. Housing goals set at other government levels -- national, state, and local -- were reviewed to determine the types and range of goals to which the region must relate. Secondly, the existing planning and professional literature was reviewed to determine what housing goals and policies were being discussed by professionals and academicians. Consultant and Metropolitan Council staff evaluations were made to determine the regional significance of various goal statements.

The most important contribution to the goals work was that of the Metropolitan Council's Low Income Technical Advisory Committee which was

appointed by the Council to participate in the housing study. The Committee itself represented people of extremely diverse and varied backgrounds; all 27 members had extensive experience and interest in the problems of housing in the region. They came from both the public and private sectors. The interests and experiences represented on the Committee included: a center city alderwoman; the deputy director of FHA; a union official; the founder and chairman of a local tenants' rights organization; an expert on the aged; a mortgage and financial specialist; a city planner with experience in working with Pilot City and Model City Programs; the executive directors of the center cities HRA's; assistant director of a suburban HRA; a rural social work supervisor; the chairman of a minority group housing committee; the vice-president of a large local home building firm selected as participant in Operation Breakthrough; the chairman and vice-chairman of the Citizen's League Housing Study; a lawyer for the legal aid society experienced with the legal problems of tenants; the head of local development corporation; a community organizer; a suburban mayor and realtor; an architect-planner for a resident controlled urban renewal area; the director of a housing information and placement service center for minorities; and a college professor active in human rights.

The goals work with the Committee began with a general session for orientation and discussion. A second meeting reviewed regional housing needs and problems. The Committee was then divided into three subcommittees of market-economic, government, and services-environment which corresponded quite closely to the major interests of the Committee members. The subcommittees began their discussions by reviewing the goals and policies in

the existing Metropolitan Development Guide and then indicating the kind of goal and policy statements they felt were needed to make a more complete set of metropolitan housing goals and policies. There developed separately from the various subcommittees substantial agreement as to goal and policy statements.

The development of a set of goal statements served a number of useful functions. The process gave the Committee and staff a common framework for approaching study problems and recommendations, highlighted data and research needs, housing problems, and helped to redefine and add to previous metropolitan housing goals. The statements developed by the Committee are being refined and incorporated into the housing component of the Metropolitan Development Guide in the appropriate Guide format. The following goals and policies were developed by the advisory committee:

Goal

Supply of shelter of good quality, adequate to the total need, suitable to the needs of, and available to, people of all ages, income levels, racial and ethnic groups, located throughout the metropolitan area in suitable living environments at costs within the resources of households at every income level.

Subgoals and Policies

Variety and choice of both tenure (home ownership, rental cooperative, condominium) and housing type (single family detached, duplex, townhouse, apartment, dormitory) for all persons at all income levels throughout the metropolitan area.

Replacement or rehabilitation of all substandard housing units, maintenance and improvement of existing adequate housing units.

Locate public and other subsidized housing throughout the metropolitan area in suitable living environments.

Housing convenient to places of employment and commerce, community services and facilities, recreational, cultural, and educational facilities.

Planned development in the Metropolitan Area with diversified groupings of populations, activities, housing types and densities around major centers, which are designed for efficiency, function and aesthetic appeal.

Plan timing, development, and location of shaping elements and strengthen control over shaping elements to increase opportunities for low income persons.

Locate most high-density housing near major activity centers while allowing other high-density housing to locate near natural amenities such as lakes, parks, and rivers.

Efficiency and coordination in the provision of services throughout the Metropolitan Area.

A minimum acceptable level of essential services for all parts of the Metropolitan Area provided at the time of residential development.

An improved service delivery system for the poor with participant involvement in deciding the content of and maintaining control over the services.

Housing expenditures not exceeding more than a reasonable percentage of income for persons and families at all income levels.

Housing costs in private market should bear direct relationship to space and/or quality, amenities or services provided.

Income at a level for all persons which will enable them to compete effectively in the housing market and reside in decent, safe, and sanitary residences.

Greater research in housing technology and freedom to use tested innovative design and technology.

Efficiency, consistency, and coordination among all units and agencies of government involved in the provision of housing.

Democratic representation and participation in all government agencies concerned with the planning and provision of housing and housing related services throughout the Metropolitan Area.

Development of equitable legal relationships between the consumers and suppliers of housing and services.

Utilize land use controls to promote low and moderate income housing.

Promote the design of federal programs and subsidies that allow low and moderate income persons to better participate in the private market.

Use of federal, state, and local legislation, funds, and sanctions to the fullest extent possible in the achievement of metropolitan low and moderate income housing goals.

Equal responsibility for low income populations with all units of government throughout the Metropolitan Area bearing their share of the costs.

Restructure collection and distribution of government revenues at all levels to aid in achievement of metropolitan and national low and moderate income housing goals.

Building on the goals work of the Committee, an attempt was made in the study to isolate the major dimensions of the housing problem in such a way that measurable objectives could be related to each of these elements and progress toward meeting the objectives measured if adequate data was available. Fourteen housing problem elements were detailed as follows:

1. Lack of adequate housing quality, including equipment and services.
2. Lack of adequate indoor space.
3. Lack of adequate furnishings.
4. Lack of adequate outdoor space, private and public.
5. Inadequate neighborhood environment.
6. Accessibility to work and community services.
7. Excessive housing expense relative to income.
8. Excessive housing expense relative to quality and space of dwelling unit.
9. Choice of tenure.

10. Racial discrimination in ownership, rental, and home-financing markets.
11. Security of occupancy.
12. Way in which housing services are delivered.
13. Housing-related problems due to illness and poor health.
14. Variety of choice within and among neighborhoods.

This work provides a comprehensive framework for looking at the kinds of housing problems faced by individuals and families in the region, although the specification of measurable objectives with respect to each element of need can be extremely difficult for some of the dimensions. This problem-oriented approach is being used as the framework for housing component of the Metropolitan Development Guide.

The problem areas were explored in terms of constraints that prevented the solution of these problems. The constraints were ordered in terms of the impact they have on impeding the development of acceptable housing and residential environments as perceived in the initial goal and policy statements. These constraints are discussed in the next section of this report.

C. Obstacles and Constraints on Low and Moderate Income Housing In the Metropolitan Area

The constraints and obstacles to providing suitable, affordable, well-serviced housing in a good environment for low and moderate income persons are vast.

No attempt is made to review here the total range of existing problems,

rather the priority constraints in the Metropolitan Area are presented. The issues which are of concern in the analysis are of three types: constraints which are judged to be of major area-wide significance; constraints which the Metropolitan Council might be able to modify or remove; and constraints which are unique to the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Constraints have been identified not simply as a research end, but more importantly in order to indicate where action is needed. The total range of constraints is varied, as is the Council's ability to affect them, therefore emphasis is placed on detailing those toward which action programs should be addressed.

The five general categories of constraints and the individual constraints within each category are ordered to reflect priorities based on their relative impact and importance in the Metropolitan Area.

Financial Constraints

The most basic problem is quite clearly the gap between the cost of housing and the incomes of persons in the region; there are a great many individuals and families who cannot afford even a modest dwelling unit. It is estimated that 34 per cent, or over 190,000 families in the region could not afford the price of the very least expensive new housing if they had to enter the housing market today. Likewise, 20 per cent of the families could not afford to purchase or rent the least expensive used housing.

Many families are, as a result, forced to live in substandard or overcrowded housing or are forced to pay excessively high proportions of their incomes for housing. Some 50,000 housing units are substandard in the region, 35,000 are overcrowded, and the lowest income families in the region are paying an average of over 45 per cent of their total incomes for housing.

Many variables contribute to the high cost of housing in the region. Certainly the greatest cost to the housing consumer is the cost of interest. Interest rates have increased from approximately 4 per cent to approximately 9 per cent in the last 17 years and as a result monthly payments have tripled while the price of the average house has doubled. A \$25,000 home financed for 30 years at 8% interest will cost the homeowner over \$66,000 by the time the house is paid for.

The cost of construction financing has gone from approximately 5 per cent of the sales price of a house to 10 per cent with subsequent increases in the cost of the housing to the consumer.

The current national anti-inflation policies and restrictive money practices have had a negative impact on the regional housing market. Housing starts have decreased significantly in the metropolitan area in the last six months. The vacancy rate in the region is very low; the area currently has a vacancy rate of about 1 per cent. The heavy demand for decent housing has pushed the cost of housing sharply upward. In addition, with limited mortgage credit available, builders fortunate enough to obtain funds have tended to build primarily for upper income markets. Mortgage money has been particularly limited in Minnesota where the usuary law limits interest rates to 8 per cent, consequently, the mortgage money available for conventional lending is frequently insufficient as other forms of investment produce higher returns. Conventional mortgages, when available, are strict; they have been for 20-25 years with a 30 per cent down payment required. The large required down payment immediately blocks most middle income persons from purchasing

housing even if they would be able to meet the montly payments.

In addition to interest rates , other housing cost components are also rising rapidly in the region. FHA data indicates that this area has one of the highest costs per square foot in the nation for new single family home construction and the construction costs have been rising rapidly at between 8-10 per cent a year. The average cost of a new FHA home was \$9,780 in 1951. This figure had risen to \$21,545 by 1967, and today is over \$24,000. There are almost no new homes on the market today for under \$22,000, and only limited used homes in acceptable neighborhoods for less than \$15,000.

The increasing costs of land, labor, and materials are all adding to increased housing expense in the Metropolitan Area, as elsewhere in the nation. Land and improvements to land particularly have added to housing costs. Whereas land in 1951 comprise 11 per cent of the total sales cost of a house built by a local firm, today land represents a full 21 per cent of the sales price.

Property taxes add an additional financial burden to the cost of housing. In Minnesota some unique aspects of the property tax law make the tax a particularly heavy burden for the renter, who is generally of considerably lower income than the homeowner. In essence, the homestead exemption provides preferential assessments to homeowners who occupy their own property. The homestead exemption can reduce the total property tax by almost half.

Property taxes have been increasing rapidly in the region. Property taxes have in recent years increased 15% annually in the region.

The regressive effects of the property tax on the lower income persons have been documented in a number of national and local reports. Special assessments, which account for over 21 per cent of all local revenue are particularly regressive, made as they are without regard to the income of the occupant or the value of the housing.

The variation in property tax rates and the lack of uniformity of assessment practices add to inequality of the property tax. Finally, the property tax tends to defer the improvement of housing in that the improvements increase the value of the house, thereby, increasing the tax and the housing costs for the consumer.

Public-Private Operations

The planning, programming and development of housing and related services has been splintered among many public bodies without any structure for uniting these activities at the metropolitan level, as a result, the housing needs of low and moderate income persons in the region have been inadequately met. The responsibility for housing has never been the clear assignment of any one public agency nor has any agency been given the responsibility to provide public housing when the local municipality fails to do so. As a result, only one public housing project of 132 units has been built outside the center cities.

In addition, the State of Minnesota has taken virtually no role in housing. The basic legislation pertaining directly to low income housing was passed in 1947; this act extended to local communities the power to establish Housing and Redevelopment Authorities to operate within the municipal boundaries. To date, 15 HRA's have been formed in the Metropolitan Area.

However, only about a third of them are active, and those which are active are mainly planning for elderly housing. The system of municipal HRA's has badly met regional low income housing needs. The State of Minnesota has provided no state aid for low and moderate income housing programs. The State must become involved through enabling legislation and provision of state aid for housing programs.

The lack of adequate federal funds for housing and urban renewal programs is a most severe constraint on meeting regional housing needs. Both center city HRA's have plans to augment the number of public housing units they have been able to build and lease to date, but federal fund availability is curtailing these plans, as well as urban renewal activities. Similar funding shortages for the FHA moderate income housing programs also exist. For example, the funds allotted for the 235 program were exhausted in a matter of months.

