

THE PLANNING FUNCTION IN METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT

Pearson H. Stewart  
A.B., Amherst College  
1940



Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of Master in City Planning  
at the  
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

September 1946

Signature of Author

.....

Signature of Professor  
in Charge of Course

.....

Signature of Chairman of Department  
Committee of Graduate Students

.....

Elm Street

Kingston, Massachusetts

September 16, 1946

Professor Frederick J. Adams,  
School of Architecture and Planning,  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Dear Professor Adams:

I herewith submit this thesis entitled "The  
Planning Function in Metropolitan Government", in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master  
in City Planning.

Respectfully,

Pearson H. Stewart

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his thanks to Mr. Frederick P. Clark of the New York Regional Plan Association and to Mr. Theodore T. McCrosky and Mr. Charles A. Blessing of the Greater Boston Development Committee for their discussions with him of both metropolitan government and metropolitan planning.

Professor Roland B. Greeley of the School of Architecture and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been very helpful in examinations of some of the proposals advanced in the present thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
THE PRESENT CONFUSION IN METROPOLITAN THINKING	4
THE GOVERNMENT AND PRESENT PLANNING OF METROPOLITAN AREAS	12
Metropolitan Government	12
Inter-Governmental Cooperation	12
City-County Consolidation	16
Municipal Annexation	20
Municipal Extra-territorial Jurisdiction	22
"Ad Hoc" Authorities	22
Municipal-State Relations	27
Municipal-Federal Relations	28
Federation	33
Miscellaneous Metropolitan Government Possibilities	38
Existing Planning for Metropolitan Areas	39
Private Planning Institutions	40
Cooperative Planning Action	41
County Planning	44
"Ad Hoc" Authority Planning	45
State Aid for Planning	46

Table of Contents - Continued

	<u>Page</u>
Federal Aid for Planning	48
Conclusions	51
<b>THE PLANNING AGENCY IN THE STRUCTURE OF METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>57</b>
The Place of a Planning Agency in the Government Organization	57
The Relation of a Planning Agency to the Executive	59
The Suspensive Veto	67
<b>THE DUTIES OF THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCY</b>	<b>70</b>
The Scope of the Activities of a Metropolitan Planning Agency	70
Research	71
Physical Planning	74
Metropolitan Planning Relations	78
Advisory Committees	91
Coordinating Function	99
Administrative Function	107
Plan Accomplishment	111
Stimulation of Metropolitan Thinking	114
Technical Staff	115
<b>THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCY - A SUMMARY STATEMENT</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	

## INTRODUCTION.

Metropolitan government in the United States is at present very amorphous; metropolitan planning is practically as formless. Although some thinking and action are being conducted on metropolitan terms by various organizations, there is no one institution whose responsibility is solely the metropolitan area. Government in metropolitan areas is predicated almost entirely on assumptions of municipal particularism. The local community is dominant in the metropolitan area, not a government of the entire area.

Metropolitan government at present is almost completely disintegrated. The separation of local government in large urban and suburban areas results in unequalized services and unequalness between governmental needs and the financial ability of the various communities to meet their requirements. The development and control of the social, political, and economic institutions of the metropolitan area are hindered and dispersed by the disintegration in the metropolitan areas. The planning and execution of services for the metropolitan area must often depend on the action of a particular suburb which may have private reasons for not joining in action with the larger area.

The problem of the metropolitan area is enormous. The physical size of the metropolitan area, the number of governmental units involved, the number of specific situations necessi-

tating metropolitan action are each important phases of the problem and each constitutes a difficult problem in itself. The physical size of the metropolitan area has not yet been adequately defined. The only definition with any acceptance is that made by the Census Bureau, based solely on population density. Other standards for the definition of the metropolitan area have been suggested: commuting area, retail sales area, adjacency and contiguity, structural density; none have achieved wide acceptance. The number of governmental units in a metropolitan area is way out of proportion to services rendered; there are many more governmental organizations than are needed. The individual municipalities in the metropolitan area are quite unable to cope by themselves with many of the problems requiring action. How can one city, for example, regulate and control adequately the development of a seaport or airport program for a metropolitan area? These factors in the whole metropolitan problem are too involved to be discussed here and they have been discussed well elsewhere,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Metropolitan Government, Victor Jones; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1942, 364 pp.

The Government of Metropolitan Areas in the United States, Paul Studenski and the Committee on Metropolitan Government; National Municipal League, New York, 1930. 403 pp.

The Government of the Metropolitan Region of Chicago, Charles E. Merriam, Spencer D. Parratt, Albert Lepawasky; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1933, 193 pp.

Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs, Vol. II, Population, Land Values, and Government, Thomas Adams, Harold M. Lewis, Theodore T. McCrosky; New York, 1929, 320 pp.

Although two of these volumes refer to specific metropolitan areas, the four together constitute an excellent statement of the metropolitan problem.

even though their solution is as basic to the solution of the metropolitan problem as is the proper provision for planning for the area.

The present discussion is limited to a development of the function of planning in metropolitan government. A consideration of various forms of possible metropolitan government has been necessary since the planning organization cannot be considered apart from its governmental milieu.



THE PRESENT CONFUSION IN METROPOLITAN THINKING

The present confusion in metropolitan affairs has resulted in an anomolous situation that is only vaguely realized in thinking concerning metropolitan areas. A decentralization trend in large cities is very real and strong; yet metropolitan thinking is focused on the central city, not on the whole area. The area and influence of large urban areas have been extended without regard to the political boundaries of the cities. The vitality and power of central cities are by no means limited by political boundaries; the influence and scope of the central city have been decentralized to extend throughout an entire metropolitan area. The extension of the central city is by no means an accomplished fact; rather it is a trend that is growing in importance and accelerating in time. While the central city has been spreading through decentralization, its domination in the thinking of the metropolitan population has remained strong. All lines of activity in the metropolitan area lead to the center, not across or around it; the central city to a large measure still controls the work of the suburbs. The central influence in the metropolitan area is still predominant despite the decentralization trend.

The anomalous confusion regarding decentralization is not primarily a result of just vested interests and big business. It is true that there has been much talk and discussion by chambers of commerce, by real estate associations,

by commercial groups concerning the need for revitalizing the central areas of large cities. Organizations and institutions with interests in the decaying core of cities have been active in endeavoring to find a solution to the problem. But more important than the efforts of particular groups to promote thinking along centralization lines have been the fundamental attitudes of the people. The central city in the metropolitan area has been dominant so long that it continues to be so merely by its own weight. The entire lives of most of the population of metropolitan areas revolve around the central city. The central city is the source of livelihood, the source of news, the location of cultural leadership, an important place of entertainment for most of the metropolitan population. It is small wonder that the thinking of the metropolitan population also revolves around the central city. The basic attitudes have been central for so long that inertia keeps them so.

Concomitant with the influence of and emphasis on the central city has been the strong effect of the local community or neighborhood on metropolitan attitudes. The individual towns and cities comprising the metropolitan area are usually thought of as being entities complete and separate in themselves. The relationship of the units composing the metropolitan area to each other and to the whole area have not been much a part of basic considerations concerning the larger area. Local particularism has long had a dominant role in metropolitan attitudes.

The ideas and opinions commonly held concerning the influence of the central city and the place of the local community in the metropolitan area are not the result of a right or wrong thinking as of a non-thinking, of inertia, of the cultural lag, as the conditions in and around the central city change. It is true that opinions concerning centralization and the place of the local community have been nurtured and lead by those with special interests but the leading could not be accomplished without receptive attitudes. And while metropolitan thinking is oriented both centrally and locally, the decentralization trend continues.

The contradiction between commonly held ideas and practice should be corrected if metropolitan areas are to maintain their vitality. The cultural lag should be eliminated, or at least narrowed, if the human resources of the metropolitan areas are to be well utilized. Whether or not urban decentralization is good and valid, it is existent and should be so recognized. Recognition of the tendencies in urban development will not come through chance; thinking in metropolitan rather than particular terms will be achieved only through guidance.

Any attempt to promote a thinking in a given direction, not at all necessarily an attempt to influence opinion, can only be successful if it is organized, if the attempt is institutionalized. This is especially true of ideas on as broad a scope as are metropolitan affairs. An institution designed for the purpose of promoting thinking and resulting

action on a metropolitan wide scope is necessary. A planning organization is established primarily to think; a metropolitan planning agency is the institution best qualified to promote thinking in a metropolitan pattern.

An organization cannot think merely for the sake of thinking; nor can an organization promote thinking on a given subject in a vacuum. In order to promote an attitude, an organization must have a purpose and program. If a metropolitan planning agency desires to foster a metropolitan attitude, it must have definite aims that it wishes to accomplish. In the execution of a desired end, the cultivation of an idea will be concomitant.

If a metropolitan planning agency aims to cultivate a thinking in regard to the whole area of its jurisdiction, not just a particular segment of it, it must have its own ideas and program well formulated. Since the basic problem in urban affairs is the tendency for large cities to decentralize, a metropolitan planning agency must know its position in regard to this fundamental problem. An institution with organized and positive ideas concerning decentralization can be the leader in stimulating what it believes to be the proper course of action for solving the situations and problems raised by development away from the center of large cities. Action can only be accomplished by positive ideas; a metropolitan planning agency is well fitted to provide positive ideas and programs concerning metropolitan affairs.

An organization planning for the whole metropolitan area is best suited to crystallize ideas concerning urban decentralization. The metropolitan area is the smallest possible area that can cope with the problems rising from decentralization; many of the problems can only be met on a regional or national basis. However, the metropolitan area must do what it can to meet and solve its problems and a metropolitan planning agency must not only participate but also lead in action concerning urban decentralization, using its own attitudes concerning the problem as a basis of action.

In an effort to promote metropolitan thinking and activity, the overwhelming influence of the particular communities must be counteracted. Extremely provincial ways of thinking and local attitudes militate against endeavour of a metropolitan scope. The unwillingness of local communities to subordinate their own individual interests to those of a larger area is a great barrier to the cultivation of a metropolitan attitude. The stimulation of the awareness of the metropolitan area as not only an existing area but also as a valid entity is necessary. As in the case of decentralization such a stimulation can only be accomplished by an agency with a positive program, a consciousness that such a program is necessary. A metropolitan planning agency is an institution capable of fostering such a program.

An awareness of the metropolitan area as a real entity is present to some extent at present. Local governmental

officials conscious of some of the reasons for their problems, real estate interests cognizant of the movement out of cities, other commercial and industrial interests of necessity taking part in the decentralization movement, students of political science know of the metropolitan community and its problems. But the problems are not real just to special interests. They affect all who derive a livelihood from the metropolitan area. In order that the problems affecting the entire larger urban area may be solved satisfactorily, the problems must be realized by the entire population of the area, not just by a few having particular interests in the problems. An institution to stimulate and be a leader in metropolitan thinking has not a little or easy task.

A metropolitan planning agency aiming to be a leader in metropolitan thinking is, of course, not an insurance that per se new attitudes toward decentralization and the validity of the metropolitan community will come. However, an agency whose job it is to think and plan for the entire urban and suburban area is practically forced to have a positive attitude toward decentralization and is compelled to think in metropolitan, rather than local, terms. There is, of course, much opportunity for a metropolitan planning agency to continue the prevailing dominant attitudes concerning local interests and the status quo regarding the core of the large area. But the metropolitan planning agency does have the opportunity for full-time thinking on metropolitan terms and is given the chance to develop attitudes that are not solely local in scope.

The work of a metropolitan planning agency is the medium by which metropolitan attitudes will be achieved and encouraged. Research and analysis, problem diagnosis and program formulation, public education and program execution are the basic steps in the planning process, steps which are as valid for complicated overgrown urban areas as for relatively simple small towns. The operations which would enable a planning agency to establish and maintain its leadership in the development of a metropolitan attitude are the practical development of the basic steps in the planning process. In the execution of these steps the planning agency has an opportunity to acquire and revise its basic metropolitan attitudes and policies. Developing a policy for a metropolitan area is not easy; it is not a matter of simply sitting down and writing out a pat statement. The formulation of a set of ideas concerning a complicated problem - or area - requires much time, effort, and work. It is only through the meeting of specific situations and problems, through the answering of individual questions, through the making of daily decisions that a basic policy for a metropolitan area can be achieved. Only an organization whose job it is to solve the detailed problems can know enough to achieve a general solution.

