

Research Department

Thomas Todd, Director

600 State Office Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-1201
(612) 296-6753 [FAX 296-9887]



Minnesota House of Representatives

1967 Proposals for a Metropolitan Council

In the 1967 session, there were two main proposals for a metropolitan level government organization: the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan, House File 1508 (Senate File 1264) which ultimately passed, establishing a metropolitan council with appointed members, and the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan, Senate File 500 (House File 1184) which would have established a metropolitan service district with elected members.

The proposal to establish a metropolitan service district with elected members was developed out of extensive study and discussion among various interest groups such as the Citizens League and several leagues of municipalities. They presented testimony to the metropolitan affairs committees early in the session and introduced the bill in early February. In response, more conservative legislators developed the proposal for an appointed council that ultimately succeeded. The proposals remained deadlocked in committee until almost the end of session.

Below is a summary of the proposals, a discussion of the issues raised by proponents of either bill, and an appendix with a chronology of events.

I. The Proposals

1. An elected council -- Senate File 500, the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan.

Senators Ogdahl, Wolfe and W.R. Anderson introduced S.F. 500 on February 8, 1967. Senator Ogdahl was chair of the Senate Civil Administration and Metropolitan Affairs-Metropolitan Problems Committee, to which the bill was referred. The House companion bill, H.F. 1184, was introduced by Representatives Frenzel, Bell, Gearty, R.W. Johnson, and J. Johnson on March 3, 1967.



The Ogdahl-Frenzel plan provided for a "metropolitan service district" as a public corporation and governmental subdivision of the state with an elected governing body of 15 members. Council members would serve staggered four-year terms. Interested, eligible persons would file for candidacy and candidates names would be placed on the nonpartisan ballot at the general election. The council chair would be appointed by the council from among the members. The council would also appoint an executive director to carry out the ordinances, resolutions, rules, regulations, or orders of the council. The executive director would have had control over all the administrative, planning, and operating departments created by the council.

The council was directed to establish an operating department for each service or function it was directed to provide or perform. The district was directed to plan and coordinate the physical, social, and economic development of the metropolitan area, including but not limited to plans for sewage, transit, garbage and refuse disposal, highways and other public transportation, parks, open space, recreation, drainage and water supply, air and water pollution, public hospitals, libraries, schools, law enforcement, property tax assessments, planning and zoning. The district would also have provided mosquito control service, sewage service, and transit service.

2. An appointed council -- House File 1508, the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan.

Representatives Newcome, S. Adams, Duxbury, O'Neill, and R. Pavlak introduced H.F. 1508 on March 17, 1967. The Senate companion bill, S.F. 1264, was introduced by Senators Ashbach, Kirchner, and Rosenmeier on March 17, 1967.

Under the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan, council members would be appointed at large by the governor on a nonpartisan basis, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill was amended in the process to require the governor to consult with area legislators before making the appointments. Other differences between the bill as introduced and the as passed are (1) the addition of designated council districts; (2) the addition of council powers and duties with regard to independent boards', commissions' or local governments' planning that allowed the council to suspend plans inconsistent with or detrimental to the metro plan; and (3) the addition of a tax levy authority to fund the council.

The council was to be responsible for planning and coordinating the operation of such regional state-created agencies as existed at the moment or might be created. The council was to be an arm of the legislature, not an independent level of government.¹ The council was not given any operating powers. The council was directed to coordinate preparation and adoption of development guides, review and approve or disapprove local governments' long

¹"Creation of an agency should be by appointment instead of election -- designed not to get the most popular figure but the most competent. . . . [E]lections are out of the question. By election you are creating a government; [we] are trying to create a coordinating force. . . . It will be an arm of the Legislature and we must look to them rather than to standing subcommittees." February 23, 1967, Senate Committee on Metropolitan Problems meeting minutes (reporting on Senator Rosenmeier's explanation of his approach and concept).

range plans, conduct federal program reviews, collect data, and conduct research and special studies of air and water pollution, parks and open spaces, tax structure and equalization in the metropolitan area, sewers, and long range planning. In addition, a council member was to be appointed to serve on each of the commissions - the airports commission, the mosquito control commission, the sanitary district, and any other metropolitan area commission or board authorized by law. The council members on the commissions did not have voting power.