The lack of a cost index in federal programs to compensate for inflation, rising labor, construction and land costs has severely limited the activities of many of the existing public and moderate income housing programs. Unrealistic cost limitations also limit the distribution of subsidized housing in the region. Housing must be built, purchased or rented in the older areas of the city where housing costs are the lowest. Much of the building under the 235 program which has been developed outside the center cities has been in less attractive areas of the region when land costs are lower and services frequently minimal.

The inexperience of citizens, non-profit organizations, and public officials in dealing with the complex and difficult problems of housing is an

important constraint on the development of low and moderate income housing in the Area. There is a great deal of interest in housing for low and moderate income persons in the Metropolitan Area on the part of various civic groups, human relations commissions, political clubs, and churches. However, this great potential for involvement is not being utilized because of lack of technical knowledge; most of these persons' backgrounds are far removed from the real estate and construction industries. Likewise, public officials frequently find it difficult to establish programs to meet low and moderate housing needs because of their limited expertise with the complex problems of developing housing and dealing with federal programs. Few of the HRA's in the region have professional staff, with the exception of the center cities. The fact that only a handful of the housing authorities in the Area are active to any degree is testimony to the technical and political problems involved in developing subsidized housing.

It is apparent that a pressing need exists for an agency to stimulate and assist local communities, public officials, and citizens groups by making housing problems known and providing educational, planning, and technical assistance in the region.

Existing regional housing and income data is inadequate and outdated. Little data is collected in the 10 years between Federal censuses. The data collected by central city HRA agencies, Community Renewal Programs, and Model Cities is limited in scope and tells little about metropolitan scale housing problems. Outside the central cities little is known since 1960. Housing data must be kept current for the metropolitan area, and this information

should be readily available to concerned agencies, firms, and the general public. This activity will be incorporated into the Council's 1970 work program, which calls for a market analysis based on 1970 census data which will be updated annually thereafter.

The housing construction industry consists largely of small, local firms who build in small volume and who cannot take advantage of mass production cost savings. There are several hundred contractors in the Metropolitan Area, but only some half-dozen large home building firms. A significant problem of the housing industry is that the large firms cannot compete with the small, local contractors who have a head start on land use controls in their communities. In addition, the small firms frequently cannot get sufficient capital to expand to the point where they can take advantage of mass production economies. The difficulties of land assembly for the private developer, likewise, reduces the ability to maximize production and efficiency in the development of housing.

Governmental-Legal Constraints

Zoning ordinances are clearly not designed to encourage provision of housing for low and moderate income persons. Both nationally and locally, the evidence indicates that zoning practices and subdivision regulations add substantially to housing costs and serve to restrict the supply of low income housing. Zoning and subdivision regulations are in the control of municipalities for the most part, and the municipality exercises land use controls generally as it pleases. A Council survey indicated that 107 of the 196 municipalities in the Metropolitan Area have zoning ordinances.

Zoning ordinances determine the location and character of neighborhoods and other development in the Area, in addition to influencing the quality and character of housing. Large lot zoning is prevalent in the region in many of the newer and more desirable suburbs. Zoning ordinances requiring large minimum square footage for homes and apartments exist in many areas and present a serious constraint on the development of even moderate cost housing. Other zoning practices, such as requiring landscaping, double garages, make positive contributions to the total environment, but also increase housing costs for the consumer. Likewise, subdivision regulations can function to add both essential services and expensive amenities to the subdivision, the costs of which are, naturally, passed on to the consumer.

Because of the difficulties and time required to change existing zoning ordinances to accommodate low and moderate income housing, coupled with the natural tendency of any developer to seek out the most profitable jobs, most developers continue to build more expensive, more profitable dwellings. The delays and litigation involved in trying to change the existing zoning reduces the profit on less expensive housing to the point where it lacks financial feasibility for the private developer.

Zoning ordinances were originally intended to ensure that certain development standards would be maintained, to designate appropriate land uses, and to protect housing and land values. However, zoning ordinances can also become a legal means of enforcing the social attitudes of the community. Zoning boards frequently are composed of laymen who do not understand urban

planning or the possible social consequences involved in their decisions or, on the other hand, the members may know precisely what they are doing and use their zoning powers to exclude development and people they view as undesirable.

Current zoning practices are to a large degree a reaction to the property tax system. Since local public revenues must, to a large degree, support municipal governmental services, communities are in competition for the highest tax yielding properties such as homes with high assessed values. Fiscal disparities do exist between communities in the region and it is not surprising, given the revenue system, that public officials seek housing they think will "pay its own way." Zoning ordinances provide them with the means for doing so.

Building codes, intended to guarantee the physical health and safety of residents by specifying proper building materials and techniques have a negative impact on housing production and costs as a result of their non-uniform, frequently outmoded and inadequate nature. The codes in the region are tremendously diverse and non-uniform. A survey found 77 communities in the Metropolitan Area with building codes. Although most communities have adopted one of the national model codes, all have added on their own local requirements until there are, in effect, 77 unique and different codes. The codes are, in addition, generally outdated and they have consistently failed to keep pace with new technology. Building codes and labor practices restrict the building industry to on-site construction and limit technological advances in modular factory constructed housing and other mass production techniques.

The qualifications for building code inspectors vary widely in the Area, as do inspection and enforcement procedures.

Housing codes deal with housing facilities, level of maintenance, and occupancy in order to ensure minimum standards of fitness for human occupancy in old and new structures. Few Metropolitan Area communities have formal housing codes. A survey found 19 communities have housing codes. In addition, only a handful of these communities enforce their housing codes in any systematic fashion. The center cities are badly understaffed with housing inspectors. Housing codes, like building codes, have little uniformity throughout the area.

The legal enforcement of housing codes through criminal sanctions has generally proven to be ineffectual as a tool for improving deteriorated housing for a number of reasons. The judicial process is extremely slow and penalties are generally fines which are cheaper to pay than the cost of repair to the building. Housing code enforcement can be processed only by a public agency, and not the persons most vitally concerned, the tenants. On the other hand, strict housing code enforcement can work great hardships on low income persons, requiring expensive repairs and perhaps eviction from the housing unit.

The law of landlord-tenant relations is inadequate to provide the kind of protection needed by low income tenants. All aspects of that relationship generally favor the landlord; the tenant has few legal rights, and most lower income tenants are unaware of the limited avenues of relief available to them.

Environmental Constraints

Housing must be situated in a suitable environment, the quality of which is to a large degree determined by physical and social services available to the residents of the area. Physical support services, including road and sidewalk maintenance trash collection, sewers, and transportation, and fire and police protection and social services, including a range of health, education, welfare, vocational training, legal assistance and recreation and community programs may be required.

A major environmental constraint is the lack of funds available to provide needed physical and social services. These services are expensive to provide and the sources of revenue are frequently not adequate to meet the needs. Many social services, in particular, have never enjoyed high priority in the nation or locally.

The uncoordinated manner in which social and physical services are delivered presents a great constraint on improving the environment for low income persons. For while the money to support services is indeed slim, the waste and inefficiency resulting from the uncoordinated fashion in which services are delivered intensifies the problem.

A third constraint involves the "reactive" nature of service delivery. Physical and social services are frequently not preplanned, but are provided only when the need for them reaches crisis proportions. Not only are services uncoordinated one to the other, but also they are frequently unrelated to housing. Since service delivery is reactive rather than preplanned to accompany housing, and resources for services are scarce, services are frequently rendered in an uneven fashion as needs are perceived and responded

to differently.

Attitudinal Constraints

The Twin Cities Metropolitan Area despite its northern location and progressive reputation, has highly segregated living patterns as a result of housing discrimination. Minorities, particularly blacks and Indians are concentrated in a few core city neighborhoods, and as a group live in some of the worst housing in the region. It seems clear that a significant, constraint operating to prevent minority persons from being more adequately housed and from having more choice in residential location, in addition to their generally lower incomes, is the pattern of housing discrimination which exists in the area.

Political and community resistance to low and moderate income housing is marked in area suburbs. This resistance is evidenced through land use controls of building and zoning controls, opposition to low income housing proposals which have been submitted to the state legislature, and opposition to provision of subsidized housing in suburban communities. Clearly, the political climate in the region has had a negative impact on adequately meeting low income housing needs in the region.

Mobile homes and other manufactured housing are about the only moderately priced new dwellings available in the Area. Mobile homes are taxed under a lower tax classification and the parks are frequently unattractive, as a result, community resistance to mobile homes is high, and only a limited number of communities in the area are currently allowing mobile home parks to be developed; the parks which are being developed are generally quite removed and lack adequate services. Whereas, nationally mobile homes accounted for

over a third of all single housing starts in 1969 in the Metropolitan Area mobile home starts were only 2 per cent of the total new housing.

The preference for low density, single family homes in the Metropolitan Area is marked, and must be considered in planning and development. The preference for low density development has several constraining effects. High rise public housing for families is thought highly undesirable and is not being built with a consequent reduction in the new public housing for families. Other publically subsidized housing developments have been slowed or dropped entirely because of reluctance to build high density dwellings for families. Single family homes are viewed as the first priority of communities and apartments are developed on generally less land. Finally, this resistance to higher density housing has meant that alternative forms of housing such as cooperatives and conominiums are almost nonexistent in the area.

Summary

The Metropolitan Council is able to effect the various constraints in different ways. Initially, through short term action the Council could provide regional coordination, technical assistance, information, and assist in gathering badly-needed data. Additionally, the Council can strengthen its existing tools of review and referral and the Metropolitan Development Guide to modifying some of the constraints detailed.

In the longer term, the Council would need to undertake programs which, in order to attack some of the most basic problems of low and moderate income housing, would require state legislation and a source of program funds. The Council must play an active role in supporting or initiating

legislative proposals which would remove some of the most fundamental constraints on low income housing, the cost and availability of financing, fiscal reform, zoning and codes, the problems of service delivery. It is clear that in many cases, a strong metropolitan and state role is going to be required if solutions are to be found to the constraints operating on low and moderate income housing.

D. Development of Techniques for Coordinating the Housing Activities of Private Builders and Developers with Metropolitan Housing Goals and Comprehensive Planning and Urban Development on the Metropolitan Level

The private development of housing has been inadequately coordinated with public development and comprehensive planning on the regional level. It is clear that a number of factors have contributed to this. The housing industry is extremely diffuse; the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area has hundreds of small contractors most operating within limited portions of the Metropolitan Area, with limited knowledge of total metropolitan housing needs and demand, and with incomplete awareness of public development plans and activities or other private housing development in the region. These small developers and builders in the region are often underfinanced, with resulting erratic housing production. In addition to the developers and builders, many land speculators and financiers are also operating in the market.

Private residential development in the region has traditionally been based on several considerations: land speculation, the cost and availability of land; local or sub-regional market demand; the availability and cost of financing;

and in response to public improvements that provide access to previously non-urbanized areas.

As a consequence, residential development has proceeded unevenly geographically, often leapfrogging erratically -- creating residential scattering and extending demands for public services beyond reasonable economic limits. This is particularly true of developers who are seeking cheap and readily available land on which to build moderate and middle income housing. The results of this lack of coordination of residential development with public service development is: a) pressure for services to follow residential development; b) the lack of predevelopment planning for services means that service costs are high and incomplete; c) those who can least afford additional costs for services in new communities are forced either to bear heavy burden for such services or do without them.

Of particular concern is the non-profit and limited profit developer of moderate income housing. The FHA moderate income housing assistance programs are inadequately coordinated with other housing and public and private services in the region. Many churches, civic groups are independently pursuing plans to build housing in the region. It is particularly important that housing developed under these programs be in suitable environments with proper schools, employment, transportation, recreational facilities, etc. This requires that the housing be coordinated with other regional planning and development activities.

It is apparent, in addition, that if the private developer of low and moderate income housing is to contribute significantly toward meeting the

housing goals of the region, greater assistance, both financial and technical will be required. Non-profit development of housing has been slow in the region, due in large part to insufficient federal funding, but also to lack of technical skills and inadequate coordination with other essential segments of the housing industry. These groups need help in organizing, developing plans, obtaining financing, aggregating land, meeting federal requirements, and obtaining public agency approval.