With the necessity for making daily decisions, there is great danger that a planning agency of metropolitan scope will not be able to see the forest for the trees. No simple solution can be given for this problem; the planning board must be so constituted as to allow it to see detail in its proper

perspective, in its proper relation to the problem of the metropolitan area as a whole. Specific problems must never be allowed to dominate the work of a planning agency.



THE GOVERNMENT AND PRESENT PLANNING OF METROPOLITAN AREAS.Metropolitan Government.

Several types and combinations of types of government have been advanced as solutions for the political structure problem of the metropolitan area. These range from proposals for informal inter-governmental cooperative action to completely arbitrary plans for city-states. Since the role of a government planning organization cannot be discussed without reference to its governmental structure, the various proposals for metropolitan government will be examined briefly. The examination will be a condensed attempt to determine which proposal is most likely to become an actual metropolitan government and in which type of metropolitan government is planning most likely to be effective.

Inter-Governmental Cooperation.

A significant development in city administration and management has been the recent growth of inter-municipal services, either informal or contract. To cite a few instances: Cincinnati has fire protection commitments with ten cities and three townships; the cities of Birmingham and Bessemer in Alabama have a joint civil service commission; the Chicago police radio network includes cities thirty miles distant, not only the cities in Cook County; California by law, permits inter-municipal contracting for technical personnel services. Los Angeles County has done a great

deal of consolidation of services; it is in a favorable situation for such activity for its entire metropolitan area is within one county. Some of the transfer of functions has been on a charter basis, others purely cooperatively. Weights and measures and public welfare administration have been consolidated completely; property assessment, tax collection, public health, library, and planning services and the courts have been partially consolidated by the county. These examples include both line and staff functions of municipal government. The process of cooperation and integration is by no means complete; as the practice of municipal administration becomes more and more professionalized and scientific the integration of municipal services increases.

Functional consolidation, the technical term for the performance by one unit of local government of a function or functions previously performed by two or more units of government with no change in the structure of local government, is essentially a device for handling ticklish governmental problems without facing the problems caused by the complexity of local government structure. Such a centralization of governmental services, not disturbing existing government boundaries is a compromise between the advantages of unified administration and local self-government. Local government vested interests, the politicians, are not at all fond of functional consolidation but they find it a difficult movement to combat. Not

being able to appeal to patriotism, they find their interests being taken away very gradually.

Cooperation by means of formal contract is more advantageous for municipal action than are informal, personal agreements. Financial and administrative responsibility is clear and definite. The temporary nature of the contracts which is unusual though not required, makes revision of the agreement easy. The uniformity of services formally agreed upon provides economy and efficiency; this is, of course, as true in the case of informal cooperation. Formal consolidation of services makes possible a transition period to a consolidation of governments.

Inter-municipal contracts have definite limitations. The contract method is very valid when the administration of a problem can be handled by uniform action by the respective parties to the contract or the action of the unit handling the problem can be agreed to readily by all parties to the contract. The contract method is not recommended for a continuing problem when independent planning and autonomous execution are essential. In such cases independent government machinery is indicated. The compromises essential in the contract method may endanger long-term, broad-range objectives.

Cooperation between independent and autonomous governmental units is a good method of dealing with an inter-governmental problem; it is by no means an easy method. Every instance of cooperation has been achieved through the overcoming

of a certain amount of local particularism. The subordination of any portion of the interests of an organization to another institution is always accomplished with some unwillingness and often resentment. This is true even with the pressure of war to facilitate cooperation. The experience of Los Angeles during the war is a prime example of the difficulty of obtaining inter-governmental and inter-departmental cooperation, even without the yielding of any autonomy. During the pre-war defense period and the war years, six separate boards, offices, or committees were established to coordinate solving of defense and war problems in the area. As it became evident that one board was not accomplishing the job, another was set up for the same purpose. The field office of the National Resources Planning Board together with the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services of the Federal Security Agency, the Vital Areas Board, the Los Angeles Area Composite Program Planning Committee, the Los Angeles Area Composite Report Survey Committee, the Los Angeles Area Office of the President's Committee for Congested Production Areas, and the Los Angeles County Office of Mobilization were responsible, one after its predecessor, for coordinating war agencies, for cooperating with state and local officials in meeting war-caused problems, for project expediting, for the formulation of comprehensive data, for joint programming. Not all the boards had all these functions. Not until the fifth office was established did coordination efforts become helpful. The sixth office was a local continuation of the fifth, a federal, office. If,

despite the pressure of war, all this effort by war agencies was expended fairly fruitlessly to obtain cooperative action, how can local governments, with no extraordinary pressure, save their own particular interests, be expected to unite efficiently for common purposes?

Governmental cooperation and functional consolidation are excellent practices - as far as they go. However, they do not constitute an attempt to meet the problem of the metropolitan area; at best they are only palliatives. Cooperation acts to smooth over or to go around the basic problems in the urban-suburban areas, not to solve.

The thinking and habits involved in cooperative action are of great value in any trend toward a rational metropolitan government. Cooperation and consolidation will not solve the metropolitan problem but no solution to the problem will be satisfactory without inter-municipal cooperation. Whatever form the government of metropolitan areas may take, functional consolidation and cooperative action will have an important role in the new governmental structure.

#### City-County Consolidation.

Consolidation of cities and counties offers on the face a fairly logical solution for the metropolitan problem. A union of the government of an urban area that occupies most if not all of the area of a county with the government of the county would lessen the multiplicity of governmental units and would make for a more straight forward administration of the area. Such results of city-county consolidation are eminently desirable.

Union of cities and counties, however, is not a simple answer at all to the metropolitan problem. The boundaries of the respective areas present problems immediately. City-county consolidation would seldom be a matter of one county. Consolidation might be relatively easy if, as in the case of Los Angeles, only one county were involved. This is seldom the case; twenty-two counties comprise the New York metropolitan area as defined by the New York Regional Plan Association. Further, the boundaries of a metropolitan area correspond only by coincidence, if at all, with those of the component counties. Both consolidation and separation would have to be used. County separation necessitates the withdrawal of a portion of a county from the remainder of the county, implying its subsequent consolidation with another unit of government. To be effective, all the area of the county or counties that is in the metropolitan area would have to merge into one governmental unit.

The experiences of the few cities that have experimented with consolidation or separation have shown the result of insufficient area inclusion. Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Denver have in varying degrees consolidated with their respective counties; Baltimore and St. Louis have separated from their counties. These are only the outstanding examples, not at all a complete list of partial consolidation instances. In each case the urban area has long since outgrown the city-county boundaries. Not only have the cities been unable to expand, being separate counties, but also the

governmental problems raised by continued urban expansion and decentralization have been met only briefly.

In the case of separation, the opposition of the rump counties would have to be met. Quite naturally, there would be no desire on the part of the portions of the counties not consolidated into one government to be left holding the whole burden of the county, a burden that previously was shared by the more populated and richer portion of the county.

The administrative setting for consolidation appears to be favorable for consolidation, for the county seat is usually the largest city in the county. This is specious reasoning, however, for most counties in metropolitan areas are completely urbanized.

There certainly is no need to have two types of government offering duplicating services in urban areas. Having overlapping city and county governments is nothing but inefficiency, wasteful of time, money, and effort. But consolidation will not be effected merely by arguments citing good management reasons. The opposition to city-county consolidation or county elimination is largely a matter of governmental vested interests, the politicians again. It has been proven time and again that their opposition is powerful. To cite but one example, Pittsburgh has been long trying to consolidate the City of Pittsburgh with Allegheny County. The proposal has been urged repeatedly and even brought to a vote, with no success.

In addition to political reasons for the inability of cities and counties to consolidate, the fundamental reason for the county's being militates against the county being useful in a solution for the metropolitan problem. Essentially the county is an agency of rural government. Its strength in urban areas, whatever it has, is only a hang-over from periods when the city was still a center of a rural area. "The tendency to make the county itself the principal or consolidated area of local administration, however, is less an urban movement in the United States than it is a movement in the rural areas, where the counties are coming to absorb more and more of the local services such as roads, health, and in a few instances even schools."<sup>1</sup> The county does not have enough vitality in the urban areas to become a metropolitan government.

In the interests of efficient government any attempt to consolidate cities and counties or to eliminate urban area counties completely should be encouraged. However, there is too much "sentiment" and not enough life in urban counties to permit them to become the focus of a metropolitan government.

1 Urban Government; Volume I of the Supplementary Report of the Urbanism Committee to the National Resources Committee, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1939, p31.



Municipal Annexation.

Annexation, or, as it is termed more politely, merger, is quite similar to consolidation both in theory and practice. On the face, it is a very logical solution for the metropolitan problem that has not worked out at all in practice. Detroit and Los Angeles being exceptions, there has been very little annexation in the last twenty years. There has been no forcible annexation since Pittsburgh annexed Allegheny in 1907. The metropolis has grown too fast for the clumsy process of merger to keep up with the growth.

The reason given most often for opposition to annexation is local autonomy. The sacred idea of home rule is invoked immediately by suburbs whenever a central city intimates that annexation is desirable. The suburban independence idea, sponsored by realtors and furthered by self-interested politicians,<sup>1</sup> has caused such emotional campaigns for home rule that the annexation movement has practically ceased.

Despite the exaggerated claims made at opportune moments for participation in local government, there is a validity in citizen participation that should not be discarded lightly. The tendency for a population to be nucleated, even within the limits of a large city where the population is organized around sub-centers, demonstrates the value of the local community. Professional planning thought

1 The Metropolitan Problem, Thomas H. Reed; in National Municipal Review, July 1941, Volume XXX, Number 7, p.405.

recognizes the neighborhood as a desirable end. Annexation, not facing the desire for local autonomy, does tend to diminish the opportunity for participation in the governmental process.

The arguments for annexation are much more impressive with the viewpoint of the central city in mind than with that of the suburbs. The central city has much to gain from annexation, the suburbs not so much. All the problems of the metropolitan area that give trouble to the central city are caused by the whole area, not by just the central city. The suburbs are able to ride on the coat tails of the central city.

Central city officials can be just as dogmatic and arbitrary, however, as suburban politicians. Milwaukee, in a publication advocating a policy of annexation, maintained that "Already (1929) we have seen attempts of suburban officials to deprive Milwaukee of its water works and obtain city water through a metropolitan commission. Next would come a demand for a metropolitan fire department, a metropolitan police department, a metropolitan health service, etc. with Milwaukee paying eighty five per cent of the bill and having little if any control over these additional taxing units.

"Therefore, Milwaukee should, from the standpoint of economy and efficiency in government, oppose the creation of additional taxing units and duplicating governments in the metropolitan area. Milwaukee should continue its progressive policy of annexation and unification of government

because this policy offers the only sensible and practical solution of its metropolitan problems, ..." 1.

### Municipal Extra-territorial Jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction of cities over areas outside the political boundaries of cities is a fairly common device in about half of the states for extending municipal powers. Courts have been liberal in the extension of extramural powers for municipal corporations providing services and for governmental units exercising police power outside political boundaries. Extra-territorial jurisdiction is exercised for a definite purpose, milk and water inspection, health services, obnoxious trade control, subdivision control, the provision of utilities, within a specified area or sphere of influence.

At best extra-territorial jurisdiction is a device for easing a specific problem. At worst it gives cities the character of local interest centers competing among themselves for spheres of influence in an already complicated jurisdiction scene. The extension of governmental relationship problems through extra-mural jurisdiction can only result in additional governmental confusion. Such jurisdiction is of some value for unincorporated areas, little for incorporated areas.

### "Ad Hoc" Authorities.

In order to solve specific problems in

1. Making Milwaukee Mightier, Arthur M. Werba and John J. Grunwall; The Board of Public Land Commissions, Milwaukee, 1929, p. 5.

urban areas, states and municipalities have borrowed a device from commerce, the corporation, a particular agency to do a particular job. The form of these agencies, which are termed "ad hoc" authorities, is not rigid or arbitrary. The formal organization and legal basis of authority vary considerably among the different "ad hoc" agencies. There are three general types: the agents of one central government, responsible to the executive or legislative body of the state or federal government; agents of several local units of government, the representatives of the local governments being chosen by the individual units; and distinct units of government, representatives being elected directly.