II. Issues: Role of the Council -- Coordination/Planning or Planning and Operating?

In the 1960s, there was growing concern about the need for regional solutions to regional problems. Despite this concern, however, local governments were worried about a middle layer of government between them and the state that an elected council implied. Would the council be responsive to the concerns of local governments? Would it threaten their existence or authority? There was strong opposition to an elected council because of these concerns, more notably from Bloomington city and business leaders who perceived a threat to local government autonomy that would interfere with Bloomington's favorable economic development.²

In addition, some legislators were concerned that the legislature maintain a significant role in the development of the metropolitan area. They believed that an elected council would have been more autonomous than was desirable.³

There were also concerns about the ability of an elected official to act for the good of the region. More than one person pointed out the risk of a body directed to think and act regionally made up of individuals dependent on election from a subdivision within the region. Could an elected council member support development of a project that would not provide any service to his or her district?

There would have to be a balancing of the desire for the electorate to have direct representation on policy issues -- particularly if the policy decisions were going to have an impact on peoples' pockets -- against the desire for the perceived regional perspective of the appointee. An appointee, the argument goes, is less likely to have a local constituency and

²A. Naftalin & J. Brandl, The Twin Cities Regional Strategy, p. 24 (Metropolitan Council, November 1980); see also Senate Metropolitan Problems Committee minutes for March 10 and 16, 1967, in which several Bloomington city and business leaders testified in favor of the more conservative, limited-power council of the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan.

³See Representative Albertson's Memorandum regarding Concepts On a Metropolitan Council; C.J. Hein, J.E. Keys & G.M. Robbins, Regional Government Arrangements in Metropolitan Areas: Nine Case Studies, p. 31 (Institute for Community Studies, December 1973); see also Ted Kolderie, "Governance in the Twin Cities Area of Minnesota," Regional Governance Promise and Performance, Substate Regionalism and the Federal System, vol. II - Case Studies, p. 116 (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, May 1973) ("Outstate legislators were vaguely concerned about the creation of what might become a 'second legislature.'").

therefore more likely to genuinely consider regional problems on a regional basis. On the other hand, as argued by Mrs. Laverne Graham of the Citizens League, appointees would be the beneficiaries of political patronage and therefore not necessarily competent for the job.⁴

The arguments for and against an elected council, however, were not made in isolation. They were generally tied to the purposed powers and duties of the council. Overall, proponents of an elected council also envisioned policymaking and services which they felt must be provided by a body directly responsive to the electorate -- an elected council.

According to proponents of an elected council the council should:

- Provide specific services, including acquiring, building, and operating facilities as necessary, such as metropolitan planning, mosquito control, mass rapid transit, sewage disposal, and an area zoo. The council should only perform functions assigned to it by the legislature and leave those services which are of a local nature to individual municipalities;
- Coordinate separate but related functions to avoid isolated and potentially conflicting actions -- i.e., coordinate airport planning and land use, or open space and tax policy and land use;
- Identify and study areawide problems like air pollution, drainage, solid waste, and make legislative recommendations;
- Review federal programs' grant and loan applications as required by the A-95 Clearinghouse Review;
- Establish and enforce pollution control standards;
- Prepare and adopt a guide for the long-range development of the metro area; and
- Approve (or disapprove) highway plans prepared by the state highway department.⁵

As expressed by the Citizens League, the powers, responsibilities and structure of the elected council were a unified proposal. "If, for example, the method of representation on this body were different or if other aspects of the structure were changed, we would not necessarily recommend all the powers and responsibilities we have included here."⁶ Therefore, whether the council would be appointed or elected was directly related to what role and functions the council would have.

⁴Minutes, February 24, 1967, Senate Metropolitan Problems committee.

⁵See, e.g., Citizens League, Recommendations for a Metropolitan Council For the Twin Cities Area, February 9, 1967; Dennis W. Dunne, Urban Study and Action Committee of the Chambers of Commerce in the Twin Cities, before the House committee January 23, 1967.

⁶Citizens League, Recommendations for A Metropolitan Council for the Twin Cities Area, at page 14.