Some mechanisms do exist currently for coordinating the activities of private builders with regional planning and development. The activities of private developers and builders of housing are indirectly coordinated with other regional developmental activities through the Metropolitan Council's planning activities and operational authority over the growth-shaping systems in the region. The development of highways, open space, sewers, has been the focus of regional level planning activities. Since privately developed housing, as noted, responds at least in part to public services careful planning of the location and timing of major public investments can have a major impact on development.

Review of local community comprehensive plans at the metropolitan level is a second means of coordinating the activities of private development with metropolitan planning and development. Residential development is directed at least in a general way by the communities' comprehensive plans which the Council in turn reviews. Both the review process and the control of growth shaping systems are tools which can be utilized at the regional level currently

for affecting public-private coordination. These tools may, however, need to be focused more sharply toward housing related objectives than they are currently.

In addition to strengthening the existing review and referral program of the Council and expanding the planning and implementation of major systems development to shape the private development of housing, there are other activities which the Council can undertake to further the relationship between public and private housing development in the region and to encourage greater private development of housing for low and moderate income persons.

The regional coordination and technical assistance program can make a contribution in this regard. The Council would render technical assistance to private developers of housing, particularly non-profit or limited profit developers in locating and constructing low and moderate income housing within areas of the region where such housing is needed and where it will be coordinated with other aspects of regional development to the maximum extent possible.

An important tool for achieving public-private regional coordination would be working with the financial institutions to coordinate their investment activities with over-all regional development. The financial institutions obviously have a great impact on the direction and type of private residential development. Financial institutions providing mortgage money should be systematically appraised of where major residential development can most appropriately take place within each decade. Such development should take into account planned capacities of transportation systems, sewers, water,

open space, education, commercial and industrial development and the capacity of social and cultural systems to provide services to various parts of the region. Similarly, developers and builders should be made aware of the Metropolitan Council's development policies and plans in order that the private sector may more effectively anticipate areas of residential growth and plan accordingly. Likewise, greater efforts must be made to coordinate the programs of the FHA with regional scale developmental activities. FHA programs clearly have a tremendous impact on the residential development activities in the region.

A regional housing information program would contribute to the objective of increased public and private coordination. Increasing the availability of housing data and facilitating its exchange between public and private interests would be the major objective of such a program. As detailed in Part III, this would include a regular system of housing data collection and analysis. It might also involve an annual conference for the private developers and financial institutions in the region to acquaint them with regional housing needs and to review regional development policies and problems of particular interest to them. These conferences could provide a valuable link between many elements of the housing industry and related service systems which currently have only limited contacts with each other and with regional development. This program would hopefully serve as an educational device which could stimulate new development of housing which more adequately meets regional needs while improving the coordination of that housing with regional development.

The Major Centers and Housing Program detailed in Part III would, likewise, address itself to precisely these concerns, working as it does toward coordinating the private development of a major center with housing and related public services.

The special planning studies undertaken by the Metropolitan Council can contribute to stimulating and coordinating the private development of housing with public development. For example, the Metropolitan Council is about to undertake a special study which examines a number of the issues and problems that surround the development of mobile home parks in the region. The study will aim toward developing Metropolitan Council policies for dealing with manufactured housing and for encouraging mobile home development which is coordinated with other metropolitan development. A second and important phase of this work may involve the identification of sites for potential mobile home development and working with private developers and local communities in an attempt to implement these plans.

In the long term, with state legislative authorization, there are a number of things which could be done to stimulate the development of new privately developed housing that is coordinated with regional development.

Long term recommendations are made in four major areas: 1) metropolitan developmental functions; 2) land use regulations; 3) state housing financing agency; 4) coordination of FHA activities and programs with regional planning.

The staff has recommended that certain developmental functions be assigned to the Metropolitan Council. It is clear that these functions -- the

authority to acquire, assemble, and develop land for sale or lease to private developers would greatly increase the direct coordination of public planning and development with private residential development and stimulate the production of housing in good environments.

The authority at the metropolitan level to waive local land use controls for both public and private development is, likewise, recommended. The Land Use Appeals Board would be a valuable tool for encouraging the private development of housing and related services that is coordinated with regional planning and objectives.

The recommended establishment of a mandatory uniform state building code would assist private developers in meeting metropolitan housing goals by making possible an increase in the quantity of housing with, hopefully, reduced cost to the consumer.

The state housing finance agency that is recommended could through its financing programs significantly increase the involvement of private enterprise in meeting the housing needs of the region. If the funding of the state agency was channeled through appropriate regional agencies, it would increase the coordination of the private development with regional comprehensive planning.

Finally, it is recommended to the federal government that the coordination of the programs of FHA, particularly the moderate income housing programs, with comprehensive regional planning would significantly increase public and private development that is consistent with over-all metropolitan planning and development.

E. The Relationship of Model Cities Program and Community Renewal Program to Comprehensive Planning and Urban Development on the Metropolitan Level

The purpose here is to define metropolitan roles and relationships in connection with local Community Renewal Programs (CRP) and Model City Programs. The programs were reviewed to determine what the past relationships of these programs has been to metropolitan development and planning, and what the role of a metropolitan agency might be in the future. The purpose of such a review is to indicate past relationships so as to guide the future. The paper examines each of the programs in both center cities in the light of the goals, planning process and programs developed, and indicates the relationship of these local activities to metropolitan level planning and development. In addition, the Model Cities programs are examined in detail in the areas of housing and employment.

Examining Model Cities, CRP's, and Council activities together may initially appear to combine dissimilar programs and functions. However, the programs have common purposes and functions in several respects.

Regardless of the different geographic size of their planning areas, all the programs are inter-related because of the common regional environment they share. Model Cities and CRP must, therefore, undertake their planning cognizant of their role in the metropolitan area as well as the social and regional implications and consequences of their programs. Likewise, metropolitan planning activities must be undertaken with constant awareness of the work being done by the various planning bodies in the region. Local

programs developed by the Model Cities and CRP's cannot be meaningfully instituted without area-wide coordination of transportation, pollution control, sewers, open spaces, health, housing, etc.

All three programs attempt to combine planning and programming activities under one umbrella. CRP's combine the program activities of urban renewal agencies with the planning function of planning commissions. The Model City Program has the same objective, combining both planning and programming into one comprehensive framework. Likewise, the Metropolitan Council represents one of the first attempts to combine planning and programming on an area-wide level.

In addition, the three programs are all concerned with the social and economic as well as the physical aspects of planning and programming. All three programs developed goals. Finally, the different programs were created in response to a basically similar problem -- an increasingly complex urban environment with a multiplicity of problems and programs and overlapping jurisdictions, and the need to attempt to order that complexity on a meaningful level.

Community Renewal Programs

The basic purpose of the CRP is to identify and measure in broad terms the total need for urban renewal action in the community, to relate this need to resources available to the community, and to develop a long-range program for urban renewal action. CRP is a master plan for total renewal, both federal and non-federal in concept and initiation. It was the original intent for CRP to serve as a bridge between the comprehensive community and individual renewal projects.

In the original CRP legislation, it was clear that CRP planning was to take into consideration metropolitan development, and specifically in regard to housing, they were to coordinate with other communities within the urbanized area. CRP's were also to utilize all possible means to seek the assistance of existing metropolitan planning agencies. The CRP it was hoped would be an educational device to inform its residents about the city's relationship to the total metropolitan area.

St. Paul received a federal CRP grant in April, 1965, and the final report by the City Planning Commission was available in November, 1969. The two primary objectives established for the St. Paul CRP were to develop a comprehensive long-range development program, and to formulate a continuing process for apportioning resources to accomplish the plan.

The St. Paul CRP included a somewhat limited consideration of the total metropolitan area in its planning activities as evidenced by its reports. As the St. Paul CRP work did not include specific program recommendations, no judgement could be made on the relationship of the programming to metropolitan development. The St. Paul CRP goals reflected and discuss metropolitan considerations to a greater degree than either the planning or programming aspects of that work.

The Minneapolis CRP program began in the fall of 1961. A final report was published in April, 1967. The City Planning Commission worked in three areas; development of goals for the city, action programs to achieve those goals, and a time table and financial program to carry out those actions.

The planning reports of the Minneapolis CRP did occasionally include data or analysis which indicated metropolitan scale considerations. However,

metropolitan considerations were not included consistently or with great frequency. Like the CRP planning work for St. Paul, metropolitan data, when included, was used primarily for contrast with municipal conditions, but limited analysis was included in the reports on the metropolitan implications of the local problems and programs. The programming section of the Minneapolis CRP established the "Balanced Program" which consisted of redevelopment, rehabilitation, and code enforcement programs, and established priorities for their implementation based largely on the availability of federal funds. Limited as the CRP's are to implementation within the municipality, the programs suggested are likewise municipal in scope.

The eight goals developed by Minneapolis CRP are mostly municipal in scale and focus. Goals and policies generally do not mention metropolitan considerations, although the transportation policies include some metropolitan focus.

In summarizing both CRP's, it is in the physical planning areas of transportation and highways where the issues and goals are most clearly seen as involving considerations which are metropolitan in scope.

Model Cities Program

The Model Cities Program is premised on the need to coordinate federal, state, metropolitan, local, public and private efforts and pool them together to solve the physical and social problems of blighted areas of the city. Urban planners are beginning to note the futility of intensive planning for a section of the city when it is not related to over-all metropolitan development. Even through the federal legislation establishing Model Cities required designation of a specific neighborhood, it was also seen that the program must keep a

broader geographic focus; such planning, it was recognized, could not be effective if undertaken in isolation from the rest of the metropolitan area. Model Cities must develop programs which relate the area's residents to the total metropolitan region. The weakness of the Model Cities legislation is, of course, that it provides no mechanisms for implementing programs across municipal boundary lines.

The St. Paul Model Cities program is in the last part of the planning stage after having resolved several time consuming disputes. The St. Paul Mid-Planning Statement suggests little which relates the Model City area to the larger metropolitan region, although the staff in dealing with the Metropolitan Council staff has indicated an awareness of these problems.

The Minneapolis Model Cities program was instituted early in 1968; the planning phase is completed, federal action funds have been awarded to the program, and contracts are in the process of being awarded.

The strength of the Minneapolis Model City planning effort is that it considered data which relates conditions in the Model City area to larger metropolitan conditions. The data is, however, used mostly to contrast and illustrate the diversity of conditions in the region and little discussion is included of the way that the larger regional social, economic, and political forces operate to affect conditions within the Model area itself.

The Minneapolis Model City goals are generally focused on the Model City area, but a few of the goals do relate to metropolitan or municipal development. These include a transportation goals and two social goals, the

need for residential mobility in regard to housing and increasing communication among Model City residents and the broader community.

The Model Cities programs by and large address themselves to a lesser degree with metropolitan or municipal development than did the planning activities.

The housing and employment programs developed by the Minneapolis Model Cities were reviewed in detail. The major housing programs are: the establishment of a Model Cities Housing Bureau; the use of funds to supplement the used housing and scattered site family public housing programs of the Housing Authority; and participation in the Neighborhood Development Program.

Of the several proposed Housing Bureau programs, a referral service and relocation grant program appear to have the most potential for increasing housing opportunities outside the Model area. The greatest amount of money, however, will go for grants to developers of moderate income housing that is located only within the Model City area. This will not increase housing opportunities outside the area.

A second housing program involves participation in the Neighborhood Development Program. Supplemental grants for housing replacement for persons forced to relocate are a part of that program; however, there is no indication that the object of this program would be to increase residential mobility and upgrading by enabling persons to move out of the area. Rather the ten grants will no doubt go toward helping to replace homes for the neediest families, who might well continue to have housing choices limited

to the Model City area even with the additional relocation payment.