The purposes for which "ad hoc" authorities have been created vary as widely as do the forms of organization of the agencies. School districts are one of the oldest forms of the independent special authority; library districts are not as numerous as school districts; park, water, sewer, port, and transit authorities are common; special planning agencies are new. Of course, combinations of purposes in one authority are very possible. The New York Port Authority is a prime example of several functions in one agency; the administration of the port of New York, the construction and operation of various tunnels and bridges, the supervision of railroad belt lines, arbitration between food shippers and distributing agents, consultation on packaging standards and farm relief programs in New Jersey, and research in suburban passenger transit problems are combined in

the one authority.

The creation of an agency for a specific purpose does not involve the disruption of an existing unit of government or the displacement of any political or other special interest. However, while "ad hoc" authorities run parallel to local interests in an effort to bypass the problems of suburban particularism, their creation very definitely does complicate the governmental situation. Every new governmental unit in an area adds to the governmental structure confusion.

The specific purposes of "ad hoc" authorities are serious drawbacks to efficient execution of the functions of the whole governmental structure. While an "ad hoc" authority may perform its own duties admirably, it is very apt to have a limited and narrow view of its job. Having definite purposes an "ad hoc" agency is in a sense not performing its job if it takes a comprehensive view of the whole physical area of its authority. Broadly this is, of course, not true, but narrowly the "ad hoc" authority is not constituted to do over-all planning.

The "ad hoc" agency in general has no method of coordinating its work with related work of other agencies. Any correlation is a result of individual cooperation, not a result of an administrative mechanism. In a state government, for instance, the governor is responsible with authority for the coordination of the work of the state departments. There is no such mechanism for "ad hoc" authorities. They are responsible principally to themselves. In speaking of London it is

said "the eight or nine million inhabitants of the metropolis are apparently to be sacrificed for an indefinite period to a reign of "ad hoc" bodies, manned by experts pursuing their own separate, specialized paths unrestrained by any consideration of the wider interests of the whole, until such time as disintegration produced intolerable results."<sup>1</sup> Although this statement must be applied to the United States with moderation, it does illustrate well the separate and individual nature of the "ad hoc" authority. And metropolitan areas need much interrelation and coordination!

The lack of democratic control common to "ad hoc" authorities is a serious disability. The debt incurring power of the specific agencies is often not subject to regular procedures that are designed to insure public control. The responsibility of the independent corporate governmental bodies is largely to themselves, not to the public. In all the suggestions that perhaps the "ad hoc" authorities might amalgamate into a metropolitan government, there is no mention of the undemocratic nature of the authorities. How they could be subjected to formal popular pressure has not been discussed.

The organization of the "ad hoc" authority is so definite, particular and limited in its purpose that a gradual change is unlikely. The particular interests of the specific agencies do not foster a merging of authorities. The lack of machinery for joint consultation and the independent corporate status of specific authorities which is a bar to

1. The Government and Misgovernment of London, William A. Robson; George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. London, 1939

the maximum utilization of the resources of one unit which may be useful to another militate against a union of "ad hoc" authorities.

It is not impossible, however, that as the number and confusion of "ad hoc" authorities becomes greater, a compendious unit of metropolitan government will develop, incorporating many functions of a consolidated municipality. To a certain extent this is now taking place. The very listing of the functions of the New York Port Authority illustrates this. The Boston Metropolitan District Commission exemplifies the tendency in a small way. Robert Moses in New York has merged all his bridge authorities into the one Triborough Bridge Authority. Certainly, however, no great measure of democratic control is present in any of these amalgamations.

Amalgamation is a possibility in the metropolitan area. A union of "ad hoc" authorities will probably not come inevitably; there will be too much opposition by the authorities themselves. Rather, it will come as a result of the efforts of one person, as in the case of the Triborough Bridge Authority, through gradual accretions of power and authority.

Consolidation of "ad hoc" agencies, despite their narrow viewpoint and undemocratic aspect, together with increased emphasis on inter-governmental

cooperation and functional consolidation will probably be the pattern for the development of a metropolitan government. There are many reasons why such a merger will not be definite or final - or even desirable - but "ad hoc" authorities do exist and will continue to be a powerful influence in the future structure of the government of the metropolitan area.

### Municipal-State Relations.

Municipal governments are not, in our governmental structure, absolute entities. The authority and responsibility of a city are derived not from the fact of its own existence but from a superior governmental unit, the state. This being so, it is quite natural for cities to look to the state for assistance in meeting problems that are too much for an individual city.

Assistance given by the state to municipalities has resulted, of course, in increased supervision and control of local cities by state governments. In matters of taxation, preparation of operating and capital budgets, control of expenditures, and the operation of various government protective services state are continually extending their control over municipalities.

While the states are losing much of their reason for being as central governments that made the state



an important unit of government in time of poor communication, the states are assuming new and additional duties as intermediary agents between the federal government and local individual towns and cities. Much federal aid is channeled through the states for supervision and administration. It is possible that the region, encompassing several states or portions of states, will usurp the role of the state as intermediary agent. For the present, however, the state has a continuing role as an administrative aid to the federal government.

The more that cities look to the states for assistance in meeting their own problems, the more will the city lose its right to exercise individual initiative and to be responsible for its own future. Further, state aid to municipalities can not by itself solve all local problems; state aid can only help in the solution of a local problem. States are now conscious of their responsibility to municipalities in the metropolitan problem; thinking and action on the state level concerning metropolitan areas is increasing. However, the problems of large urban areas will not be solved by state assumption of the problem.

#### Municipal-Federal Relations.

The problems raised by relations between municipalities and the federal government are essentially the same as those between states and cities, the same but much more acute. There is much more financial power behind

the authority of the federal government than behind state governments.

Federal services for cities are growing and expanding in the establishment of minimum standards for various types of governmental endeavour in which the federal government is interested. The regulation of business practices, social security provision, health and sanitation measures, education encouragement, the construction of public works, food and drug regulation are increasingly becoming responsibilities of the federal government. This development is occurring less through direct operation of services than through the establishment of minimum standards by means of fiscal aid to local units of government. In fields of activity in which the federal government is operating, state and local initiative is coming increasingly to be forced to operate within the framework of federal standards. The federal government is accomplishing the establishment of standards through financial pressure by increased federal taxation, federal spending, and federal credit. Federal aid to local governments, given upon the fulfillment of requirements may be in the form of outright grants, grants-in-aid, or as credit.

More and more effort is being expended by federal government in its relations with local units of government. Direct relations with cities, unthinkable under a literal interpretation of the constitution, are

becoming common. While such an action would not be possible at present, it is entirely feasible that, as the legal bases for federal governmental action are changed gradually, the increased functions of the central government regarding local communities may become institutionalized in a Department of Urban Affairs.

Federal aid is a powerful method of obtaining local cooperation in federal programs, a method which can be used and abused. At present, the iron hand in the velvet glove is functioning well with much consideration for local interests. The operation of the United States Public Housing Authority is an excellent example of deference to local responsibility by a federal agency. The Authority is quite decentralized. Local authorities are responsible for site selection, project planning and construction, and for project operation; the federal authority gives only financial assistance - and advice.

Receiving federal aid is a very attractive prospect to municipalities but one that may well help a municipality become atrophied. Cities receiving federal aid may become dependent upon the aid, reducing the respective expenditures when aid is withdrawn. The cessation of the activities of many state planning boards when the National Resources Committee aid was withdrawn is illustrative of this definite possibility.

Grants to local governments for specific

purposes actually have the effect of limiting the discretion of local governments. This is especially true when the grant is so large in respect to local revenues that the local unit is not free to decide what should be spent on various services. If local expenditure discretion is lost because of the excessive size of federal aid, then local self-government is but a form, not an actuality.

It would be a brave city that would refuse federal aid on the grounds that the right of self-government was being denied it. The influence of financial aid is very persuasive. Federal aid must be continued, for local communities are unable to raise enough money for their needs and problems, but at the same time local responsibility for the expenditure of aid received should be maintained and increased. "The equalizing and stimulating grants for specific purposes should be minimized and emphasis placed on redistributive grants intended frankly to offset the narrow scope and inflexible character of local government taxing power." <sup>1</sup>

The balance between local control and central finance is delicate. Each level of government quite naturally wants to extend its own authority and responsibility; it is extremely difficult to minimize one's own authority and influence and voluntarily yield responsibility

1. Federal-State-Local Fiscal Relations, Thomas H. Reed; Municipal Finance Officers Association, Chicago, 1942, p. 59.

to another. The federal government is at present maintaining the primacy of local interests. The constitutional basis of the government fosters such action - but the constitutional basis of government changes.

In the administering of federal aid to local municipalities assistance is given both directly to local communities and through state governments. In the development of metropolitan government it is very likely that direct relations between the new unit of government and the federal government would be established. In essence, the state is now an arbitrary unit of government. It is no longer necessary as a central government as it was in the colonial period and in the early days of the republic. The principal reason for federal dealings with municipalities through states is that the authority of cities is derived directly from the state. A metropolitan government ideally would not need to be dependent on the state for its authority.

Metropolitan problems are too large to be solved by municipalities alone; federal assistance is required. Federal aid in the metropolitan problem will come in the further growth of federal services for cities and in the growth of the number of relationships between the federal government and the municipalities that bypass the state. Much judgment and moderation are necessary in the application of federal aid to large urban areas lest

federal standards and financial assistance become rigid and arbitrary for the solution of the numerous and complex metropolitan problems.

### Federation.

The most practical ideal solution for the metropolitan governmental problem is the formation of an additional unit of government in the area, a federated metropolitan government. A federated government would utilize existing local government units as its basis for representation and services. A federated government for a large urban area has many disadvantages; it is by no means the perfect solution to the problem. It is, however, the most perfect solution that stands a chance of being executed.

Federation would maintain the sacred fires of local autonomy while at the same time providing a central government to cope with problems involving the whole urban and suburban area. Federation bypasses hostility resulting from annexation or consolidation proposals. Although federation is more practical than other metropolitan government propositions, political practicality by itself is no reason for advancing a suggestion. A federated government would be able to provide governmental services on a metropolitan scale.

The two principal examples of a fed-

erated government for a metropolitan area are New York and London, neither of which either is a true federation or governs an entire metropolitan area. In every instance of federation, the tendency has been toward centralization at the expense of the semi-autonomous units.

The boroughs of New York City, comparable to local governmental units in a true federation, actually have no legislative power. They are administrative divisions of the board of public works. The president of each borough acts in a legislative capacity on the Board of Estimate but that does not constitute a local government. Each borough has a planning commission. Since the planning commission of the city is unwilling to give the borough commissions any voice or authority, the borough commissions are completely ineffective. New York City is a federation in theoretical structure only.

The government of London County is more truly a federated government than is that of New York City. The local governments, the Metropolitan Borough Councils, have considerable legislative and administrative power. Departments of Engineering, Health, Treasury, Valuation, Libraries, Parks, and other minor functions are administered by an elective council having legislative power. The government of

the entire County is the County Council. Its elective council administers departments of the Controller, the Engineer, the Architect, the Solicitor, Health, Valuation, Public Control, Parks, Education, Supply and Social Welfare. The County Council levies assessments on the boroughs and the boroughs have taxing power. While the individual boroughs have considerable authority, the tendency has been for the power of the County Council to increase at the expense of the Borough Councils.

Many proposals for a federated government for metropolitan areas have been advanced. To elevate the county to be the central government unit, to preserve existing municipalities, to abolish the existing municipalities in favor of larger governmental subdivisions, to delegate specific power to the central government with all residual power left to the local municipalities, and the reverse of such allocation of power are examples of the various proposals. Methods of representation and election are as numerous.

In order to be an effective governing body, a federal metropolitan government would have to have the power of assessment and taxation. If local units of government had any substantial measure of financial autonomy, they could disregard at will the central government. Central financial control is necessary also



to equalize governmental services throughout the entire metropolitan area, at least to bring the poorer governments in the area up to an established minimum. There is nothing in federation that would prevent a local member of the federation from providing additional services or levying additional taxes if it so wished. A federated government would have to take its financial power from the component communities and, as necessary, from the state.