In contrast, proponents of an appointed council wanted a council of far more limited powers and duties. According to proponents of an appointed council, the council should:

- Coordinate, not govern;
- Provide comprehensive planning, including review and approval of local governments' long-range plans;
- Review federal programs;
- Collect data for itself and other potential users, and accept federal funds for providing information on population, land use, finances, etc.;
- Receive and administer public and private grants for research and demonstration projects in areas of metropolitan interest if no specialized agency has been created, including those relating to water supply, refuse disposal, communication, transportation; and
- Coordinate civil defense planning.

Thus, the controversy's focus was not simply whether the council should be elected or appointed, but what kind of council it should be and with what powers.

If the council was going to have a more passive role, coordinating, planning and making recommendations to the legislature for action, then it was less important to have the direct representation of the electorate.

On the other hand, if the council was going to have planning and operating duties, and provide direct services traditionally provided by an elected body of local government officials, then it was felt that the council should be elected as well.

Thus, in 1967, proponents of the different council formations appeared to have used a functional analysis to determine how to structure the council, including how to select its members. The council's functions and the selection methods were not independent, but were packaged deals. The proposal for a council with no operating powers, only coordination and planning duties won, and with it the appointed council.

As the duties of the council change, the arguments for or against changing the method for selecting council members are revisited and since 1967, there have been several proposals to change the method of selecting council members from the appointment method to the elective method.

III. Chronology of Events

1966

During the 1966 interim, Senator Gordon Rosenmeier, chair of the Senate Civil Administration Subcommittee on State Departments, and Representative Howard Albertson, chair of the House Metropolitan and Urban Affairs Committee, held hearings on the problems of urban growth to develop a legislative proposal on metropolitan government.⁷

During the same time period, the Citizens League also studied the issue of metropolitan government and held hearings to receive comments and proposals from many different people.⁸

Before any bills were introduced, the Senate and House committees on metropolitan affairs heard extensive testimony on the question of regional government. Below is an overview of the testimony and events, reconstructed from the committee meeting minutes and documents and the House and Senate Journals.

January 23, 1967

The House committee heard the testimony of Dennis W. Dunne on behalf of the Chambers of Commerce in the Twin Cities. Mr. Dunne reviewed the two then-existing concepts of metropolitan government -- the super central government that takes over functions of local municipalities, represented by Dade County, Florida, and the middle level of government that takes over public services that are area-wide in nature and cannot be provided properly within the boundaries of a single municipality, represented by the Toronto/Winnipeg/Montreal model. Mr. Dunne leaned toward the Toronto model. The model his committee recommended had a metropolitan area services council with an executive committee, and an executive director

⁷It should be noted that when asked if the idea for the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan arose out of this interim study, Senator Rosenmeier apparently responded that it had not, but was his own idea. See Minutes of Senate Committee on Metropolitan Problems, February 24, 1967. Representative Albertson's memorandum on the Concepts on a Metropolitan Council states that there is no acceptable model for a metropolitan government in the United States and that Toronto's plan would not be adaptable. He acknowledges that "[i]n arriving at these concepts the knowledge of the workings of government studiously imparted by Sen. Rosenmeier has been most valuable. The influence of Sen. William Kirchner and Sen. Robert Ashbach, former House members who have devoted so much time to this subject over the past four years ... is readily apparent."

⁸Citizens League, Recommendations for a Metropolitan Council for the Twin Cities Area, February 9, 1967 (explaining how the Metropolitan Affairs Committee was formed, who actively participated in the committee's work, that there were 24 meetings from mid-June 1966 to November 1967 in which the committee received background information and received testimony from 23 identified individuals representing government, academia, the media, and business, that others testified on specific areawide functions or concerns, and that from this a summary of the proposals was published and circulated to about 1000 governmental, civic, business and labor leaders for comment. After the comments were reviewed, the final proposal was prepared.)

supervising the sewage disposal, mosquito control, mass rapid transit, planning, and area zoo services.⁹

February 6, 1967

The Hennepin County League of Municipalities presented its resolution supporting establishment of a metropolitan multi-purpose service district to the House committee. The resolution was presented by Mr. Bergstrom, executive director, and the mayors of New Hope, Richfield, Brooklyn Center, and Mound testified in support of the resolution.