Another housing program calls for supplementing the used housing and scattered site family public housing programs of the Housing Authority. Again, these funds would only be used for units to be acquired within the Model Area and would not increase housing opportunities outside the Model City boundaries for Model City residents.

The Minneapolis program has allotted funds for the following programs that deal at least in part with employment: a work experience program, a health care program for the elderly that would include training and employment of health care workers, and a drug abuse program including vocational rehabilitation and job replacement services for hard core unemployed persons with drug abuse problems.

The employment programs are not focused directly on making available or utilizing employment outside the Model City area and, in fact, most offer employment only within the area. However, the long-range effects of the program might well result in employment being sought in the wider regional market because of the increased job skills and mobility attained through the training and employment programs.

In short, the danger of the Model City programs the way they appear to be operating in this region is that they may have the long term effect of actually reducing opportunities for mobility in housing and employment for the Model City residents by concentrating those opportunities heavily within the Model City area. The focus of the planning and program activities of the Model City program has clearly been on the geographic area rather than the target population.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The main conclusions reached is that better coordination is needed between the planning and programming activities at the metropolitan level and the municipal and submunicipal levels. Local programs and planning activities need a larger metropolitan focus, programs developed must work toward increasing mobility and opportunities for residents throughout the metropolitan area.

A number of reasons have contributed to this. Federal law calls for cooperation between the programs without providing the necessary mechanisms for implementation; a municipality or Model Cities program without the authority to implement plans outside its boundary is limited in what it can realistically hope to do through its planning activities.

The political context in which the programs operate often creates a situation where certain types of planning or programming work will not be undertaken. For example, resident participants in local Model Cities Programs have expressed considerable opposition to investing funds outside the Model City area.

In addition, each of the programs, including the Metropolitan Council, have focused on specific roles without being sufficiently concerned about relationships with other agencies.

The fact that the Metropolitan Council is new and has undergone a period of rapid change and that the metropolitan role in planning and programming was still evolving while much of the work was done has meant a limited metropolitan involvement in CRP and Model Cities. The CRP's staff did participate in the development of metropolitan plans through the old Joint Program of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

In order to further the needed coordination, the Council should provide more comprehensive review of Model City and CRP programs and plans in order to insure greater consideration of and consistency with metropolitan development.

The Council is developing a liaison function with the on-going Model Cities programs. This should include as much substantive planning involvement as possible between them. One proposal is to set up a planning body composed of St. Paul and Minneapolis City Planning personnel, the Model Cities staff and resident leaders, Metropolitan Council planning staff, and State Planning Agency staff. They would meet regularly to consider and establish common planning, programming and developmental strategies and to work toward the solution of regional scale social, economic and physical development problems within the Model Cities and CRP areas. This group might want to focus on planning activities which have the most direct regional significance such as housing and employment.

At a minimum, there should be greater resource allocation for coordinative liaison on the part of all the agencies involved. Liaison activities should be three-fold; planning, programming, and policy making at the regional and local levels. Additionally, there should be greater involvement between and among municipal agencies. Just as the Council has had limited involvement in the Model Cities and CRP development, so too have the programs in Minneapolis and St. Paul had limited involvement with each other. The St. Paul Model City might well profit from close coordination with the

Minneapolis Model City. A joint program of both Model Cities might well make a significant impact on poverty in the Twin Cities Area. The Twin Cities Area is unique in having two Model City programs and would have an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the possibilities of joint programming. The problems of achieving such joint efforts have been difficult from a planning point of view and almost insurmountable from a political point of view. Since Model Cities planning is tied to municipal agencies, the problem becomes one of the municipal boundary line once again. The proposed joint planning team might be an effective means of overcoming, or at least modifying, some of these constraints. Thus, more could be done in the metropolitan area now through efforts toward greater planning involvement, sharing of information, joint participation of planning staffs, joint development of programs, etc.

In short, inter-agency involvement, resources to support such involvement, and mechanisms to implement programs are essential to effectively promoting greater consideration of metropolitan development and programming in CRP and Model Cities planning and programming.

F. Housing Aspirations and Neighborhood Values of Various Socio-Economic Groups

Planning must be people-oriented; planning is too frequently concerned with people only in the sense that they occupy building and vehicles and function within the housing, land uses, and other community arrangements provided by the planner. Planning for people must begin by finding out how different groups of people live, what their aspirations are, and what problems

exist that need to be solved. The planner must take people's wishes into consideration when formulating plans.

Therefore, low and moderate income groups in the region were identified and their housing and housing-related problems reviewed. Secondly, and the major area of emphasis, was an examination of the housing and neighborhood values and aspiration of various socio-economic groups in the region. Finally, the identification of housing values and aspirations was related to the development of housing goals and the implications for public policy reviewed.

Low and moderate income populations were defined conceptually as persons who cannot participate fully in the private housing market. It is felt that this definition is a more proper means of identification than a straight economic definition based on an exact dollar figure. A broader definition of low income must take into consideration social and psychological factors, income, age, size of family, changing housing costs, and other living requirements. For the development of policies and programs, it is necessary to turn from identifying the poor strictly along economic lines and to examine the people in terms of special problem groups.

Large Families

Large poor families in the area are faced with very severe housing problems. In 1960 there were over 100,000 families in the region with five or more members.

Family income for these large families is frequently insufficient to purchase or rent housing in good condition that is adequate in size to accommodate the entire family without overcrowding. Forty-four per cent of the families with six or more members earned less than \$7,000 annually.

Existing housing units in good condition that are adequate for a large family have an extremely low vacancy rate. In addition, many landlords refuse to take any children at all, let alone a large family, and many also decline to accept families receiving welfare. These factors combine to make it almost impossible for large families of low and moderate income to find suitable housing in a good neighborhood in the region. In addition, for many years very little family public housing was built in the Metropolitan Area, although the leased and use housing programs are operating successfully now to the extent that federal funding allows.

Elderly

Elderly persons constitute a large percentage of the total metropolitan population and in the last 10 years the number of elderly appears to have been increasing rapidly in the center cities. A survey conducted in 1969 found 27% of the population of Minneapolis and St. Paul was over 62 years of age. The elderly of the region are largely concentrated in lower cost, inner-city housing which is frequently in substandard condition. Even though the majority of the public housing units built in the area are for the elderly, there is pressing need for additional elderly units in the region as evidenced by large waiting lists and the current poor housing of the elderly. The fixed incomes of the elderly make their housing situation particularly desperate when housing costs are increasing so rapidly.

It is estimated that over half of the elderly heads of families have incomes of less than \$5,000 yearly, as compared to a total metropolitan population of which 25% have a similar income. Those who are elderly and inadequately housed may be persons who have been of low income all their lives,

individuals whose moderate incomes provide them with severely limited savings, assets, and social security payments for retirement, and those who may be financially able to afford better housing, but prefer to remain in their substandard housing for a variety of reasons. Elderly persons can be forced to remain in poor housing because of their need for nearby transportation, commercial and social services, the desire to remain among friends and family, or to remain in a familiar neighborhood.

Blacks

The black population in the Metropolitan Area appears to have been increased substantially in the last ten years. In 1960 the black population numbered 20,700, or 1.4% of the total population; it is currently estimated at between 30-40,000. Blacks are generally concentrated in a few very limited areas of the central cities. The housing conditions of blacks reflect the fact that their incomes are significantly lower than whites, and also demonstrate the effects of racial discrimination. Blacks live in crowded, substandard or deteriorating housing far more frequently than do whites. For example, in 1960 55% of non-white renters were inadequately housed as opposed to 32% of the white renters in the region.

Migration by blacks to Minnesota has generally been a second or third step from the rural south. As a result the Metropolitan Area black population has traditionally been rather urbanized. There is evidence, though, that direct migration from the South has been increasing in recent years.

Indians

While the Indian population of the area is comparatively small, estimated

at between 8,000-to-12,000 persons, their housing problems are extreme because of low and frequently irregular incomes, high residential mobility, discrimination, and lack of urban sophistication.

Indians suffer from housing that is frequently badly overcrowded, and they often are forced to put up with extremely poor living conditions in very limited areas of the center cities. In the Metropolitan Area, almost no Indians live outside Minneapolis and St. Paul. Indian housing problems are compounded as a result of their inexperience with landlords and basic tenants' rights.

Mexican-Americans

The major concentration of the estimated 3,000 Mexican-Americans in the region is on the west side of St. Paul. Detailed data on this group are very limited although it is known that they frequently have low income and live in aging housing. Mexican-Americans come to Minnesota most commonly as migrant workers and settle in the Metropolitan Area in search of permanent work.

College and Trade School Students

College and trade school students generally are of low income and are exploited in terms of housing because of the high rents they must pay for housing which is located near the various campuses and schools. Overcrowding is common among college students in order to reduce the cost of housing. There are an estimated 70,000 students in the area.

Single, Unrelated Individuals

Another group identified as frequently having housing problems are single, unrelated individuals ranging from working young adults to the hippie and the transient. In 1960 there were 94,000 unrelated individuals under the age of 65 in the region. Single, unrelated individuals generally reside in or near the core areas of the center cities.

Rural

A final group with housing problems are the rural populations located at the fringes of the seven county Metropolitan Area. Nearly one-third of all the substandard housing in the region was outside the center cities in 1960; likewise, it is estimated that 33% of the lowest income families currently live outside the center cities.

Housing Values and Neighborhood Aspirations

This section deals specifically with the housing and neighborhood values and aspirations of various socio-economic groups in the region.

This work was based mainly on a 1964 survey commissioned by the Metropolitan Council's predecessor, the Metropolitan Planning Commission. In that survey a cross-section of the region's population (4600 persons from as many households) were surveyed at length. Of the five survey sections, the fourth dealt with housing and neighborhood attitudes, and is of major interest here. The analysis examined the responses by the social and economic characteristics of occupation, age, income, education, and race.

In general, residents of the Metropolitan Area expressed considerable satisfaction with their existing housing and neighborhood situations. Eighty-eight per cent of all residents are satisfied with their present dwelling unit, and 83 per cent indicated satisfaction with their neighborhood.

Contentment with the home and neighborhood increases with income, occupational status, and age. Blacks are only slightly less satisfied with their housing than whites, but express considerably less satisfaction with their neighborhoods. Indians are the most unhappy with both factors.

Blacks complain most of crime and run-down conditions in their neighborhood. Whites also express concern about crime, but more frequently indicate that incompatibility with neighbors and the closeness of the houses in their neighborhood are their major sources of dissatisfaction.

Generally, the lower the income and occupational status, the more complaints are centered around problems of housing upkeep, repair, and heating. The higher the income, the more likely the complaints are to be with social or status concerns.

Most respondents indicated that they considered no other neighborhoods before selecting their present housing, and also that their present neighborhood was mainly selected because that was where a suitable dwelling was found and the neighborhood was familiar.

Half of the respondents felt the particular housing unit and the neighborhood were equally important in deciding where to live; most of the remainder felt that the neighborhood was most important. It is clear that the neighborhood environment is considered extremely important in the selection of housing. Thus, in viewing the past experience the survey concluded that area residents are generally less satisfied with their neighborhood environment and more content

with the housing unit itself. Upper socio-economic groups are likely to have housing and neighborhood complaints associated with status, while lower income and minority groups are mainly concerned with poor physical conditions of housing, such as deteriorating neighborhoods and crime. The neighborhood and environment of the housing unit itself is viewed as critical.

The survey also asked extensive questions about preferences and aspirations in regard to housing and neighborhood.

Nearly 85 per cent of Area residents indicated they would like to live in a single family dwelling, although only 70 per cent did at the time of the survey. Duplexes and small apartment buildings are the preference of another 11 per cent. The preference for lower density living seems quite clear in the region. Preference for the single family home was found to be most directly related to income. Likewise, the old and the young have less desire to live in a single family home. In the prime child-rearing years, 95 per cent of the people prefer a single family home.