Despite the trend toward centralization in partially federated metropolitan governments, and indeed, in all levels of government, federation should mean administrative and political decentralization. Federation gives an opportunity for the governing of local areas and the solution of local problems by local units of government and the governing of metropolitan areas and the solution of metropolitan problems by a metropolitan unit of government. Perhaps such a decentralization of authority of authority is utopian; the tendency is in the opposite direction. For instance, in the Los Angeles City annexations each community annexed to the large city has the opportunity of forming a borough council to act in an advisory capacity to the central government. Admittedly this is a weak provision of local government but it has never been exercised.

The executive officer of a large federated metropolitan government would have to be elected,

a mayor rather than a manager. Too much policy determination and too many relations with component, state, and federal units of government are involved in metropolitan government to permit the executive to be appointed by the legislative body. Efficient management is admirable but the executive officer is a governmental leader as well as a governmental manager.

It is probable that the advantages of a federated system of government outweigh the disadvantages. Federated metropolitan government would result in a more efficient performance of the area-wide functions of government than does their performance by many separate units; local autonomy would be maintained; each locality could be given the type and amount of services it desires, over a minimum; tax differentials could be provided for the central city and the richer and poorer satellites. To cite disadvantages: an additional unit of government would be created; a dual system of government is more complicated than a single system; a federated system of government may well prove to be expensive, its efficiency being unproven.

Metropolitan federation is the only proposal that allows direct differentiation between metropolitan and local problems and provides a government for each type of problem. Given a proper measure of

authority by means of the power of taxation, a federated government for a metropolitan area is the most feasible governmental solution that recognizes the peculiar nature of the problem, its metropolitan character.

Miscellaneous Metropolitan Government Possibilities.

Proposals that are more novel than practical have been advanced for the solution of the metropolitan governmental problem. These include suggestions for a regional council with veto power, for a city-state, and for a completely new city.

The first prize winning proposal<sup>1</sup> in the American Society of Planning Officials' Contest for proposals for the organization for metropolitan planning suggests the establishment of a regional council for a metropolitan area, composed of representatives of the federal, state and the central city governments, that would have the power of review and veto over proposals by the component governments involving financial or area commitments concerning the metropolitan area. The power of veto would necessitate active planning so that the council could approve or disapprove proposals with reason.

<sup>1</sup>First Prize Winner, Harvey F. Pinney; Organization for Metropolitan Planning, Four Proposals for Regional Councils; American Society of Planning Officials, Chicago, 1943.

The proposal is excellent as far as it goes - but it does not go very far. The regional council is not given any financial control over the area. It is hard to see why a government, especially the federal government, should submit to control of fund expenditures by a council that has no responsibility for the collection of those funds. Those who get money want to spend it.

The remaining two proposals, that for a city-state and that for a completely new city, are practically identical; certainly the objections to each are the same. These suggestions may be the simplest type to put on paper, for all existing administrative and legislative structures and problems can be ignored - but such a procedure is completely unrealistic. One unit of government for the metropolitan area is not at all the ideal, for participation in and feeling toward the new government would be nil. A single large unit of government for the metropolitan area would involve about as much individual emotion and action as does the federal government.

#### Existing Planning for Metropolitan Areas.

Planning for metropolitan areas is carried on to a limited degree at present by various institutions, both public and private. Other types of present public planning activity can have influence on

planning for metropolitan areas. Private metropolitan planning organizations, inter-governmental planning activity, planning action by "ad hoc" authorities, and the influence of state and federal planning can affect metropolitan areas.

#### Private Planning Institutions.

Private planning institutions, encompassing the area of more than one governmental unit, in general have a policy of stimulation of and cooperation with official planning action. The emphasis in the activity of the private planning is on collaborative and advisory functions, not on direct participation. The New York Regional Plan Association, for example, has said that it can claim some success if its only accomplishment is the stirring up of local planning. The functions of the Regional Association of Cleveland are to encourage the expansion of official planning agencies, to provide consulting services, to make technical studies, and to encourage education for planning. The Regional Planning Federation of the Tri-State Metropolitan Area of Philadelphia has established similar functions. Some of the private planning organizations that are concerned with the area of more than one municipality have maintained in the past that cooperative action

can accomplish most of the solution of the metropolitan problems, that doubtful benefits are contingent on the creation of a government body with metropolitan jurisdiction. Whatever the private organizations may have said concerning their basic philosophy they have accomplished much not only in the stimulation of specific programs but also in the encouragement of the idea of the metropolis as an entity. That there is a consciousness of the needs of the metropolitan area is to a great measure due to the work of the private planning organizations. Even though the private associations are being called upon to perform more and more work of a semi-official nature in both a coordinating and a technical role, their primary value is their ability to stay apart from governmental policy and detail, remaining free to advise and to criticize impartially. In this role the private planning institutions are extremely useful and worthwhile. An official metropolitan planning agency will be very fortunate if it has an alert private planning body available to provide criticism and advice.

#### Cooperative Planning Action.

In the field of inter-governmental planning action cooperation is the keynote. Some planning is being done by associated governmental units but it is

all done on a basis of action among equals. No one member of any group has power over any of the other members, nor do the associations have any authority in themselves. In order to carry planning by several associated governmental units beyond the stage of platitudinous utterance, active cooperation is absolutely necessary, since positive authority is lacking at present.

Cooperation and, in planning agencies with a little measure of autonomous authority, coordination, are the basic ideas of inter-governmental planning commissions. Even in time of emergency it is very difficult for a local governmental unit to yield any of its authority to a coordinating agency. The Hampton Roads Regional Defense Council, for instance, was established on a purely coordinating basis; it had no authority of its own.

Educational and advisory functions occupy most of the effort of the Harrisburg Regional Planning Commission. Although its enabling act permits local planning boards to delegate to the regional planning commission all of their planning duties, actually the regional commission is limited to the giving of advice to local boards. It aids local planning boards in the consideration of sub-division development, with city and state aid studies regional traffic problems,

and advises on zoning problems.

The Cincinnati City Planning Commission, with the cooperation of the Metropolitan Planning Committee which is composed of representatives of the other governments in the metropolitan area, has assumed the initiative in the preparation of a metropolitan master plan. The metropolitan committee includes representatives of towns in both Ohio and Kentucky.

The Toledo City Planning Commission and the Lucas County Planning Commission operate out of one office; the engineer, the assistant engineer, and office personnel are the same for both commissions. Three members of the city planning commission are also members of the county planning commission.

Coordinating committees of similar administrative agencies meeting to facilitate the solution of joint, specific problems are becoming more and more common. While such committees are not concerned with overall planning, they are a definite step toward more cooperative action.

Purely consultative and advisory bodies such as the Massachusetts Federation of Planning Boards, exchanging and discussing professional views and problems, are an additional medium furthering inter-governmental cooperation.



The work of inter-governmental planning associations must not be neglected, however, merely because they are not a part of one government with power. Cooperative action is of too much value both in itself and in its resulting governmental habits to be cast aside arbitrarily. The metropolitan governmental problem will not be solved by voluntary cooperation alone - nor will it be solved without cooperative action. Cooperative thinking and action are excellent methods of beginning to overcome the jealousy of local prerogatives that are so big an obstacle to metropolitan action.

#### County Planning.

The influence of the county in metropolitan planning is good and of value as far as it goes. That the boundaries of the county coincide with those of the metropolitan area by happenstance if at all, militates against the county being a very practical medium for metropolitan planning.

The outstanding instance of county planning for a metropolitan area is in Los Angeles. California has established regional planning districts; in the case of Los Angeles, the Regional Planning District and the County have coincident boundaries

so the planning commissions of the two have been made identical. The Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles is a very active commission and its policy of cooperation with the planning commissions of the county constituent cities has been practiced consistently.

Not all urban counties are planning so well for the metropolitan area. The area of Hamilton County, Ohio, which has a Regional Planning Commission, is fairly identical with the Cincinnati metropolitan area, yet it is the Cincinnati City Planning Commission which has assumed the responsibility in formulating a metropolitan master plan. The authority of the Regional Planning Commission is limited to advice to component towns and control of unincorporated areas.

County planning can be of assistance in metropolitan planning affairs but the influence of the county in urban areas is in general not strong enough to enable county planning to be of much use.

#### "Ad Hoc" Authority Planning.

The planning of "ad hoc" authorities affecting metropolitan areas has the same faults concerning metropolitan affairs as do the authorities themselves. The same criticism can be made concerning any specific department planning in any level of

government. Department or "ad hoc" authority planning tends too much to be of limited scope to be of much value in overall planning. The specific thinking involved in a particular action agency is quite necessary for its own program, but specific thinking does not make for coordinated plans. It is an extraordinary agency that can consider basic aspects of a problem concomitantly with its details. Planning by "ad hoc" authorities must be a part of an overall metropolitan plan, but merely an assembly of various agency plans will not result in an effective plan.

#### State Aid for Planning.

The assistance that states have given to local communities in planning activities may influence planning for metropolitan areas. The state, being to an increasing measure responsible for the action of individual cities, has increased not only the amount of assistance but also the amount of actual participation in local affairs.

At best, state action regarding local planning is a beneficial paternal influence. The Tennessee State Planning Board cooperates actively with local communities in providing both guidance and technical aid for local planning. In the early stages of planning in a community, funds for planning are supplied

largely by the state - and the Tennessee Valley Authority - to individual towns. As planning becomes firmly established in a given community, that community is supposed to assume more and more of the financial burden of planning. Although there is a great temptation for the towns to continue dependent on the state for such financial assistance, the system is working out in practice. Such practices must be executed with judgment and moderation lest the state find itself carrying all the financial burden of planning. Planning paid for by such beneficence alone cannot hope to have good support from the respective communities.

At worst, state action regarding local planning can be either a complete domination or a complete ignoring of local planning. One is as bad as the other, especially in the case of metropolitan government, for the problems of the metropolitan area cannot be solved by the action of merely one governmental agency.

In any state action concerning large urban areas there is the danger that the respective state policies will be dominated by the portion of the state that is not urban. This is a very common situation; the "down-state" or "up-state" influence on the state legislature is actively disliked by metropolitan areas. Perhaps a single metropolitan

government would be able to offset the rural influence on state action.

The desuetude into which the Division of Metropolitan Planning of the Boston Metropolitan District Commission has fallen is illustrative of results of state neglect. In 1941 the Division was merged with the Massachusetts State Planning Board and practically speaking hasn't been heard from since.

A state planning board probably would not spend much time in the encouraging of planning in a metropolitan government; it would conserve its energies for local communities lacking in financial resources. However, the influence of the state in metropolitan affairs, both actual and potential in the state's being the source of authority of a metropolitan government, must not be minimized. A metropolitan government planning agency would have to work in cooperation with the state government and planning board if it desires accomplishment of plans that affect other than just the metropolitan area.

#### Federal Aid for Planning.

The relation of urban planning to federal assistance for planning is in general much the same as are the municipal-state planning relationships -

the stimulation of local planning activity by means of financial assistance and encouragement.

Federal aid for local planning has been given by three general methods: cooperative contracts, as in the Tennessee Valley Authority relations with state planning boards; requirements that projects to be constructed with federal financial assistance conform to a local plan; and outright encouragement and technical assistance given by the National Resources Planning Board and its predecessors.

Before 1940 the Tennessee Valley Authority had no formal mechanism for the encouragement of local planning. Much was accomplished, however, by the customary Authority method of cooperation and personal contact. In 1940 regular planning assistance programs were established. In these, the Authority by means of cooperative contracts work with the state planning boards to foster local planning. The State commissions are responsible for the initiation and guiding of local programs; the Authority supplies funds equal to those provided by the state, and technical personnel. The cooperation between the states and the Tennessee Valley Authority is very close and active, resulting in much local planning stimulation.

The Federal Works Authority requires that every application for an advance plan preparation must show that the desired project conforms to an over-all plan that has been approved by the respective competent government. The requiring of plan conformity is a basic part of the federal government's public works programs, resulting quite naturally from a desire to see federal funds expected wisely. At present, the financial authority of the federal government is being used judiciously in deferring to and requiring of local planning; there always is the possibility of arbitrary direction.