February 8, 1967

Senate File 500, the ^{electd}Ogdahl-Frenzel plan, was introduced.

February 13, 1967

The House committee again heard background testimony. The minutes reflect that the position of the Citizens League was presented (and a copy of the League's recommendations dated February 9, 1967 are attached to the minutes). The League wanted a single, multipurpose metropolitan government "to provide general leadership in the identification and solution of . . . metropolitan problems and to administer metropolitan services such as sewage disposal, mass transit, mosquito control and others."¹⁰ The League emphasized that metropolitan government was not a new concept in the area because there were already several single-purpose service districts or commissions. The proposal was to bring them together to provide a more cohesive approach, and prevent conflicting overlaps.¹¹

⁹January 23, 1967 testimony of Dennis W. Dunne before the House Metropolitan and Urban Affairs Committee.

¹⁰February 13, 1967 Statement of Charles H. Clay, Chairman, Citizens League Metropolitan Affairs Committee, to Members, House Metropolitan and Urban Affairs Committee.

¹¹The Citizens League identified 13 problems needed to be addressed by a council and focused on 5: transit, sewage, parks and open space, a metropolitan zoo, and highways.

In recommending creation of a multi-purpose metropolitan government to provide leadership, and to administer services, the League pointed out that there were already existing various metropolitan service districts with single purposes but that it would be more beneficial to bring them all together and stop the proliferation of single purpose commissions. Supporting its argument in favor of an elected council of 29-31 members from the area senatorial districts, the League stated:

"[T]here is a need to establish representative government on a 'one man, one vote' basis in the area of metropolitan problems. Single purpose districts or commissions, as a rule, are neither representative of nor answerable to the voters. It doesn't seem practical to elect all the members of the existing boards, let alone the new ones which might be created. Yet these boards make important decisions and often exercise

The Metropolitan Section of the League of Minnesota Municipalities presented its position and attached to the minutes is its recommendations on sewage, mass transit, and metropolitan government structure. With regard to the metropolitan government structure, it recommended:

- that a single, open-ended, multipurpose service district be created whose functions and operating authority can be expanded and modified from time to time;
- that the functions of the district at a minimum include metropolitan planning, sanitary sewage, and mass transit;
- that the governing body consist of 30 members, one from each senatorial district selected by direct election;¹²
- that the term of office be four years and the terms be concurrent;
- that members of the governing body be paid adequate compensation; and
- that the chair be selected from among the members by the members.

In a variation on the elected council concept, the Ramsey County League of Municipalities recommended a council of representatives from each senatorial district in the seven-county metro area. The representatives would be selected by a caucus of city or village councils located in each district, the vote of each city or village prorated to provide equal representation by population. The metropolitan multi-service district would be given limited and specific powers and duties, including establishing uniform tax assessment procedures in the region, and acquiring and operating planning, sewage disposal, mosquito control, airports, park and recreation systems, metro transportation, and air pollution control functions. The

taxing power. The Metropolitan Planning Commission is an example of a single-purpose commission which is not elected nor appointed on a 'one man, one vote' basis, but which is making very important decisions affecting this area. The importance of this commission will increase dramatically next summer unless a metropolitan council is created. Federal legislation will require that requests for federal funds for parks, hospitals, sewage facilities, highways, etc. must be submitted to an agency having areawide responsibility for planning for review. The decisions of the MPC on these requests will be extremely important in determining which grants are made. It was not intended, however, that the MPC make governmental decisions. It was to be advisory only. The MPC itself recognizes that these decisions should be made by a body elected by the people and has recommended that it become a department of planning in an elected metropolitan council."

Statement, February 13, 1967, by Charles H. Clay, Chairman of the Citizens League Metropolitan Affairs Committee, to the House Metropolitan and Urban Affairs Committee, p. 3, attached to the minutes of 2/13/67.

¹²In the secondary sources describing the 1967 legislative battle over establishing a metropolitan council, the competing proposals are generally described as a 30 person, elected council versus a smaller, appointed council. In fact, the bills actually introduced both had smaller councils of 15 persons. Even as late as April 6th, however, when Representative Albertson placed his full page ad in the Stillwater Evening Gazette, he was describing the competing proposal not as it was introduced, but as it was initially described by some proponents early in the 1967 session.