Respondents were asked, in addition, if they thought they might prefer a different type of housing unit in 10 to 15 years; nearly 30 per cent thought they would. The young felt they would be more likely to prefer a single family home in the future. On the other hand, the elderly indicated substantial interest in changing to multi-family housing in future years.

When asked about open space, the response was overwhelmingly for the private yard; 90% wanted to live in a housing unit with a private yard. The preference for yard space, shape and size varies with socio-economic characteristics. In general the preference for a large yard increases with income. Many residents like large yards; 44% would like a yard of 1/2 acre

or over. However, the majority prefer a smaller lot with 54% indicating they would prefer a lot of 1/4 acre or less.

A number of questions were asked about preferences in regard to neighborhood social relationships. Most residents would like to live near people who are generally casual acquaintances. The lower persons are on the socio-economic scale, the more they prefer close friendships with their neighbors.

Sixty-eight per cent of the respondents indicated they would like to live in an area where all residents are of the same race, with 23 per cent indicating preference for a neighborhood of mixed races. The young and the better educated would like living in an integrated neighborhood. Among blacks in the region, 85 per cent would prefer integrated living. Most residents do prefer a mixture of nationalities in their neighborhood, and they also indicate preference for a neighborhood where there is a mixture of ages.

Over half of those surveyed indicated a preference for living in an area where most people were of about the same income level. As income increases, this preference becomes stronger. Only 1 per cent would like to live in a neighborhood where most of the persons are of lower incomes than themselves. Eighty-six per cent would like to live among neighbors with a variety of religious backgrounds.

By way of summary, neighborhood social diversity is most strongly supported in regard to religion and nationality. A variety of ages is felt less desirable though still supported by the majority of people. Where race and income are concerned, sentiment is considerably more in favor of social homogeneity.

In general, the attitudinal factors concerning housing and neighborhood values and aspirations in the Metropolitan Area are quite similar to what is known about housing attitudes in other parts of the nation. Residents of this area, as well as nationally, do not want high rise, high density development, or large public open space in place of private yards. The value placed on the single family home and the private yard is high.

However, it is then necessary to ask what such attitudes mean for planning and the development of public policy. The answer is that the planner cannot formulate plans based strictly on such a survey of housing and neighborhood values and aspirations; however, neither can he ignore the desires and experiences of the persons for whom he is planning simply because he does not agree with them. An examination of preferences and values suggests much, both in terms of opportunities and constraints for future regional development. It is clear, in regard to housing preferences, that most people want what they simply may not realistically be able to have. The single family home with its own large private yard is increasing financially infeasible for more and more families. The 4 million people anticipated in the region by the year 2000 will not all be able to live on large private lots; the land and public services required for that does not appear to be physically or economically feasible. Rather the planner must, knowing the preferences, work to create an environment and housing with maximum acceptability.

In addition, the planner must recognize that people have, in general, a limited range of experiences which results in narrower preferences. The planner must, therefore, educate and offer alternatives. The planner has a

responsibility to enlarge the choices and alternatives of housing types, neighborhoods environments and social relationship as well as provide the kind of environments which are desired by much of the population. For while it is valid to allow people to choose to live as they do now, the planner need not necessarily encourage them to do so, and he definitely must not support what he believes to be dangerous or socially detrimental to larger social good just because public opinion favors it. In order to properly plan for, and educate the population, the planner must himself be familiar with the social traits, activities, and desire of a diverse population. He must give attention to the kind of housing most people want in addition to offering them expanded choices.

Public policy may not always be made in complete accord with the diversity of wishes within a region, but, at a minimum it must be made by leaders knowledgeable of and sensitive to the problems and aspirations of the many different groups in the area.

G. The Relationship of Major Metropolitan Growth Shaping Systems to Low and Moderate Income Housing in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area

The major metropolitan systems which are the primary determinants of urban growth are major highways and mass transit, major diversified centers and industrial parks, open space, and major utilities. These four growth systems, or shaping elements, are the basic physical elements of the Metropolitan Council's plan for regional development.

In essence, the Council proposes a regional plan in which development is ordered around a series of major centers and industrial parks among which are included the present downtowns. These centers would contain a wide variety of community services and facilities, in addition to retail and commercial outlets. Centers and industrial parks would be major areas of employment. They would be linked by major highways and a mass transit system. Open space areas and recreational facilities would be highly accessible to these major centers. Sewers would be used to shape development consistent with regional planning objectives, to encourage higher density residential development and to promote orderly, efficient growth. High density residential development serving a mixture of incomes would be encouraged to locate around major centers and natural amenities. Lower income housing, in particular, should be readily accessible to the mass transit system and other public services.

The major growth systems of highways and mass transit, major commercial centers, industrial parks, open space and major utilities have had a substantial impact on the urbanization process and residential development in the Metropolitan Area. The impact has not, however, always been positive. In some cases where such development has not been effectively coordinated with regional goals, the effect has been undesirable and has not resulted in either orderly urban growth or in desirable living environments. Without proper regional developmental planning and control, the major growth systems have not benefited the low and moderate income groups in achieving adequate housing in good environments to the extent that they have benefited other income groups.

A number of problems with the housing-growth systems relationship were detailed in the course of the study. A key problem noted was the lack of accessibility for many low and moderate income persons to many of the major concentrations of jobs, major services and facilities in the Metropolitan Area. This limited mobility, coupled with the restricted locations of low and moderate income housing, has reduced the range of choice and opportunity in relation to employment, shopping, education and recreation. Major new highways built in the area have not increased mobility for the 10% of the families in the region who do not own automobiles. These 60,000 families and persons without cars would be, by and large, of limited incomes.

The present transit system, moreover, restricts residential and employment choices for those who are forced to rely on the bus system exclusively. Many places of shopping, employment, and recreation located in the suburbs are virtually inaccessible for the inner city poor. Within the center cities, those without cars frequently find access to amenities and services difficult and costly. Low income persons living in many rural or less development portions of the Metropolitan Area have even more severe access problems as frequently there is no public transit available to them.

Major centers and industrial parks have followed the general trend of locating in the suburbs while low and moderate income housing has remained most heavily concentrated in the center cities. Likewise, many of the large attractive parks and lakes are located outside of the central cities in the suburbs. These parks are almost exclusively accessible only by private auto. Attractive parks, lakes and playgrounds in the center cities or suburbs usually result in considerably increased land values adjacent to or near these

amenities with the result that low and moderate income persons generally are restricted from locating near these areas.

Another problem is, then, the effect of these major systems on increasing land values and restricting residential opportunities for low and moderate income persons. Land opened up for prime development by broad based public investment in sewers, highways, open space, etc. becomes tightly controlled by the local community. Required lot and house sizes increase, high density is not permitted or tightly controlled, greater demand for public services results in tax increases and, in sum, low and moderate income housing does not get built. On the other hand, if vast expanses of new land were opened suddenly for urban development, assuming a relatively small population pressure, land prices might remain stable or decrease, but at the expense of accessibility and uneconomical and inefficient dispersion of the metropolitan population. It is the past experience that when badly needed residential services or amenities are lacking, some limited housing opportunities for lower income persons open up at the price of inadequate residential environments. This is seen in the pattern of leapfrog development in the region.

Four major conditions were detailed as having contributed to this situation in the past. First, there has frequently been poor coordination in the planning and programming of the major growth systems due to public and private fragmentation. Centers, industrial parks, and the bus system are developed by private enterprise. Highways, open space, and sewers have historically been developed by numerous governmental levels and units.

Plans and programs have in the past been rather loosely coordinated in the Metropolitan Area. The creation of the Metropolitan Council was in large degree a response to precisely these kinds of coordinative problems.

Secondly, the problem is, of course, more serious than simply the lack of coordinative mechanisms. The inability to implement developmental activities in conjunction with a comprehensive regional plan has been a constraint on the effective use of growth systems to guide orderly urban development. Major centers, for example, are developed through private activities and can only be indirectly implemented at best.

Thirdly, growth systems have frequently been reactive rather than operating as shapers of urban and residential growth. In the past, the policy has usually been to provide the growth systems as a result of a demand generated after substantial residential development has taken place in an area. The major growth systems have not been used to shape development in an orderly manner throughout the Metropolitan Area.

Lastly, and a key issue, is that the major physical systems have frequently been developed without sufficient regard to the impact of that development on housing, particularly low and moderate income housing. Housing has been allowed to develop haphazardly, "filling in" the land opened up by the major systems.

The Metropolitan Council is increasingly coming into the position of being able to control the development of at least some of these systems. The Council has some direct programming and operational powers as well as the more indirect authority to review and refer local plans and programs.

Both types of control are being utilized to increase comprehensive regional development, and will hopefully correct some of the errors of the past and result in better coordination of these major systems with low and moderate income housing.

For each of the major systems the Council's Development Guide details regional goals and policies. The Development Guide and its policies function as the official guide for all decisions that are made at the regional level for the development of these major systems, not only when control is vested in the Council or its subordinated boards, but also for guiding the review of plans and programs developed by other jurisdictions and agencies.

The extent of Council control over each of these major systems varies considerably. The Council is best able to effect the development and operation of the sewer and open space systems. In 1969, the state legislature created the Metropolitan Sewer Board and the Park Reserve Board as subordinate boards of the Metropolitan Council. These boards are charged with carrying out the Council's plan for sewers and open space. The boards are the operational arms while the Council retains the comprehensive planning function. The Council must prepare the sewer and open space plans as part of the Development Guide and approve the budgets and programs of the boards. The Metropolitan Council clearly has substantial authority over the planning, construction and financing of the sanitary sewer system and the location, development and operation of some of the parks and open spaces in the Metropolitan Area, and as such can influence general directions of growth and residential development in the region.

Likewise, the Metropolitan Council has considerable authority over transportation planning in the Metropolitan Area. A Metropolitan Transportation Committee operates under the Metropolitan Council. The main functions are the establishment of work programs for a metropolitan transportation system plan and program to coordinate the policies of other participating agencies. The authority to plan for and implement a mass transit system is split between the Mass Transit Commission and the Metropolitan Council. Basically, the MTC has the authority to levy a metropolitan wheelage tax, and certain other regulatory and operating powers over both existing and proposed transit systems. The Metropolitan Council has a negative control in that the Transit Commission's plan, budget, and acquisition of existing transit companies are all subject to approval by the Council.

The Metropolitan Council is in a key position to coordinate the planning, layout and construction of highways in the Metropolitan Area. In the area of mass transit, the Council has even more authority to influence the layout and construction of the proposed mass transit routes.

Lastly, an important shaper of growth in the Metropolitan Area is the location of major centers and industrial parks. At the present time, the Metropolitan Council has little direct control over the location and development of the major diversified centers. Rather, this control is indirect through the ability to influence the location and timing of construction of sanitary sewers, highways and mass transit, and open space. Also indirectly, the Council has the authority to review local comprehensive plans and review

applications for federal funds by local governments and special districts which can effect the location of the major employment and retail centers in the region.

These current major systems controls have the potential for making a significant impact on overall regional development. Clearly the general direction of regional development can be greatly influenced by the allocation and timing of public investment in these major growth-shaping systems. The location of these systems can also influence the rate of growth in a general area, the density, cost of land and services, and accessibility.

In general, it can be seen, the Council is increasing in a stronger position to coordinate the major growth systems with a regional plan. In the areas of open space, transportation, and particularly sewers, the Council's powers and consequently its potential is the greatest. Two key elements are not, however, within Council jurisdiction. These are centers and low and moderate income housing. Lacking these, the Council's position is weakened for being able to effectively increase housing and other opportunities for low and moderate income persons and coordinating regional development with a comprehensive plan.

H. Improved Techniques for Matching Major Metropolitan Growth Systems with Housing Goals

The Metropolitan Council can achieve better coordination of the major growth systems with low and moderate income housing goals in two general ways. First, the Council can utilize its existing powers to the maximum to

insure that the growth systems are coordinated with overall regional development and are working toward regional low income housing goals. Secondly, the Council can work toward acquiring new powers from the state legislature which would allow the Council to increase its direct involvement in regional developmental activities.