The National Resources Planning Board before its demise worked through state planning boards in its stimulation of local planning. The N.R.P.B. furnished technical consultants to state planning boards, participated in the interrelating of planning activity among several planning agencies, and collaborated with special commissions on regional problems. If metropolitan governments had been in existence, the N.R.P.B. would very likely have worked directly with the metropolitan planning agencies.

Many agencies of the federal government give assistance to other governmental units in various phases of planning<sup>1</sup>. A metropolitan

<sup>1</sup>Federal Aids to Local Planning, National Resources Planning Board; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1941, 151 pp.

planning agency would need to know the best methods of utilizing federal planning services provided.

A metropolitan planning agency would probably have direct relations with the various federal agencies concerned with urban affairs. A large metropolitan government would be so strong and the respective state governments would be so weak in relation to the metropolitan government that there would be no need for the metropolitan government to have the state as an intermediary in its relations with the federal government. Federal planning activity, both direct participation and financial encouragement, will continue to expand in the field of municipal affairs and will be very important to a metropolitan planning agency.

### Conclusions.

The organizations and governments that can help in the planning of metropolitan areas are several and diverse; they are not, however, systematized at all; there is no coordination among them on a metropolitan basis. Various of the different planning agencies can make definite contributions to the solution of specific metropolitan problems; no one can solve the whole problem of "conurbations". An institution solely concerned with metropolitan planning would have to correlate the efforts



of all the planning and action agencies that have interest in metropolitan areas. Much of the correlation process would of necessity be a definite understanding of how much work could be left to outside agencies, how much the metropolitan planning agency would not have to do.

Certainly there is no point in a metropolitan government trying to supplant all the activities of other governmental units, in disestablishing all the foundations of cooperative action that have been built up gradually by agencies concerned both financially and politically with metropolitan areas.

The present complex, uncoordinated structure of planning for metropolitan areas, distributed among several government units, illustrates well the necessity of having one unit of government to be a focus of metropolitan activity, to have authority over the metropolitan area. The existing emphasis on cooperation that is easing some of the problems of large urban areas is very definitely valid but it is not enough. More power in an urban central government is needed to give adequate governmental sanction to metropolitan planning, to facilitate the execution of plans. If a metropolitan

government is given sufficient authority, then its planning agency can have vitality. Planning for an organization without authority and power is essentially planning in a vacuum. An active and responsive planning

agency can best be a part of that metropolitan government that has power. Essentially it matters little what form of metropolitan government evolves so long as it encompasses the entire metropolitan area and has authority in the entire area. If it should happen that the urban county was revitalized <sup>and</sup> amalgamated to include a whole urban and suburban area, planning could be a vital part of that form of metropolitan government.

The future course of metropolitan government will probably be a continuing formation and merger of "ad hoc" authorities. Although such agencies, formed to meet specific situations, are makeshifts in the whole metropolitan problem, they are the only metropolitan tendency that is at present at all vital. Merger of governmental agencies into one metropolitan government will probably be reached through the efforts of a positive personality, rather than through an inevitable trend. The particular aspects of "ad hoc" authorities militates against merger by other than definite and positive action.

As the merging process continues, it is possible that a pattern of federalization in metropolitan government will appear. Certainly a federated government for large urban areas is the

solution that is both most ideal and most possible of accomplishment. Federation attempts to meet both the problems of the metropolitan area and those raised by local particularism.

It is unlikely that any of the other possible forms of government for metropolitan areas will develop. The other possibilities discussed are too much devices to be realistic. The merger of "ad hoc" authorities considers existing tendencies; federation considers the practical and ideal aspects of the metropolitan problem. None of the other governmental solutions do either.

Whatever the future pattern of metropolitan government may be, the federal emphasis in metropolitan affairs will continue. This is especially true in the financial contribution of and resulting control by the federal government. Metropolitan problems have too many national aspects for the federal government to ignore. A metropolitan government must continue to expect and cooperate with federal participation in metropolitan affairs.

There is, however, no one single answer that can be given to the problem of a metropolitan organization. The definite answer will be different

for each metropolis, depending much on specific situations. The different types of possible organization are not mutual exclusive; several may be used together as the local problems require.

In any case, a metropolitan government must have authority. This can only come basically from the possession of the power to levy and collect taxes. The taxation power must be taken from the component municipalities and vested in the metropolitan government. If the central government does not possess this power, it has no compelling force over the local communities.

In a definite metropolitan government, complete extinction of local governing units is neither necessary nor desirable. A metropolitan government can exist simultaneously with and derive strength from local communities. At the same time, the metropolitan government problem is completely unsolvable if exaggerated and bigoted ideas of local particularism prevail. Individual municipalities must be ready to yield some of their prerogatives to the central government and the metropolitan government cannot expect to assume all the powers of all the component governments.

Metropolitan government cannot

be achieved if attention is paid only to specific projects and problems. The overall aspects of the metropolitan area problem must be considered. It is the inability of "ad hoc" authorities to consider the basic area problem that makes them but a makeshift in the solution of the whole problem. An adequate solution to the governmental problem must consider the relation of the metropolitan government to other government units and must have fundamental attitudes concerning the metropolitan area developed.

THE PLANNING AGENCY IN THE STRUCTURE OF METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT.

The Place of a Planning Agency in the Government Organization.

In order to determine the place in the structure of government that best enables an official planning agency to execute its duties, the functions of both the executive and legislative branches of government must be studied. Both branches, as is the planning agency, are responsible to some extent for policy determination.

It is the legislative arm of government that is responsible fundamentally for policy determination. In theory, the legislature formulates and defines the basic policies of a governmental unit; in practice, it does make final decisions on specific policies and practices. Such a responsibility certainly seems to necessitate a technical group to advise the legislative body on both basic and specific policies. If the planning function in government were limited to just general policy determination, the planning agency might well be attached to the legislative body in an advisory capacity.

However, the planning agency in government has much more to do than merely to advise any organization concerning community development policies. Limiting the planning agency by placing it under the legislative branch of government would be depriving it of much of its

reason for being.

Aside from theoretical considerations, the planning agency should not be controlled by the legislature for a much more practical reason. A man cannot serve two masters. If the planning agency were subject to a legislative body, it never would know what it was doing. It would be impossible for one agency to serve well all the members of a legislative body, no matter how considerate and well organized the legislative body might be.

The executive arm of government has in general three functions: to provide a system of governmental and public-governmental communication, to promote the securing of desired and essential governmental efforts, and to formulate and define purpose. The last function belongs ultimately, of course, to the legislative branch of the government but the executive has the responsibility of leading and encouraging the legislature, for the presentation to the legislature of information and recommendations. The planning agency is qualified to implement the policy definition function of the executive; it also can aid the executive in his other two functions. The planning agency in a government structure has much concern with implementing policy execution, with the dissemination of public information concerning community development, and with the coordination of governmental activities. These responsibilities

of the planning agency are part of the first two functions of the executive. The planning agency has much work to do besides policy determination advice, efforts that are part of the executive's functions; a planning agency should be responsible to the executive branch of the government.

### The Relation of a Planning Agency to the Executive.

Whether metropolitan government evolves from a merger of "ad hoc" authorities or a federated form of government comes directly, the executive arm of the new government should have the planning function responsible to it. A planning agency can be associated with the executive of a government by two methods: by an advisory, semi-autonomous position in the governmental structure and by direct and immediate accountability to the executive. The first of these methods is conventional for planning commissions in United States governments; the second is used partially only by the New York City Planning Commission.

The advisory position of planning in government is designed to keep the planning agency free from political influence and to help popular participation in the planning of the development of an area. The position of a planning agency directly responsible to the executive of a government facilitates the making of administrative



policy in addition to area development planning. Although a metropolitan government would be far too big to permit its structure to be predicated on a citizen participation basis, the two methods of relating planning to the executive are not entirely mutually exclusive. It is true that popular participation in the planning process for large metropolitan areas will have to be secured by methods other than membership on the planning commission, but administrative policy formulation does not per se enable a planning agency to be arbitrary in its development plans and merely because a planning agency is accountable directly to the executive does not of necessity mean that it is controlled by the executive officer of the government unit.

While it is generally admitted that a planning agency can be an aid to the executive in overall administration and current management, there is still considerable question that the planning agency should be exclusively appurtenant to the executive. It has been maintained that an agency whose function it is to determine the future development and character of a city cannot be considered as being tied closely to either the executive or legislative branch of the government. However, a planning board cannot exist profitably in a vacuum; in order to function well it must be closely

related to its government, more closely related than by the happenstance of cooperation. It is not the planning agency that determines the future development of a community but the community itself. The planning agency is only the particular agency that is established to reflect the attitudes of the community by means of expert opinion in the government.

Since the formulation and definition of purpose is a function of the executive, the specific agency that enables the executive to fulfill that function must be closely associated to the executive. "The formulation and definition of purpose is ..... a widely distributed function, only the more general part of which is executive. In this fact lies the most important inherent difficulty in the operation of cooperative systems - the necessity for indoctrinating those at the lower levels with general purposes, the major decisions, so that they remain cohesive and able to make the ultimate detailed decisions coherent; and the necessity, for those at the higher levels, of constantly understanding the concrete conditions and specific decisions of the 'ultimate' contributors from which and from whom executives are often insulated. Without that up-and-down-the-line coordination of purposeful decisions, general decisions and grand purposes are merely intellectual processes in an organizational vacuum, insulated from

realities by layers of misunderstanding. The function of formulating grand purposes and providing for their redefinition is one which needs sensitive systems of communication, experience in interpretation, imagination, and delegation of responsibility." <sup>1</sup> And most planning commissions are only advisory bodies!

That a semi-autonomous planning commission with an advisory role in the governmental structure would be free from control has been one of the principal arguments for such a type of planning commission. That semi-autonomous planning commissions can be subjected to control, either political or other special interest, even though their place in the government is designed to free them from such control, need not be discussed here. Nor, at the same time, need the fact that with increased scientific public administration a planning agency directly responsible to the executive will not necessarily be subject to the political whims of the executive be discussed here. Both depend much on specific circumstances.

In considering the advisability of providing administrative mechanisms designed to prevent the

<sup>1</sup>The Functions of The Executive, Chester I. Barnard; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1938.

influence of special interest on planning commissions, the work of the planning agency itself must be weighed. The functions of the planning agency must be considered first; a planning agency cannot operate well if it is hamstrung by devices designed to prevent political control. The best insurance against such influence is the efficient operation of the agency itself. Perhaps the advisory planning commission is free of political restraint but it is also free of an efficient relation with the government it is supposedly serving. The desirability of adding the executive in his thinking and planning responsibilities overcomes disadvantages caused by the possibility of political domination of a metropolitan planning agency by the executive office having the planning agency directly accountable to itself.

Nevertheless, a planning agency does not need to be a babe in the woods. A planning agency can be so organized even with direct accountability to the executive as to militate against special interest domination. A commission organization with members having long overlapping terms can be as effective for the prevention of political influence for a planning commission that is responsible directly to the executive as for an advisory commission.

It can be argued that a board type of organization is not feasible if the agency is to be directly responsible to the executive, that if close contact to and control by the executive is to be maintained, a single head for an agency is necessary. This is true for operating departments in which specific action, not continuous thinking, is the function of the department. It is not true, however, for a planning agency whose function it is to advise the executive. A planning agency in order to prevent stagnation must have a variety of minds and opinions; a single head of a planning agency would make for not only stilted but also unrepresentative planning board opinions. A single head for a planning agency is both unnecessary for the executive and undesirable for the agency itself.

New York City has experienced difficulty in the operation of a planning commission with a multiple head. It was found that each member of the commission wanted to issue commission administrative orders, a practice which resulted in much confusion among the technical personnel of the commission. This hindrance to efficient administration can be overcome by a clear delegation of commission administrative authority to the chairman alone.