Ramsey County League also recommended directing the metro government to study other specified areas for including in the functions of the metropolitan government.¹³

February 23, 1967

Representative Albertson addressed the Senate committee on Metropolitan Problems, distributing copies of his memorandum to the House Rules Committee on the concepts for a metropolitan council. Senator Rosenmeier also testified, stating that the legislature should only delegate coordination and planning functions. He stated that by and large, the single purpose service districts were doing an efficient job and there was no need for a single, multipurpose service district to house them all. Furthermore, he stated that the council should be appointed not elected -- "designed not to get the most popular figure but the most competent. . . . By election you are creating a government; that [we] are trying to create a coordinating force."¹⁴

February 24, 1967

The Senate committee heard testimony from Mrs. Laverne Graham of the Citizens League, opposing the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan. She stated that single purpose districts are weak, and that an appointed council has built-in patronage and therefore there is no reason to believe the council members would be the most competent. In addition, Vern Bergstrom of the Citizens League, asked whether the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan was a recommendation of the Senate Subcommittee studying this issue during the interim. Senator Rosenmeier stated that it was not, that it was his own idea.

February 27, 1967

The House committee heard from three members of the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council¹⁵ who generally supported establishing a metropolitan council to address regional problems and expressed their basic policy concerns. They also stated it may be necessary for such a council to have authority to directly operate some programs. They did not express any opinion on whether the council should be elected or appointed.

¹³See Report of Metropolitan Government Study Committee, Ramsey County League of Municipalities, January 4, 1967, attached to the February 13, 1967 House committee meeting minutes.

¹⁴Minutes, February 23, 1967, Senate Committee on Metropolitan Problems.

¹⁵Donald Dayton, Chairman of Dayton's, Earl Ewald, president of NSP, and Philip Nason, president of First National Bank of St. Paul.

February 28, 1967

The Senate committee discussed the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan and the Mayor of St. Paul testified in favor of it.

March 2, 1967

The Senate committee continued its discussion of the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan and heard testimony in favor of it from the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce, Toro Manufacturing of Bloomington (who felt that the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce's opposition to the bill did not represent all the organization's members), the Hennepin County League of Municipalities (which distributed its resolution), the Mayor of New Hope, and the Mayor of Brooklyn Center.

March 3, 1967

House File 1184, the companion bill to the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan in S.F. 500, was introduced in the House.

March 3, 1967

Representative Albertson read to the committee his memorandum to the House Rules committee concerning a metropolitan council concept, and Senator Rosenmeier presented the concept in greater detail, answering the committee's questions.¹⁶

March 7, 1967

The Senate committee continued its discussion of the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan and heard testimony in favor of an elected, operating/coordinating council from the Citizens League, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce, the West St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, and the Metropolitan Section of the Minnesota League of Municipalities. The Ramsey County League of Municipalities explained its preference for a modified elected council that would essentially keep more control in the hands of elected local officials.

¹⁶Minutes, March 3, 1967 House Committee on Metropolitan and Urban Affairs.

March 10, 1967

The Senate Committee heard testimony in opposition to the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan from various representatives of the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce and Bloomington's mayor. The testimony in opposition continued on March 14 with the Bloomington city attorney, John Pidgeon, who felt that the process of establishing a metropolitan government should be incremental -- it may need to be elected someday, but that the first step should be the Rosenmeier-Albertson approach.

March 16, 1967

Discussion of the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan continued in the Senate committee with more testimony in opposition to the plan. A representative of the Metropolitan Council of Chambers of Commerce explained that of the 24 chambers of commerce that are members of the Metropolitan Council of Chambers of Commerce, 6 favored a strong metropolitan council, 3 did not favor a strong council and 15 did not have a position on the issue. He questioned, among other issues, whether elected members would be as qualified as appointed. The attorney for the metropolitan mosquito control district testified that the district already cooperated with the University, the department of health, and the department of agriculture, and he failed to see how the bill would benefit the mosquito control district's operation.