The key tools which the Metropolitan Council has currently for coordinating comprehensive regional planning with housing are the Metropolitan Development Guide and the review and referral process.

The policies which are included in the Metropolitan Development Guide are significant in that they guide many public and private decisions made in the region. Policies and program statements which tie housing and the other major growth systems together in a scheme for comprehensive development must run throughout the Guide. Thus, it is important that the Development Guide contain not only a strong set of policies and programs in the housing section, but also it must include policies and programs in the other major systems sections which relate them to the problems of low income housing. Some specific policies which relate the major growth systems to housing were developed in the study. As each of the Guide sections are written and re-written, it will be important to work for inclusion of policies in all sections which are sensitive to the consequences for low and moderate income housing. Inclusions of such policies will represent an important step toward insuring better coordination of comprehensive regional-scale planning with residential development.

A second way in which the Metropolitan Council could use its existing powers and better coordinate major metropolitan systems with low income housing goals would be through the strengthening of the Council's review process. Such

a program would focus official attention on the high priority that needs to be placed on the development of low and moderate income housing in conjunction with other major growth systems. The review program would stimulate public agencies to provide for such housing; it would coordinate housing with other regional scale developmental activities and it would promote consistency with the Metropolitan Development Guide.

The review program proposed is described in detail in Part III.

The Metropolitan Council could utilize its existing authority and, in conjunction with its housing review program, initiate a program which would work toward coordinating the development of low income housing with the development of other major growth systems in accordance with the metropolitan plan. Under this program, the Metropolitan Council would develop a plan for major center and the services to accompany it and would be charged with working closely with communities, private developers, and public boards and agencies in their planning and development of major growth system in an attempt to coordinate these plans with the development of low and moderate income housing. In particular, it would be an attempt to encourage development of new major centers as called for in the metropolitan plan. Council policies, as noted, call for the development of these new centers with transit systems that would linke the center to adjacent or near by low, middle, and upper income housing, junior colleges, high schools, health facilities, and open space. The Council would coordinate the activities of highway departments, the transit commission, state college board, local school districts, local government, and private developers, nonprofit or

limited developers of housing. It would, in essence, be an attempt to illustrate how by working cooperatively and using the full backing of the Metropolitan Council and its boards, development might be brought about which works toward achieving the major comprehensive plan and housing goals of the region.

The addition of certain new powers could be extremely effective in enabling the Metropolitan Council to better coordinate the major growth systems with housing goals.

As noted, the Metropolitan Council currently lacks land use control over the development of major centers and industrial parks and low and moderate income housing.

The addition of public developmental powers, along the lines of New York's Urban Development Corporation, operating under the Metropolitan Council would be the most comprehensive and far-reaching approach. This would allow industry, housing and other public facilities to be planned and developed comprehensively. It would make possible public or private development, or a partnership of public and private development. This capability exercised in conjunction with the Council's current authorities would provide major opportunity for maximizing the coordination of major public and private development with housing.

A companion measure to enable this kind of development would be the authority vested in the Metropolitan Council to waive local zoning codes for public or private development that meets the criteria of working toward regional objectives.

These, then, are in general terms, the techniques which could be used for improving the coordination of the major growth-shaping systems with housing. Some the Council could implement with current authority if funding were available; others would require legislative action. Implementation of some new techniques are clearly called for if low and moderate income housing is to be better coordinated with total regional development and if comprehensive planning is to be, in fact, implemented.

PART III

THE HOUSING ELEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

The previous sections in this report have addressed the housing goals, problems, needs and constraints in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The real question is, of course, what can be done to modify or remove these constraints and how can the housing needs of the region be more adequately met. Part III focuses on the development of a housing plan for the region and the implementation required to achieve regional housing goals. Parts I and II, it should be noted, referred briefly to some of the ideas and recommendations which are presented in detail in this section. The final report outline made this duplication necessary. Part III, however, contains the full set of detailed recommendations for implementation of the housing study.

I. Housing Component of the Metropolitan Council's Development Guide:
The Twin Cities Metropolitan Area Housing Plan

The Metropolitan Council will implement its housing element through the development of the housing component of the Metropolitan Development Guide which is, in effect, the housing portion of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area comprehensive plan.

By way of background, the Development Guide of the Metropolitan Council is the official plan for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Region. The state legislative act which created the Metropolitan Council in 1967 stipulated that the Council would prepare a guide for the physical, social, and economic development of the metropolitan area. The Metropolitan Development Guide is the basis for Council decisions and actions; it is used to evaluate all plans and programs for review and referral purposes, as well as guiding

public and private developmental activities in the region. The Metropolitan Development Guide indicates what the major problems are in the region and states what the Council feels should be done about these problems.

The Metropolitan Development Guide is in a loose-leaf format designed to make the Guide responsive to the results of technical studies and decisions throughout the area. Additions can be made easily; new chapters added as they are prepared and adopted; updates of problems and programs can be made to the various components. By the end of 1970, the Council will have prepared sections of the Guide on Metropolitan Zoo, Sanitary Sewers, Solid Waste, Parks and Open Space, Metropolitan Finance, Centers, Transportation, Health, Housing, Criminal Justice, and Airport Development.

The results of the study "Housing in the Comprehensive Plan," will be the basis for the Metropolitan Development Guide's housing component. It is through Metropolitan Council action on the housing component of the Guide that the goals, policies, problems and program recommendations from this study will become official Metropolitan Council policy and, thus, part of the Twin Cities Metropolitan plan.

Briefly, the housing component of the Metropolitan Development Guide will consist of three major parts.

The first part sets out Council policy on housing. It contains regional housing goals, an analysis of major regional housing problems, and official Council policies on actions to solve these problems. Policies, it should be noted, are not limited to actions that the Council alone is empowered to make, but are directed at the decisions of a wide variety of public and private

decision makers in the region. Part I will suggest solutions to such problems as inadequate housing quality; excessive housing expense relative to income; accessibility to work locations and community services; housing choice within and among neighborhoods; limited choice of tenure; racial discrimination in housing and home financing markets; and inadequate neighborhood environment. This section is being drawn from the work on goals and policies, constraints, values and aspirations, and the major growth systems detailed earlier in the report.

Part II is the 30-year system plan for housing the metropolitan area's population. It provides a description of the existing housing stock and housing-related services in the metropolitan area and a projection of new and replacement housing and services needed in the metropolitan area in accord with the policies in Part I. The data compiled by the housing study will be the basis for this section. The systems plan will, in addition, indicate where housing opportunities should be made available for low and moderate income persons in the region. New housing opportunities should be in three major areas in the region: 1) expansion of the adequate housing stock in the center cities for low and moderate income persons through programs of rebuilding and rehabilitation; 2) increased opportunities for low and moderate income persons in the suburbs. The higher density housing for lower income persons should generally be located near major centers and mass transit and around major amenities in the region. Lower density development for lower income persons should be located in suburban areas which are well served with essential services and facilities and which are convenient and accessible to jobs and other more

specialized services which may be required by low or moderate income persons;

3) new centers and new town development. Low and moderate income persons should have the opportunity to locate outside the major urbanized areas of the region in the major new towns and centers which will develop in the next decade.

The system plan as well as the policies and problem section will be thoroughly reviewed every five years, and they will be amended as information from future studies becomes available.

Part III is a development program, a timetable for the implementation of the housing system plan. It outlines annual housing objectives and short term actions to meet the objectives, such as the annual number of housing units required, the magnitude of housing replacement programs, community services for critical target areas, and study programs. The Council will formulate and adopt the development program annually. Programs described in the following short term recommendations will be recommended to the Metropolitan Council for inclusion in this section of the Metropolitan Development Guide.

As required under the Metropolitan Council's enabling legislation, a public hearing will be held on the Development Guide before it is adopted by the Council.

The Council's housing program for 1971 State Legislative session will follow from the housing component of the Development Guide.

II. Recommended Programs

To implement the Metropolitan Council's housing component, a number of programs are recommended. These programs and recommendations are of two types: 1) short term programs that the Metropolitan Council could implement within its current authority; and 2) long term programs or those programs which would require state legislative changes. Programs of each of these two types will be detailed in turn.

Short Term Recommendations

Six major short range Metropolitan Council programs are recommended to help meet current and future regional housing needs within a comprehensive developmental framework and improve the quality of residential environments. These programs include: 1) regional coordination and technical assistance to stimulate and coordinate development of housing within the region; 2) major centers and housing program; 3) strengthening of the Metropolitan Council's review function to encourage the development of low and moderate income housing; 4) on-going legislative program to work toward achievement of long range goals; 5) increasing the flow and availability of housing information in the region; and 6) development of a regional housing program designed to accelerate planning for housing and related services and the implementation of housing plans in the region. The implementation of the recommendations will, of course, be contingent upon adequate financial and staff resources to support the programs.

A. Regional Coordination and Technical Assistance Program

The functions of this program will be:

1. To develop regional coordination housing programs aimed at solving low and moderate income housing problems in the region. At present, the HRA's in the region, Urban Coalitions, Model Cities, League of Municipalities, the Metropolitan Council, human relations groups and others are all developing housing programs which need to be coordinated and appropriately channeled within the political process.
2. To provide technical assistance to groups, communities and private developers wishing to provide housing for low and moderate income people. Such assistance would include: aid to non-profit sponsors and commercial developers in site selection; developing funding; preparation of grant applications; assistance in establishing contacts with public officials, financial institutions, entrepreneurs; and in negotiations for public assistance.
3. To provide a means for regular exchange of technical information between public and private interests that are actively involved in developing housing within the region. To act as a clearinghouse of information on regional developmental activities and to facilitate communication between and among public and private developmental interests in the region. These interests include all levels of government within the region; major elements of the housing industry -- labor, finance, land developers, contractors; professional, trade, financial and labor associations; civic groups with direct interests in housing; Urban Coalition, Urban League, and Model Cities.

There is a vast array of technical information currently available in the region which, if coordinated, could stimulate the development of effective and coordinated programming and increase housing production among the diverse interests concerned with the provision of low and moderate income housing.

B. Major Centers and Housing

The metropolitan plan is premised in its physical aspects on the idea of organizing metropolitan growth through the control and integration of major centers of activity, major open space, major transportation and major utilities. Many social objectives also can be achieved such as increased housing opportunities for low and middle income persons and improved coordination of that housing with the major development systems. As the result of legislation passed in the last session, the Metropolitan Council now has direct or indirect control over sewers, metropolitan open space, and transit.

Much can be done through the establishment of major centers and the linking of these centers with other key development, high density housing for a mixture of income levels, high schools, junior colleges, hospital facilities and other major activity centers. Metropolitan Council policies call for the development of these new town or diversified centers with transit systems that would link the center to adjacent or nearby housing, junior colleges, high schools, and other activity centers. The Transit Commission has endorsed this idea and developers of two current major centers are very much interested in pursuing such an approach.

Provision of mass transit to the center and adjacent housing could provide the opportunity for low and moderate income persons who are

dependent on transit, to live elsewhere than in the center city where the present transit system operates exclusively. This major center development could open up job opportunities in the suburban areas which are currently inaccessible to many center city residents. This ability to integrate the center with its environs offers the greatest opportunity for the Metropolitan Council, operating within its current authority, to increase housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons while insuring that the housing is in suitable, well-serviced environments.

To implement this program, the Council would prepare a plan for the major center development and coordinate the activities of state and county highway departments with the state college board, local school districts, local governments, HRA's, private developers, and non-profit sponsors of housing. The development scheme would be for the environs of the center itself as well as for the major systems which would serve the center. A development scheme could be incorporated into local plans under a planned unit development ordinance, official map procedures, and other means. The Metropolitan Council would prepare and submit coordinated federal applications which would pull together the diverse governmental units involved.