The advisability of long overlapping terms as a device to counteract political control has been questioned. Since the executives of governmental units increasingly are becoming strong, and such would be the case in a metropolitan government, the executive must have confidence in the planning agency or else reliance will not be placed in the agency nor will funds for the agency be forthcoming. To maintain confidence, devices such as overlapping terms and removal restrictions are held to be undesirable. To a certain extent this is true. Certainly the executive must have confidence in the planning commission. However, the necessity in a planning agency for the continuity of thought outweighs the disadvantages to executive confidence resulting from long overlapping terms. Community planning cannot be done overnight; much time and effort are essential. The reserve of thought concerning both specific problems and an entire area that is accumulated by a planning agency in its daily operation must not be arbitrarily thrown away at the pleasure of the executive. If this is true of community planning it is even more pertinent for metropolitan planning with its larger problems.

The executive does not need the device of control of the tenure of office of the planning agency

members. Just the fact that he is the executive officer of the areas is sufficient to give him sufficient control over the planning commission. The planning commission needs the confidence of the executive to effect any changes in governmental policy; the planning commission needs the confidence of the executive to effect the accomplishment of a specific project; the planning commission needs the confidence of the executive to secure funds for its own operation. The executive of a metropolitan area need not be concerned that the planning agency will be dominant through its own efforts.

The mechanics of the composition of a metropolitan agency that will be directly responsible to the executive are quite straightforward: a full-time, paid commission having departmental status, with long, overlapping terms, appointed by the executive. It is probable that only the larger metropolitan areas could afford a full-time, paid agency. Perhaps in smaller metropolitan areas only a chairman need be full-time, the other members being reimbursed per diem. In either case, the planning agency should be a staff agency of the executive. The exact number of years in a term is unimportant, as long as the term length enables a continuous thought pattern to be established. The New

York City Planning Commission has an eight year term. The total membership on the metropolitan planning agency should be small in order to enable the executive to maintain contact easily with the agency. The number of members should, of course, be uneven. A membership of seven would permit two members to be from the central city, two from the suburbs, one from the state, one from the federal government, and one to be apportioned as required by the particular situation. Nine members would raise the central city and suburb representation to three each. The planning agency membership representation is discussed below.

#### The Suspensive Veto.

The suspensive veto, the requirement of an extraordinary majority in the legislative body to overrule an action of a planning board, has been advanced as a means of giving a planning agency more authority than the customary advisory structure of planning commissions permits. If a planning board desires to be in an independent position in the government the suspensive veto is an anomaly, for it is the legislative body that should be the final policy determining agency, not a semi-autonomous board. The suspensive veto gives an advisory planning commission an undue amount of authority over the elective legislative body.



The suspensive veto held by the planning agency is equally anomalous if the planning agency is directly responsible to the executive. It would be giving the executive an extraordinary control over the legislative body. If a project disapproved by a planning agency had to be passed by a two-thirds vote of the legislative body in the first submission of the project to the legislative body, the executive would have essentially two opportunities to veto a project, the first submission and his own, normal veto power.

A planning agency directly accountable to the executive is in a position to ease the executive's responsibility in project approval. A provision that all prospective changes in the physical structure of the metropolitan area that are subject to governmental control be approved by the planning commission before submission to the legislative body would enable the planning commission to exercise directly an executive function of project approval.

The legislative body ought to be able to override the decisions of the planning board by a simple majority. If the planning agency wished to continue to oppose a legislative overruling, it could advise the executive to veto the measure. If the measure was vetoed, a two-thirds vote by the legislative body would

be necessary to pass the measure finally.

THE DUTIES OF THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCYThe Scope of the Activities of a Metropolitan Planning Agency.

The sum total of the activities of a metropolitan planning agency should result in a public policy for the metropolitan area. Since the area comprising metropolitan districts is so large and the problems of the metropolitan area are so many, varied, and exacting, the functions of the metropolitan planning agency necessary for the formulation of the public policy are several and important. To summarize the activities of a metropolitan planning agency; research concerning both the existing conditions of the metropolitan area and the resultant problems; physical planning for the metropolitan area; formulation of standards and minimum requirements, minima, not stereotypes, for local planning; the stimulation of local planning; the stimulation of participation in metropolitan planning; the coordination of inter-departmental and inter-governmental activities and programs; planning the execution of metropolitan proposals; and education for metropolitan thinking. Each of these activities will be discussed below.

## Research

The function of a metropolitan planning agency upon which area planning depends is, of course, research and analysis of metropolitan activity. The assembly and examination of data concerning the metropolitan area is basic in a formulation of policies for the entire area. All the surveys that a local community planning board needs in the solution of its problems are just as necessary for a metropolitan planning agency.

The compilation of data on a metropolitan scale is an enormous task, one that could consume all the time and effort of a metropolitan planning commission. If a metropolitan planning agency has to make all the necessary surveys itself, to undertake all its research alone, either the agency would be bigger than any of the metropolitan operating departments or else it would be able to do no actual planning.

In order to accomplish its program and not be completely bogged down by data requirements, a metropolitan planning board must utilize existing surveys and data assemblages as much as possible. All local planning board data must be available to the larger planning board. A metropolitan planning board must work in close cooperation with private, state, federal, and other planning agencies possessing needed data so that

the desired data may be available to the metropolitan planning agency.

As much as feasible, a metropolitan planning agency should be a research and survey coordinating agency, not a research and survey operating agency. Such coordination depends mainly on cooperation, and cannot be achieved by definite allocation of duties. A metropolitan planning agency cannot arbitrarily tell a state planning board what surveys it should conduct nor can it direct local planning boards in their research since local problems differ from metropolitan problems.

The problem of compiling and correlating the data of different agencies is difficult but must be solved. Each agency very probably has different standards in its examination and presentation of data; different political entities present area boundary problems; different surveys are conducted with by no means identical purposes. The metropolitan planning agency must receive all different surveys and studies and combine them into one set, having a uniform basis and presentation.

It is probable that a metropolitan planning agency will not be able to find all the necessary surveys and studies being conducted by other agencies. Some research will have to be conducted by the central

agency; this, if possible, should be only the research that is not being conducted by other agencies. As a metropolitan planning agency grows in capability it will be able to do more and more of its own research, being able to conduct its surveys primarily for metropolitan problems, not being forced to depend on studies made for other than metropolitan reasons.

If, as will be very likely, a metropolitan planning commission finds it necessary to limit its research program, it should study the economic base of the metropolitan area. Such a study is very probably not performed by other agencies. It is essential for a government planning agency to have well-founded ideas concerning the economic present and future of its governmental area. The next most basic study for a metropolitan agency, a land use study, can probably be compiled from surveys made by component governmental units.

As a metropolitan planning agency becomes established it should, in conjunction with its economic base studies, summarize and report on the volume of employment in the metropolitan area and make recommendations concerning the expanding, contracting, or adjusting of public works employment levels. In order to be effective such a program must be conducted in cooperation with the federal government, for public

public works employment adjustment can only be of value if done nationally.

Concomitant with a program of research, a good planning library is necessary. The metropolitan planning agency must keep not only a library of its own material but also an index of metropolitan material available elsewhere.

### Physical Planning.

In planning for a metropolitan area the formulation of a master plan should be the basic principle in the program of the planning agency. Even though much of the work of a planning agency, especially of an organization for a new, large governmental unit, will of necessity be concerned with specific project and problem planning, the fundamental policies upon which a master plan should be predicated must be considered in all detail planning.

A metropolitan master plan must not be just a pretty, paper plan containing only design, but rather should be the formulation of a definite program to achieve desired and definite objectives. In addition to design, it must include the financial, administrative, and legal mechanisms

necessary for the plan accomplishment. Program definition must include data analysis, a diagnosis of problems, and a statement of objectives. Although these requirements are not at all peculiar to metropolitan areas, they are basic to master planning.

A metropolitan master plan must, of course, not concern itself with purely local problems; it has quite enough to do with the problems of the metropolitan area. The nature of a particular problem determines which type of government should deal with the problem. A metropolitan planning organization should be concerned with the following situations: the provision of equipment and services that are beyond the capacity of a particular locality; the provision of facilities located in a particular district but serving the entire metropolitan area; the provision of services in which efficiency of operation requires a high degree of specialization; the need for coordination of effort; and the provision of uniform standards. Housing, airports, technical education, street naming, and zoning are respective examples.

Many of the more common problems that should be dealt with by a metropolitan planning commission have been given considerable publicity. Highways, railroads, airports, seaports, recreation,



education, and utilities are usually considered as metropolitan problems. Urban redevelopment, specialized public health institutions and medical services, taxation policies, smoke abatement, flood control if necessary are also problems that can be effectively dealt with on a metropolitan scale.

The planning for large housing and slum clearance projects cannot be done by just one municipality. Urban decentralization is too much a metropolitan problem for urban redevelopment to be just a municipal affair. Urban redevelopment must be planned in cooperation with local housing authorities and the federal government. The metropolitan planning commissions not a private redevelopment corporation, must be responsible finally for all redevelopment plans. This is essential if the new projects are to conform to the master plan of the metropolis. The metropolitan planning agency should assume the lead in the replanning of slum and blighted areas and not passively accept private real estate ideas.

A plan to ease the transportation difficulties of the metropolitan area will probably be the first of a metropolitan planning agency's specific plans. A good transportation plan must be closely allied to the airport and seaport, if present,

plans for the metropolitan area.

In planning the accomplishment of its program the metropolitan planning agency must consider the taxation policies for the area. The problems of blighted area taxation, tax delinquency, and premature subdivision are definite metropolitan problems. Of course, a metropolitan planning agency is not solely responsible for these problems; they must be studied in cooperation with the budget and financial departments of the metropolis.

Metropolitan plans must not usurp the functions of local plans. For instance, the metropolitan recreation plan should deal with the provision of large parks and open spaces, not at all with the provision of local parks and playgrounds. The same is true of utility planning, education planning, public health planning, and other functions of metropolitan planning; each should be concerned only with those aspects of the problem that are too large or too involved for local communities.

In the relation of local plans to metropolitan plans, metropolitan planning should provide the framework into which local plans can be fitted. In order to be effective a metropolitan skeleton plan which can be given substance by local

activity must not be imposed arbitrarily but must be formulated in close cooperation with local governments and planning bodies - a very difficult procedure.

#### Metropolitan-Local Planning Relations.

In considering the organization and functions of the planning agency in a metropolitan government, the contrast between planning for a local community and planning for a large metropolitan area must be remembered. Planning for a metropolitan area is such an immense and difficult problem that of necessity many conceptions of citizen participation in the planning process practices by local planning boards would have to be discarded. Metropolitan problems are so vast that their solution would have to be quite impersonal. At the same time, however, metropolitan planning, just as much as local community planning, needs public support and participation in order to be effective in furthering a new conception of the metropolitan area. Even though a metropolitan planning agency cannot operate with continual citizen participation as should local advisory planning boards, it must, nevertheless, enable its work to be visualized on a local level. It is a difficult problem in itself, aside from the basic metropolitan problem. The big

and impersonal nature of the metropolitan area, not at all local and small, necessitates an emphasis on policy in planning, rather than on citizen participation. The necessity for participation is present, however, in metropolitan planning; its acquisition is very difficult.

In its physical planning process the emphasis of the metropolitan planning agency must, of course, be on area rather than on local problems. In order to accomplish anything, the metropolitan planning agency must consider only those problems that affect the entire urban and suburban area. If it paid any attention to local problems, not only would it be assuming local prerogatives but also it would become so involved in detail that no metropolitan planning could be accomplished.

Metropolitan planning must stress coordination much more than does local planning. A metropolitan planning agency would be a part of the coordination machinery of government, a median agency in the coordination process. A metropolitan government would have much coordination responsibility; local governments receive the result of coordination. Local planning boards can expend much more effort, relatively speaking, in physical planning than could a metropolitan

planning agency; a metropolitan planning agency would have to expend much time and effort in inter-departmental and inter-governmental coordination.

The line of demarcation between the duties of local planning boards and the metropolitan planning agency is very tenuous and difficult to define. How much should the metropolitan planning agency duplicate or assume the functions of the local planning boards is not a question with a facile solution.