March 17, 1967

The Senate committee considered Senator Ashbach's bill to establish an area board of coordination, Senate File 1159, which had been introduced on March 13, 1967.¹⁷ Senator Ashbach explained that his bill was mostly based on Senator Rosenmeier's idea for an appointed council. Senator Ashbach felt that the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan would not work and that it was better to start with an appointed coordinating council. He also felt that with respect to the coordinating function, the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan was not strong enough because it only provided the metropolitan government advisory power over long range planning.

On the same day, the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan was introduced in the House as H.F. 1508 and in the Senate as S.F. 1264. Senator Ashbach was also the chief author for the Senate bill.

March 21, 1967

Senator Ashbach presented S.F. 1264 to the Senate committee. Senator Rosenmeier testified that the appointed council made the most sense because elected officials will represent their constituency, not the region as a whole, and that it was less likely that an elected person

¹⁷The House companion bill was H.F. 1446, introduced on March 15, 1967 by Reps. R. Anderson, O'Neill, Hoppe, Morris, and House. Both remained in committee.

would have the combined political, financial, and scientific understanding necessary for regional coordination. "[T]o insure competence and representation of the area as a whole, an appointed council is necessary."¹⁸ Senator Kirchner, also an author of S.F. 1264, in supporting an appointed council, expressed a distrust of the ability of the average person to vote competently for more people. In addition, there would be greater expense of election campaigning that would be more than what would be spent on projects over a few years time.

There does not appear to have been any formal consideration of the proposals in any committee after March 21st, until the House committee took action on the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan, H.F. 1508, on May 8th.

April 6, 1967

On April 6th, Representative Albertson placed a full page advertisement in the Stillwater Evening Gazette, p.6, in which he explained, among other things, his four objections to the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan for an elected council:

- The proposal he referred to had 29 council members elected from senate districts so that 15 members would be from Hennepin county and only 1 from Washington county, skewing the representation to regions within the metro area instead of a balanced regional representation;¹⁹
- The districts for the proposed elected members were based on a 1960 census which was badly out of date, particularly with regard to the suburban areas. The 1970 census data would be better and therefore it would be better to wait until then to set up an elected council system;
- An elected body would just be another layer of government and before adding it, they needed to decide what to do with the existing layers; and
- An elected body feels more permanent and would be hard to change or eliminate should it not really be needed or not work. Albertson preferred to have the council be under the strong hand of the legislature and the governor.

Albertson concluded by urging caution and moderation, stating that the process should be "evolutionary rather than revolutionary."

¹⁸Minutes, March 21, 1967 meeting of the Senate committee on Metropolitan Problems.

¹⁹By April 6th, the size for a council was roughly the same with either bill. However, the tie to senatorial districts and the potential imbalance between the counties left some with the concern that council members would have less than a regional perspective.

May 8, 1967

The minutes of the House committee reflect a flurry of amendments offered, including an effort to substitute a modified version of the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan (that would have started with an appointed council that would have been replaced with an elected council after the 1970 census) for the Rosenmeier-Albertson plan. Another amendment that failed would have sunset the act in one year. A motion to re-refer the bill to another the Civil Administration committee failed, although it succeeded on the House floor later that day.

May 11, 1967

The bill was reported back from the Civil Administration committee to the floor on May 11th.

May 15, 1967

H.F. 1508 was on special orders and another flurry of amendments were offered. Representative Martin Sabo offered a floor amendment that would have provided for a successor council to be elected for a two-year term at the 1970 general election. The amendment failed 62 to 66.

May 19, 1967

H.F. 1508 was heard in the Senate and Senator W.R. Anderson (one of the authors of the Ogdahl-Frenzel plan) offered an amendment that would have provided for a successor council to be elected. The amendment failed on a tie vote, 33 to 33. A move to break the tie resulted in a clear defeat for the amendment.²⁰

May 20, 1967

May 20th was the last day for bills to be considered by the 1967 legislature and the legislature adjourned sine die on May 22nd.

Deborah A. Dyson
Legislative Analyst

²⁰According to Ted Kolderie, the move to break the tie and pass the amendment failed "after Rosenmeier rose to argue with his outstate colleagues regarding the dangers of creating an elected body for the emerging dominant community in Minnesota." Ted Kolderie, "Governance in the Twin Cities Area of Minnesota," Regional Governance: Promise and Performance, Substate Regionalism and the Federal System, vol. II - Case Studies, p.116 (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, May 1973).