Such a program would in effect give the Metropolitan Council an opportunity to exercise real leadership in shaping the development of the region by using its current direct and indirect authority within the region. It would allow the Metropolitan Council to shape regional growth, at least in part, much as a development corporation might.

C. Metropolitan Housing Review Program

The functions of this program are three-fold: (1) to focus official attention on the high priority that needs to be placed on the development of low and moderate income housing; (2) to stimulate public agencies to provide for such housing; and (3) to coordinate residential development with other regional scale developmental activities and promote consistency with the Metropolitan Development Guide.

This program will refine the Metropolitan Council's review system to increase its concern for low and moderate income housing problems in the region. Communities shall be requested to include in their plans and with all applications for federal and state funds a statement of their housing problems and goals and indicate local policies for remedying these problems. Communities will be asked to demonstrate their progress toward meeting the regional housing goals. Communities might, for example, be asked to demonstrate how the jobs which are available in the area relate to the housing that is present in the community.

In order to initiate this program, Metropolitan Council staff will be required to:

a. Meet with high level representatives of all state and federal agencies providing aid for local communities to establish the criteria and procedures for operating the program.

b. Establish conferences with local planning consultants, public agency community planners, and public officials to delineate Council policy on low and moderate income housing.

c. Establish staff criteria for evaluating proposals.

D. Legislative Program

It is recommended that the Metropolitan Council carry on a legislative program devoted to developing and coordinating support for housing proposals to be submitted to the 1971 State Legislative session. This program will include the following functions:

1. Work with a Metropolitan Council Housing Policy Advisory Committee if such a committee is appointed to recommend legislative actions to the Council.

2. Coordination of the many groups and public agencies interested in supporting or developing housing proposals for the state legislature.

3. Review of the various alternative legislative proposals anticipated in areas of housing and fiscal reforms for Metropolitan Council support or opposition.

4. Work with state legislative committees in presenting testimony and evidence in support of housing legislation.

E. Housing Information Program

The purpose of this program will be to improve the quality of data available for decision-making in the area of housing and increase the exchange and flow of such information to the general public, private developers, and other persons with specialized involvement in regional housing and development activities. Its functions will include:

1. Providing information to individuals, groups, communities, HRA's, and private developers in the region concerning regional and local housing problems and related developmental activities. Although there is considerable interest on the part of citizens, civic groups, and public officials and private developers in housing problems, the information available to the region is an insufficient base for them to take effective local action to solve their problems.

2. Developing an annual program of housing data updating for the region. When 1970 census is available the Metropolitan Council will undertake a regional housing analysis, and annually thereafter conduct an annual sample survey to update basic housing data on supply and demand factors, with special attention to low and moderate income housing.

3. Facilitating information exchange. The Council will establish and coordinate conference, committees, or task forces to stimulate the development of housing within the region, to work for implementation of a regional housing program, and to improve communication and information exchange between persons involved in public and private housing and related developmental activities.

The form and participants in the meetings would be dictated by their functions and objectives. For example, a Metropolitan Housing and Redevelopment Coordinating Conference could meet at regular intervals. The regional HRA executives and Metropolitan Council would meet to coordinate local HRA plans and programs with regional public housing plans and programs, coordinate regional strategies for using existing public resources to house low and moderate income families, and coordinate regional strategies for legislative action programs. A committee of builders could be convened to review their

mutual problems, discuss their plans and to review with them current and future thrusts of metropolitan development.

F. Metropolitan Continuing Housing Planning Program

The purpose of this program is four-foled: (1) to provide regional guidelines that will stimulate low and moderate income residential development; (2) to develop coordinated regional scale developmental plans; (3) to devise new means for providing low and moderate income housing in the region; and 4) to add to knowledge about regional housing problems, opportunities, and constraints.

On-Going Housing Planning Programs

1. Interim Land Use Housing Study

The Metropolitan Council is currently undertaking a study to explore the feasibility of using interim housing on other major growth system development sites in the region. The study is focusing on the potential value, socially, physically, and economically, of such interim housing in solving problems of low and moderate income housing in the region. The study will recommend policies and guidelines for interim site use.

Recommended New Planning Programs, Top Priority

1. Housing Programming Assistance. To assist local communities in their planning and programming for low and moderate income housing, the Metropolitan Council will advise each community in the region of the number of housing units for which the community should plan based on the known housing needs of the region. The Metropolitan Council, through the Housing Coordinator, will offer all possible technical assistance to the communities to aid them in realizing their low and moderate income housing goals.

2. Exploration of a series of standards to be achieved over the next few years with respect to residential environmental quality in the region.

3. Updating the location of unskilled and semiskilled jobs in the metropolitan area in relationship to low and moderate income housing.

Recommended New Planning Programs, Lesser Priority

1. Provision of technical assistance to the Regional Housing Coordinator in developing and evaluating program proposals, in evaluating sites and in preparing cost and feasibility estimates for program proposals.

2. Provision of technical assistance to local communities in the development of housing elements for local community plans.

3. Coordination of housing elements of community plans prepared by jurisdictions within the Metropolitan Area.

4. The development of a series of detailed planning case studies -- including an inner city private development (Cedar-Riverside), a new town (Jonathon), an innovative mobile home development (Commeron), a new commercial center (Rosedale), a proposed major development in a rural area (South Washington County), three inner city poverty areas (Pilot City, Minneapolis; Model City, Minneapolis; and Model City, St. Paul) -- to investigate what regional scale coordinative strategies and resources can be used in stimulating low and moderate residential development and adequate residential environments in each case. The findings of these case studies would be used in modifying the Metropolitan Development Guide, in redefining review procedures, in preparing legislative recommendations, and in developing coordinative action programs to stimulate residential development.

Long Term Recommendations

The Metropolitan Council cannot, acting within its current authority, hope to make a major impact on the housing needs of the region. Therefore, the staff recommends that the Metropolitan Council should seek legislative authorization for certain operational housing functions. In addition, other legislative changes need to be made if the region's housing goals are to be met. These programs, to be carried out at other than the regional level, are also recommended for Metropolitan Council support.

A. Metropolitan Housing and Development Functions

In order to improve the coordination of housing programs in the region and to insure a continuous supply of housing in suitable environments, it is recommended that authority should be assigned at the regional level to Metropolitan Council for the following functions and responsibilities:

1. Over-all responsibility for housing in the metropolitan area.
2. Annual review of the budgets, plans, and programs of the Housing and Redevelopment Authorities in the region.
3. Authorization to operate or assist in the development of programs of municipal HRA's in the region seeking regional assistance or participation.
4. Authorization to operate federal housing programs, including the building, leasing or purchasing of housing for low and moderate income persons in communities which are not providing housing for low and moderate income persons. This would include communities which have an HRA that is inactive or has failed to provide sufficient housing after a reasonable period of time.

5. Receive federal and state funds and be authorized to enter into contractual agreement with the appropriate sponsors of housing for low and moderate income persons.

6. Authorization to acquire land by purchase and gift, supported by the powers of eminent domain, and to assemble tracts of land; prepare land for development; prepare a plan for the area; sell, lease or hold land for development in accordance with a comprehensive plan; write down the cost of land and its improvements, when justified through sale or lease to a developer of low and moderate housing; work with private and public developers to develop appropriate residential, industrial, commercial, educational health, recreational, and other necessary facilities. It may be necessary to authorize direct development at the regional level if appropriate private developers cannot be found. Such authority vested at the regional level would allow for development of new town and major new diversified centers. This kind of development has significant potential for helping to solve the housing and environmental needs of the region.

B. Land Use Controls

1. Creation of a Metropolitan Land-Use Appeals Board

The Metropolitan Land-Use Appeals Board would operate as a subordinate board of the Metropolitan Council. It would be empowered to waive local zoning codes for public and private development if that development was shown to be in accordance with metropolitan objectives. Application could be made to the board when a zoning change has been first rejected by the local community. Board members would be appointed by the Metropolitan Council.

2. Establishment of a Uniform State Building and Housing Code

The state should establish a single model housing and building code based on a performance standard where appropriate. The code should be mandatory for all communities in the state, without change. The uniform state code should specifically authorize licensing industrialized housing for use anywhere in the state.

3. Establishment of a State Code-Certification, Testing and Appeals Board

State should establish an agency to test and up-date the state building and housing codes, and review all appeals to the codes. Such an agency would certify and test new products and processes and in general act as a clearinghouse for all aspects of code improvement and updating.

C. State Housing Finance Agency

The State of Minnesota should establish a State Housing Finance Agency to increase the supply of low and moderate income housing by providing mortgage, construction, rehabilitation and other grants and loans for housing developed by non-profit or limited corporations or public agencies. Such an agency would seek to encourage the involvement of private enterprise by increasing the financing available to sponsors of housing which would include low and moderate income persons. Such an agency could receive its funds from state appropriations and through the sale of bonds.

To insure that maximum coordination is achieved on a regional scale between other housing activities and metropolitan comprehensive planning and development, it is suggested that the state funds should be

channeled through regional agencies or awarded in accord with a regional plan where such agencies exist in the state.

State programs would be required to give priority assistance and funding to developers who have affirmative plans to locate, promote, and manage their low and moderate income housing to achieve integrated housing.

Programs which could be operated by the state housing agency include:

1. Low-interest construction loans to non-profit or limited profit developers of low and moderate housing.

The state could make available to the developer of low and moderate income housing interim construction loans at below-market-interest rates. Since construction financing is short-term, such a fund would have rapid turnover and thus, a limited amount of money could finance a large number of projects. No net cost to the state need be incurred; a state could earn enough on its loan sufficient to pay borrowing costs and the cost of administering the program. The reduction in interest could result in reduced rents or higher quality construction for the consumer.

2. Low-interest loans to limited-profit and non-profit developers to enable them to fall within federal cost limitation on low and moderate income housing.

The cost limitations of federal programs are a serious constraint on the development of federally subsidized housing in the metropolitan area due

to the high cost of housing in the area and the desire for low density development. State assistance could remedy this by providing an additional interest-free loan to the developer of up to ten per cent of the total cost of the project to supplement the FHA financing. Repayment of the state loan would be deferred until the federal mortgage loan is paid off or refinanced. Again, a small state loan could bring high returns, financing ten per cent of the project cost would bring forth ten times that amount in private and federal investment.

3. Low-interest loans for rehabilitation of substandard housing.

The state should make available loans and grants for rehabilitation of substandard housing. Loans could be repaid on a long-term basis or when the housing is sold or refinanced. Loans should be administered by the appropriate Housing and Redevelopment Authority and in accordance with the comprehensive plan for the neighborhood. Priority should be given to persons under citation for housing code violations and to persons of low and moderate income.

4. State mortgage insurance.

The state could guarantee the mortgage loans for low and moderate income homeowners.

5. Rent supplement program.

The state could supplement the rents to enable low income families to live in adequate housing throughout the region without paying an excessive amount of their incomes for rent.

D. Landlord-tenant relations

Three recommendations are made for equalizing landlord-tenant relations and for insuring that renter occupied housing is kept in acceptable condition. These are as follows:

1. Require every lease to pledge that the premises are fit to live in when the tenant moves in and that the landlord will keep them in good repair.

The Minnesota law as it now stands provides the tenant with little guarantee that his dwelling will be habitable or that the landlord will have a continuing obligation to maintain or repair the property during the term of the lease, unless there is an express agreement to that effect.

A statute should specifically place upon the landlord the duty of repair during the term of the lease and should require that the housing will at all times comply with the housing code unless the violations have been caused by the tenants willful or irresponsible conduct.