Administratively, the easiest method of solving the problem of local-metropolitan planning relations is to deny the solvability of the problem, for the metropolitan planning agency to assume all the duties of the local planning boards. Such a solution to the problem would enable the metropolitan planning agency to plan for the entire area without the necessity of considering local prejudices and attitudes. A metropolitan planning agency could consider each problem only from the metropolitan viewpoint, not needing to weigh local factors except as found necessary or desirable.

Administratively, the elimination of local planning boards is very attractive. Local factors often militate strongly against the proper metropolitan solution of a problem. The

example of Milton in the Boston metropolitan area is illustrative. The town, adjacent to Boston proper, has adopted a policy of restricted building suitable for a much more rural suburb than it is. The policy has kept Milton as it desires to be but it has at the same time forced the expansion of the whole Boston area into awkward patterns. The problem of acquiring local support for locally undesired metropolitan plans is almost so difficult as to necessitate complete operation of local planning by the metropolitan planning agency.

The large number of component municipal planning boards in a metropolitan area that need at the very least cooperative liaison with a metropolitan planning agency favors the elimination of the local boards. In the New York metropolitan area as delimited by the New York Regional Plan Association there are 550 separate communities. It would be a huge task to cooperate effectively with such a number.

An elimination of local planning boards may be very attractive administratively; it would also be very undemocratic. Such an elimination would be in addition very impractical for it would result in almost a complete impossibility of plan

accomplishment. If metropolitan planning had no local support, it would be a planning in an ivory tower.

Metropolitan-local planning relations might be facilitated by an up-the-line system of responsibility: all local planning decisions to be approved, rejected, or modified by the metropolitan planning agency. Such a system would insure that metropolitan considerations were given proper weight in local planning.

However, a metropolitan planning board cannot be absorbed entirely in local minutiae. If the central planning body has to inspect all local plans, it would never be able to do any of its own work. Actually, such a system of responsibility upward is but a slight modification of no local planning. If the final and definite responsibility for all decisions is with the metropolitan board, there is no incentive at all for local planning. A delegation of authority to the central planning agency would make for little community participation in the planning process.

The metropolitan planning agency and the community planning boards must each have their own sphere of influence. The line of demarcation can

only be drawn on the nature of the problem, whether they are metropolitan or local in scope. Although the line should be fairly rigidly drawn so that each agency knows its responsibilities, the line must not be too exclusive. The problems themselves are not rigidly divided but spill over into the area of influence of both types of governments.

The metropolitan planning board should deal, of course, with problems affecting the entire metropolitan area, the local boards with purely community problems. Each should be responsible for its own sphere of influence. There will be little temptation for local boards to assume metropolitan functions but the metropolitan planning agency must be careful not to undertake local prerogatives lest it lose the benefit of local assistance.

A method of control by the metropolitan planning agency over local governmental affairs having a metropolitan aspect is essential if metropolitan considerations, not solely individual community attitudes, are to guide in the development of the metropolitan area. The establishment by the metropolitan planning agency of metropolitan standards which can guide local planning boards and a metropolitan plan framework into which local plans can be fitted



can enable a central planning commission to insure the domination of its own ideas concerning the future of the metropolitan area.

The plan framework is the basic master plan for the metropolitan area, a statement of fundamental objectives concerning metropolitan development as well as the design and procedures necessary to accomplish the objectives. Given a basic metropolitan master plan, local planning boards can plan accordingly, can adjust local plans to meet the requirements of the entire area. Of course the metropolitan planning agency is responsible for the basic master plan; however, the plan should be made in consultation with local planning boards on factors affecting the respective communities.

A metropolitan planning agency should establish standards for zoning, subdivision control, recreation and education, to be guides for local communities. These standards would be established both to achieve desired minima and also to help execute portions of the master plan.

In conformity with its master plan, a metropolitan planning agency should establish a zoning plan for the entire metropolitan area, considering the welfare of the metropolitan area and the

component towns together. The zoning plan would be transmitted to the towns who would then have to adjust their zoning ordinances accordingly.

There would be no necessity for the metropolitan planning agency to write a detailed zoning ordinance for the entire metropolitan area. It would be sufficient if it defined in some detail districts and uses. A too detailed ordinance would be a wasting of time on phases of the problem that could be better solved locally. The metropolitan planning agency would be responsible for general zoning definitions of uses and districts, definitions in only enough detail so that the individual towns would have no doubt as to district boundaries. Local planning agencies would be responsible for detailed interpretations of the general ordinances and for its administration.

Subdivision regulation can be handled similarly. The metropolitan planning agency should establish subdivision standards for the various sections of the metropolitan area in accordance with the desired pattern of change or growth for the area. The regulations, of course, need not be the same for the entire metropolitan area. Local planning boards would establish detailed regulations supplementing

the general metropolitan requirements and administer the regulations.

In the establishment of standards for recreation and education facilities, the metropolitan planning agency should set forth minimum standards for the various municipalities of the entire area. These need not be uniform and must be based on considerations of local factors. The establishment of standards for particular services is not an attempt to solve local problems, rather an attempt to guide the solution in a desired pattern.

Metropolitan-local cooperation in the establishment of a plan framework and standards is essential if both are to be adhered to by local communities. The metropolitan government is responsible for the standards, but they must be made by and with local governments. The mechanics of joint formulation of standards and the plan framework as affecting local communities will require the use of advisory committees of the local planning boards. The actual work of the advisory committees will be done, insofar as the individual communities are concerned, by the local planning technicians but the local responsibility is ultimately with the actual local planning commissions.

The metropolitan government

must not be dogmatic in the establishment of standards or it stands no chance of <sup>their</sup> having any weight. However, the metropolitan government must be able to enforce adherence to standards or to the plan framework. The enforcement must come not from the metropolitan planning agency but from the entire metropolitan government. It is inherent in the idea of a metropolitan government that it has authority in metropolitan affairs.

Authority for a plan framework and standards can be obtained by legislative action. If, as with any legislative measure, the executive submits a formulated standard to the metropolitan legislative body and it is passed by the legislature and signed by the executive, it then would become an ordinance and have the power of the metropolitan government behind it. The same procedure is very proper for those portions of the master plan having prospect of immediate execution. Long-term plans should be well publicized as being the opinions of the metropolitan planning agency but should not be given the authority of law; conditions are too apt to change to permit long-term plans being made official, yet at the same time in order to gain public acceptance they should be well known. Legislative authority for standards and for plans for immediate execution helps make the whole metropolitan

government responsible for the planning process, not just one agency of the government.

A metropolitan planning agency can help local-metropolitan planning relations by a policy of stimulating local planning. By giving aid to communities, a metropolitan planning agency can foster a cooperative attitude that will be of great value in facilitating the acceptance of metropolitan ideas by the local communities.

The policy of encouragement must not be a policy of replacement. Local planning autonomy must not be discarded in favor of dependence on metropolitan planning. The Tennessee Valley Authority has maintained local autonomy; the National Resources Committee was not able to establish state planning boards on a firm basis. Moderation in the extending of aid is quite essential.

Local communities should be encouraged to have as active a planning body as they can afford. Aid should be given to those communities that need it, aid in the form of technical personnel and financial assistance for plan and capital budget preparation. As planning becomes firmly established in a community, less and less aid should be given by the metropolitan government to that community.

Local relations can be helped by two administrative devices, the use of metropolitan planning field representatives and subordinate metropolitan planning districts. It will be of great value if the metropolitan planning agency can go to the local planning board through the device of a field representative and not require local personnel to come to the metropolitan office. Any device that maintains the self-importance of the local community is important; the metropolitan government will tend always to increase its prestige at the expense of the local units.

The number of communities in a metropolitan area will necessitate field offices. To conduct all local planning relations from one office would result in a huge establishment very difficult to manage. Field office districts would probably be constituted on a county basis. While it would be very desirable to establish districts based on logical boundaries, the fact that present census data is assembled on a county basis would probably require that counties be used.

Advisory committees, discussed below, can be of great value in establishing and maintaining good local relations. Advisory committee membership should be drawn from all component communities and

planning boards, though not every unit need be represented by any means on every committee.

In the relations of the metropolitan planning agency to local planning boards, great emphasis should be placed on the stimulation of local government and planning prestige. In all technical aid to local planning, the fostering of local ascendancy is important. The metropolitan government will dominate per se; the local municipalities must not come to feel inferior.

In the encouragement of good relations between local and metropolitan planning boards, the representation of the local communities on the metropolitan planning board can be of great help. In order to make the suburban cities appear important in metropolitan government, especially in the planning function of the government, they should have representation on the metropolitan planning commission equal with that of the central city. If the particular situation requires, the extra member of the planning agency might well be allocated to the suburbs. The central city need have no worry that the suburban municipalities will have more authority than it does; the central city has enough power just by being the largest municipality in the metropolitan government.

In the selection of the suburban

representatives, the executive of the metropolitan government will have difficulty not to slight any of the satellite cities and towns. Since every suburban city can obviously not be represented on a workable planning agency, the executive will have to remember that it is not in the planning agency but in the legislative body that the suburbs have their basic representation in metropolitan affairs.

#### Advisory Committees.

A metropolitan planning agency must utilize every opportunity to lighten its work load; the problems of a large urban-suburban area are so great and numerous that one body cannot hope to plan effectively for all by itself. Even though the easiest method of work supervision is to have all agency duties performed by the one agency, a metropolitan planning agency must be willing to have some of its functions performed by groups not completely responsible to the central planning agency.

Advisory committees, though administratively a headache, are a useful device for easing the work of a metropolitan planning commission. Advisory committees can be used to provide technical advice and assistance, to stimulate citizen participation



in metropolitan planning, to help in public relations and the education for metropolitan thinking, and to aid in coordinating the work of local planning boards with the central planning agency.

In order to gain as complete representation as possible, the membership of the advisory committee should be drawn from the entire metropolitan area. The members should be chosen by the metropolitan planning agency in order that it may acquire the type of technical assistance and popular representation it desires.

Advisory committees for a metropolitan planning agency can be of two types, technical and citizen. The function of the technical advisory committees is to provide professional or governmental advice on metropolitan affairs, that of the citizen advisory committees is to be principally a public relations medium.

Technical advisory committees may be composed of professional planners or of other representatives of various governments and governmental agencies. Advisory committees made up of planning technicians from local planning boards will be of primary importance in the formulation of standards for application by local communities. Giving a

committee composed of local representatives the responsibility for forming a standard to be used by the individual towns will facilitate the acceptance of that standard by the component localities.

In addition to the forming of a particular standard or the giving of advice on a particular problem, the technical advisory committees will be a medium of exchange of metropolitan ideas. Metropolitan problems should be discussed and tentative solutions agreed upon by technicians in order that permanent satisfactory answers may be decided generally; technical advisory committees are a device for such discussion.

In organizing, and coordinating, and maintaining the work of the planning technician advisory committees, a superior-inferior relationship must be avoided. Committee chairmanships by local personnel and continual field trips by metropolitan planning agency technicians and field representatives are devices to help avoid such a feeling. The metropolitan planning agency must be willing to go to the advisory committees and their local planning personnel and not expect local technicians to come always to the metropolitan office, both if it desires the advisory committees to accomplish any work and

if it wishes to augment local planning prestige. For advisory committees to do any satisfactory work, their efforts must be continually prodded by the metropolitan planning agency by means of technical assistance and prestige stimulation.

Planning technician advisory committees should be several in number, one for each specific metropolitan problem or standard that requires discussion or solution. Several committees will allow the membership of each to be small and workable. One, or even a few, committees cannot cope with all the problems of a large urban-suburban area.

Representatives of various governmental units and governmental departments can be used as public works coordinating committees. Representatives of all government agencies having authority over funds for public works affecting the metropolitan area should be included; the federal, the state, the metropolitan government, and the component cities and counties each have some authority in the construction of public works.

Public works coordinating committees will allow the various governments and government departments to be cognizant of public works

planning and development from the beginning of each project. The committees will be a device to prevent one department from taking action affecting another government department or unit without its knowledge. The advisory committees in this coordination function will be primarily a common meeting ground for the respective operating agencies, not organizations to approve or veto a specific project. Such definite action is a responsibility of the government units as whole, not subsidiary advisory committees.