2. Prohibit retaliatory evictions

Minnesota law allows a landlord to begin eviction proceedings without giving any reason to the tenant. Retaliatory eviction, eviction for a tenant's complaint to municipal authorities of violations of any housing, health or building codes, should be expressly forbidden. The tenant should be guaranteed the lawful exercise of his rights without fear of eviction. If notice of eviction is served within 90 days of the date of any attempt by the tenant to secure or enforce his rights, it should be the responsibility of the landlord to prove that the eviction was not retaliatory. In addition, a landlord should not be permitted to raise the rent as a penalty for any lawful act of the tenant.

3. Permit a tenant to institute housing code enforcement procedures through court action and to pay rents to a court-appointed administrator to secure code compliance

The tenant in Minnesota is not allowed to control code enforcement procedures. Although the tenant is the critically interested party, the law provides only for public enforcement of housing code violations. The tenant must be allowed to initiate action directly and the law should insure that the code enforcement procedure will result in either prompt improvement of the building or its condemnation and subsequent removal from the housing inventory.

A tenant should be permitted to file a petition directly with the court. If the court finds the property is in violation, an administrator should be appointed to collect the rents from all the occupants of the building and to make the necessary repairs. If the rents are insufficient to make the required repairs to the building, the administrator would present to the court a plan for the rehabilitation of the building or recommend its condemnation. The administration of the building shall terminate only when: 1) it has been certified by the appropriate municipal agency that the violations found to exist when the action was initiated have been repaired; or 2) the building has been condemned.

E. Housing Services

Housing opportunities are extremely restricted for poor persons and families, but most particularly for non-whites in the region. The following recommendations are made to assist in overcoming these barriers:

1. Establishment of a Metropolitan Housing and Referral Placement Center.

A metropolitan housing center would be dedicated to increasing

mobility for low income and minority families through housing placement activities. Low income families would be made aware of all possible avenues open to them in finding housing and encouraged to look at housing outside the center city. The center would work in close cooperation with civil rights enforcement agencies and the housing authorities.

2. Grants for Social Services to Accompany Housing

Low and moderate income housing is frequently built with insufficient attention to the human needs of its occupants. Federal funds do not provide adequately for such services. The state should assist in providing an adequate environment by making grants to communities or other non-profit groups for the operating cost of social service programs to accompany low and moderate housing when no other funds are available and the need for such services is demonstrated.

Such social service programs could include day care centers, recreational, educational, housekeeping, and home management programs.

F. Fiscal Reforms

The negative effects of the housing property tax are two-fold. First, the tax acts regressively on lower income persons and adds significantly to the total cost of housing. Secondly, it has led to restrictive zoning practices and a reduction in housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons. It is clear that changes in fiscal policies must be made to insure that needed community services are supported, restrictions limiting housing opportunities are lessened, and the burden of the property tax on low income persons is made more equitable in relation to income. These issues are being studied in considerable detail by an on-going Metropolitan Council fiscal study, as well as a number of other studies in the state or region. For that reason, it

would be inappropriate to make specific legislative recommendations of fiscal reforms at this time. However, fiscal concerns which pertain specifically to low and moderate income housing must be reflected in the recommendations of the current fiscal work of the Council. The following proposals should be considered:

1. Enactment of a system of taxation which does not act regressively on persons of lower income.
2. Collection and distribution of taxes on a metropolitan basis to reduce the incentives for "fiscal" zoning by individual communities.
3. System of taxation that rewards rather than punishes persons who improve substandard housing.
4. Assessment practices which are uniform throughout the metropolitan area.
5. Elimination of the sales tax on building materials for the construction, improvement and rehabilitation of low and moderate income housing.
6. Tax abatement for low and moderate income housing and grant-in-aid program to communities that accept low income households to cover the extra public service costs incurred by that housing.

PART IV

DETAILED CITATION OF PAPERS AND CONSULTANT WORK

A. Consultant Papers

1. "Report for the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area on Social Services and Populations in Low Income Housing," by Robert Morris, D.S.W. and Norman R. Kurtz, Ph.D.; Professors of Social Work, The Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.; January 1970, 77 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council relates to work program item G-24.

Drs. Morris and Kurtz review the role and nature of social services in the metropolitan area, outline service needs and requirements by major functional classifications, and recommend a model for regional scale service delivery. They propose a Metropolitan Service Center which has overall responsibility for planning and organizing, and integrating delivery of social services in the metropolitan region. The Center would be primarily responsible for assembling resources, planning general strategies, allocating resources, and evaluating needs and affectiveness at the community level. The local community would be primarily responsible for implementing the programs.
2. "Summary of Innovation in Building Technology," by Mrs. Susan Stoddard Pflueger; 8F Davis Drive, Tiburon, California; November, 1969; 25 pps.; on file at NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items G-23.

Mrs. Pflueger reviews new techniques in building construction and rehabilitation and relates these innovations to constraints and regional housing goals.

3. "Governmental Constraints in Housing." by Dr. Jan Krasnowiecki; Professor of Law, The Law School, University of Pennsylvania, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104; August, 1969; 16 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item C-14.

Dr. Krasnowiecki dicusses a range of governmental constraints and issues, evaluates their impact on housing; and suggests some actions to assist in overcoming or modifying these constraints.

4. "Presentation at Second Twin Cities Meeting of the NAHRO Advisory Committee on Housing in the Metropolitan Plan," by Dr. Jan Krasnowiecki, Professor of Law; The Law School, University of Pennsylvannia, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104; December, 1969; 8 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items C-14 and H-29.

Dr. Krasnowiecki reviews key constraints operating on low income housing and offers three major recommendations: a metropolitan zoning board empowered to waive local land use controls; low interest loans for land acquisition for low and moderate income projects which are brought before the zoning board; and creation of local corporations empowered to acquire rental properties in older neighborhoods.

5. "An Act creating a Metropolitan Land-Use and Development Review Board within the Metropolitan Council for the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington and providing for the operation thereof;" by Dr. Jan Krasnowiecki, Professor of Law; The Law School, University of Pennsylvania; 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104; November, 1969; 16 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item H-29.

Dr. Krasnowiecki proposes a Metropolitan Land-Use Board empowered to waive local land use controls for low and moderate income housing.

6. "An Act to ammend 462 Minnesota Statutes authorizing the courts to refer actions arising in the Metropolitan Area comprising the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington to the Metropolitan Land-Use and Development Review Board for hearings and recommendations, and requiring transfer of certain actions arising in said metropolitan area for final disposition by the Board," by Dr. Jan Krasnowiecki; Professor of Law; The Law School, University of Pennsylvania, 3400 Chestnut Street, Phila., Pa. 19104; November, 1969; 3 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item H-29.

Dr. Krasnowiecki proposes an amendment to Minnesota Statutes which would authorize the courts to refer zoning and planning disputes which arise in the metropolitan area to the metropolitan review board if,they have regional significance.

7. A series of memos to the Metropolitan Council housing staff, by Dr. William G. Grigsby; Professor of Economics, Institute for Environmental Studies; University of Pennsylvania, 3400 Chestnut Street, Phila., Pa. 19104; April, 1969-March, 1970; approximately 30 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items A, B, and G.

Dr. Grigsby in his role as general consultant to the study has reviewed, evaluated, and added to the staff work in a series of memos. These memos include, "Metropolitan Aspects to Low-Income Housing Problem," "Metropolitan Housing Goals and Goal Development Process," "Proportion of families who cannot afford new housing," "Housing Goals and Measurable Objectives."

8. "Measurable Objectives for Housing in the Metropolitan Plan," by Dr. William G. Grigsby, Professor of Economics, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Pennsylvania, 3400 Chestnut Street, Phila., Pa. 19104; March, 1970; 29 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item A.

B. Major Staff Papers Submitted to NAHRO

1. "Proposed Metropolitan Housing Goals for the Minneapolis-St. Paul Area and Documentation of the Goal Development Process," by Metropolitan Council staff; November, 1969; 41 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items A and B. 1-8.

The paper details a framework for the housing study, documents the goal-making process, and indicates a set of proposed metropolitan housing goals and policies.

2. "Obstacles and Constraints on Low and Moderate Income Housing in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area," by Metropolitan Council staff; February, 1970; 64 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items C. 9-15.

This paper identifies the key constraints on low and moderate income housing in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Constraints and problems are detailed in the general areas of financial, public-private operations, governmental-legal, environmental and attitudinal.

3. "The Relationship of Model Cities Program and Community Renewal Program to Comprehensive Planning and Urban Development on the Metropolitan Level," by Metropolitan Council staff; November, 1969; 39 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items E 19-21.

This paper examines the Model Cities and Community Renewal Programs in Minneapolis and St. Paul and analyzes their relationship to metropolitan planning and development. Recommendations are made for furthering the comprehensive planning relationship between these programs and metropolitan development.

4. "Housing Aspirations and Neighborhood Values of Various Socio-Economic Groups," by Metropolitan Council staff; March, 1970; 64 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item F-22.

This paper identifies the various low and moderate income groups in the

area and their housing and environmental problems. It examines housing values and aspirations both nationally and in the region.

5. "The Relationship of Major Metropolitan Growth Shaping Systems to Low and Moderate Income Housing in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area and Improved Techniques for Coordinating these Systems with Housing," by Metropolitan Council staff; March, 1970; 23 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items G-24 and 25.

This paper reviews the past and current relationship of the major growth systems, open space, centers, transportation, and utilities to housing and the Metropolitan Council's current abilities to coordinate these systems with housing to achieve comprehensive regional scale planning and development. Recommendations are made as to how the major growth systems might be better coordinated with housing in the region.

C. In-House Staff Working Papers

1. "Review of national, state, local and other values and goals which guide and influence metropolitan low and moderate income housing goals," by Metropolitan Council staff; January, 1969; 15 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item A-2.

2. "Conceptual framework for metropolitan low and moderate income housing goals," by Metropolitan Council staff; January, 1969; 15 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item A-1.
3. "Defining and identifying low and moderate income population, problems and needs," by Metropolitan Council staff; February, 1969; 50 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items C-9, a and b.
4. "Preliminary review of Model Cities, and CRP Programs," by Metropolitan Council staff; April, 1969; 18 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item E-19, 20, 21.
5. "Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Area Housing Supply," by Metropolitan Council staff; May, 1969; 80 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items G-23 and C-9, b.
6. "Housing demand in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area," by Metropolitan Council staff; August, 1969; 15 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items G-23 and C-9, b.
7. "Summary of housing conditions in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area," by Metropolitan Council staff; October, 1969; 17 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item G-23.

8. "Economic constraints," by Metropolitan Council staff; August, 1969; 10 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item C-11.
9. "Governmental and Legal Tools and Constraints," by Metropolitan Council staff; December, 1969; 68 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items C-14 and G-26.
10. "Effect of the major growth systems on low and moderate income housing," by Metropolitan Council staff; December, 1969; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items C-13 and G-25.
11. "Housing cost components," by Metropolitan Council staff; November, 1969; 7 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item C-11.
12. "Financial constraints on housing consumption," by Metropolitan Council staff; November, 1969; 19 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item C-11.
13. "Summary of constraints on the achievement of metropolitan low and moderate income housing goals," by Metropolitan Council staff; December, 1969; 72 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item G-24.

14. "Services defined and clarified," by Metropolitan Council staff; September, 1969; 4 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item G-24.
15. "Review of selected operating housing programs, and selected proposed and recommended housing actions," by Metropolitan Council staff; 10 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items D-16 and 17.
16. "Proposed program recommendations," by Metropolitan Council staff; January, 1969; 10 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items D-17 and H-28.
17. "Relationship of Major Growth Systems with Low and Moderate Income Housing," by Metropolitan Council staff; February, 1970; 33 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program items C-13, G-25, H-28.
18. "Housing Quantity and Quality in the Seven County Twin Cities Metropolitan Area," by Metropolitan Council staff; January, 1970; 12 pps.; on file with Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item G-23.
19. "Recommend Short Term Housing Programs to be Undertaken by the Metropolitan Council," by Metropolitan Council staff; March, 1970; 7 pps.; on file with NAHRO and Metropolitan Council; relates to work program item H-30.