Public works coordinating committees, as well as the technical planning committees should be several, one for each of the several aspects of public works construction. Of course, only agencies concerned with a particular type of construction should be represented on the respective coordinating committee.

Citizen advisory committees, a public relations instrument for the metropolitan planning commission, can be used to acquaint special groups outside the government with the problems of the metropolitan area and to secure advice on those problems from the respective interests. Essentially, citizen advisory committees are a method of spreading the influence of metropolitan, rather than local, attitudes.

Citizen advisory committees are the place for special interest representation in the planning process. The planning agency itself should be free from domination by one set of influences. The strong influence of the real estate profession on many planning boards at present is an example of a preponderant influence that should be avoided. The planning agency of a large metropolitan area, being both paid and full-time, can be so constituted as to prevent interest domination. However, the ideas of particular groups should by all means be heard and reckoned with; advisory committees allow special groups to express their opinions without danger to the integrity of the planning agency.

The membership of citizen advisory committees can be larger than that of technical advisory committees. While technical committees should have fairly stable membership to permit continuity of thought, the membership of citizen advisory committees should change fairly frequently in order to enable as many people as possible to see the perplexities of metropolitan problems.

An industrial advisory council can help the metropolitan planning agency

in its problem of industrial zoning. The location of industrial estates and the decentralization trend are, of course, subject to great pressure and influence by industrial and commercial interests. The planning agency's solutions to industrial zoning problems can only be satisfactory if reached in cooperation, not necessarily agreement, with industrial interests.

A labor interest committee is necessary to counteract the influence of the industrial advisory council. In the governmental process, labor groups must be made to feel as important as the commercial interest. Labor groups must not come to feel that the metropolitan planning agency is dominated by real estate and industrial leaders. If they do, popular reception for official plans will not be easy to achieve.

A local research council can help make available to the metropolitan planning agency research done by other agencies. By judicious management the metropolitan planning agency may be able to instigate desired projects and to inculcate its own research ideas and standards into the activity of other research agencies.

A technical society council, composed of representatives of local chapters of

professional societies, A.I.A., A.S.C.E., A.S.L.A., and others, can give citizen professional and technical advice on metropolitan problems. Service organizations, public relations groups, educational and religious institutions, women's clubs, public welfare groups, and recreational societies can be media for assistance in the metropolitan planning agency's public relations tasks.

In all the work of the advisory committees, the metropolitan planning agency must be the final authority. Advisory committee must not be used as a method of evading responsibility, but as a means of securing pertinent opinion. The increasing use of the advisory committee in the administrative process demonstrates that a more effective and available method of obtaining citizen opinions and of measuring consent than the relatively crude device of the ballot is desired. Advisory committees are channels for fresh currents of opinion, designed to augment, not to replace, governmental machinery.

The central planning agency has a major problem in maintaining advisory committee interest in its activities, not so much interest by non-members as by the members themselves. Practically a requisite for interest continuance is the acceptance

of the opinions of the committee by the metropolitan planning agency. In order to be able to accept the judgments of the advisory committees as much as possible, an effective check on irresponsible and impractical advice is necessary. Such a check can only be achieved by very judicious care in membership selection and the requirement of extraordinary majority or even unanimous committee opinions.

Advisory committees, both technical and citizen, can be a very useful device for securing local cooperation. The fostering of good relations with component communities is one of the prime functions of the metropolitan government and its various departments.

#### Coordination Function.

Inter-departmental and inter-governmental coordination, a primary function of the executive in a metropolitan government, is to a considerable extent the duty of the metropolitan planning commission. It is a responsibility of the planning commission to lighten the work of the executive by being the metropolitan government coordinating agency.

In its coordination duties,



easing the executive's span of control problem, a metropolitan planning agency is by no means entirely responsible for inter-departmental coordination. The final responsibility rests, of course, with the executive. However, the planning agency can be the 'operating' agency for inter-departmental planning and thinking.

The need for inter-departmental coordination is not a result of poor management of the operating departments nor a result necessarily of self-centered attitudes on the part of the operating departments. They are simply too busy to think about the long-term or joint aspects of their work; they are not organized to do long-term planning, that not being their job. Considerations of basic problems by operating departments are a result of individual action, not a result of an administrative organization.

A definite agency is necessary as a nucleus for coordinating action. Coordination is never achieved through good will alone; positive action is needed. A metropolitan planning agency is well suited to be a center for coordinating activity, to assume the lead in coordination.

It must be remembered that coordination is purely an advisory function. An

agency to study and recommend should never be an operating agency for the execution of its conclusions. A coordinating agency has accomplished its purpose if an agreement on policy and necessary steps for policy execution has been reached by the respective operating agencies. The recommendations of the planning agency in its function as a coordinating agency can be used by the departments and the executive to help offset the effect of narrow, rigid departmentalism by having a joint plan that cuts across departmental activity boundaries.

The inter-departmental committee, mentioned above, is a good device for departmental coordination. Early determination of departmental plans and viewpoints helps avoid misunderstandings and irritation. The Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has found the inter-departmental committee an effective method of bringing together departmental representatives for informal discussion. The inter-departmental committee, as an additional benefit, is a method of securing expert advice.

Formal review by the metropolitan planning agency of all public works projects of metropolitan significance will aid in the coordination

process. By such review the planning agency would be able to advise concerning project conflicts, conflicts with either other department projects or with the master plan.

In formal review of projects, the approval or disapproval of the planning board should be stated definitely. Since the planning board is advisory to the executive, the planning board should approve or disapprove all projects before their submission to the executive for his submission of them to the legislative body. The executive can, of course, overrule the action of the planning board.

In order that the planning board may have the respect of the operating departments and maintain friendly relations with them, the metropolitan planning board should have equal status with the other departments of the metropolitan government. The chairman of the metropolitan planning board must be able to deal with high administrative officials on their own level.

As important in metropolitan planning as the coordination of inter-departmental affairs, is the coordination of inter-governmental public works. Inter-departmental coordination is, of course, facilitated by the singleness of govern-

mental authority; inter-governmental coordination is complicated by a multiplicity of governing units.

In metropolitan areas the state or states and the federal government are the governmental units whose activities most need to be coordinated with those of a metropolitan government. At present, any coordination is a result of happenstance, not an organized system. State-local relations are largely a matter of individual state department relations with local communities as each department sees fit. Municipalities have no one source in the state to which they can go for information concerning all the plans for a specific locality. The same is true of the federal government, the problem being more acute because of the greater complexity of the national government.

To help achieve inter-government coordination the superior governments concerned with the metropolitan area should have representatives as members of the metropolitan planning commission. Since the planning agency is the coordinating agency for the metropolitan area, other government representatives on the metropolitan planning commission can help it coordinate the public works activities of their respective government units. They can be liaison officials between the metropolitan government and

their own. Having full knowledge of the metropolitan problems they would be able to work closely with the proper department of their parent government, acquainting each department with metropolitan requirements and helping to eliminate parent government department duplication of effort concerning the metropolitan area. The superior government representatives would acquaint the metropolitan government with the standards, proposals, financial resources, and policies of the superior government that relate to the metropolitan area. The representatives of the superior governmental unit would have no authority in themselves to change the actions of their parent government; their function would be limited to coordination.

The representative of the state government, appointed by the governor from or on the advice of the state planning board, and approved by the normal course of state action regarding executive appointments, would be paid by the state. His job would be full-time. Constitutionally, such a representative would be entirely feasible, since municipal authority is derived from the state. A state representative on a metropolitan planning board would help the state to maintain close and active relations with a metropolitan government.

If the metropolitan area extended into more than one state, each state involved in the metropolitan area should have a representative on the metropolitan planning board. The total membership of the metropolitan planning agency must be an unequal number, however.

The representative of the federal government should also be appointed by the executive and paid by the federal government. The representative should come from the executive branch of the government, not from one particular department. If the National Resources Planning Board were revitalized, it could supply a representative for the metropolitan planning board. At present, the Budget Bureau is the only promising section of the executive for a metropolitan representative.

At present there is a question of the constitutionality of a federal representative for a metropolitan government. Since all governmental powers not specifically allocated to the federal government reside in the government of the several states, such a representative would probably be construed as an undue assumption of power by the federal government. At present, therefore, a federal representative to a metropolitan planning commission would have to be a

consultant, not a regular voting member. In theory at least, the planning commission would be able to disregard the opinions and actions of the federal representative. Actually, however, he would still be the representative of the federal government who was spending all his time on the problems of a particular metropolitan area.

Constitutional law changes; the functions of the federal government are expanding. The emerging power of the federal government probably will make possible a federal representative on a metropolitan planning commission by the time there is need of one.

If an "ad hoc" authority is important in a metropolitan area, not being a part of the metropolitan government, it should have a representative on the metropolitan planning agency in the same manner as the state and federal governments. The Port of New York Authority should be so represented in a New York metropolitan government.

The members of a metropolitan planning agency who are representatives of non-metropolitan governing units should be always in the minority. The representatives of the metropolitan area should always be able to out-vote those who are not. In cases of deadlock between the central city and

suburban members on the metropolitan planning board, the representatives of superior governments would be able to resolve the conflict.

Administrative Function.

The function of the executive that makes a planning agency necessary is the formulation and definition of purpose; the planning agency aids the executive in his thinking and planning responsibilities. The duty of performing the thinking tasks of the executive is a full-time job, one that cannot be done concomitantly with another responsibility.

A planning agency is not an operating agency. If a planning board becomes involved in the execution of a policy it has little or no time for its thinking responsibilities. The experience of many planning boards in zoning is illustrative; many boards have become so tied down to zoning, both its drafting and administration, that they have had no time for any other planning activity. The necessary, continual detail essential for the good conduct of an operating agency militates strongly against the possibility of long-term thinking.

The great deficiency in plan execution is commonly considered to be the fault of



the planning agency of a government. Since the planning board has made plans and since the plans are unexecuted, the planning board is therefore at fault. To correct this situation, many proposals have been made to give the planning agency more administrative power than it now possesses. It has been suggested that the planning organization have all legal powers necessary to make sure that its decisions are carried out.

Not only would plan execution authority completely swamp a planning agency with administrative detail, but also such authority would be an incorrect solution to the problem of accomplishment of plans. While a planning agency must of course consider in its planning how plans can be executed - a failure to do so resulting per se in ivory tower planning - the lack of action concerning plans is not alone the fault of a planning agency. It is the fault and responsibility of the entire government. A planning commission is not a whole government in itself, it is but one special section of a governing unit whose function it is to think and plan for the whole government.

The solution to the problem of the disparity between plans and execution is not

the improper loading of the planning agency with tasks that belong to operating departments, but rather the better integration of the planning agency into the structure of the government so that each department of the government will feel equally responsible for the plans of the planning agency, even though the plans are drawn by one particular agency, not by each department individually.

Let the metropolitan planning agency be free of administrative responsibility so that it may concentrate on its own function, metropolitan planning. The administrative responsibility sometimes delegated to the planning board should rather be allocated to the proper administrative agency. Real estate acquisition should be handled by a separate real estate board. Subdivision control should be managed by local planning boards, zoning by local building inspectors, and zoning appeals by local boards of appeal. In order to maintain the metropolitan character of zoning and because of the amount of work involved in the administration of zoning for metropolitan area, a separate metropolitan board of appeals will be necessary. This, however, should be very separate from the metropolitan planning board.

The delegation of administrative

responsibility to the component government units raises the problem of securing uniformity of policy application in a diversity of authorities. The problem is very difficult to solve but is justified by the necessity of freeing the metropolitan planning board from operating responsibilities.

In order that zoning may be effective over the entire metropolitan area, not just in those municipalities that agree with the basic metropolitan zoning pattern, it must be accepted completely by the courts, the legislative bodies, the building inspectors, and the boards of appeals of the area. The acceptance is not easy but is fundamental. If the metropolitan legislative body and the courts maintain a firm attitude from the beginning, appeal trouble will be lessened markedly.

Good subdivision control practices will have to be maintained by continued friendly relations between the metropolitan and the local planning boards. This is especially true in the formulation of subdivision standards.

Divesting itself of administrative responsibilities by no means eases the work of a metropolitan planning agency. By the increased necessity for inter-departmental and inter-component metropolitan

governmental good relations the metropolitan planning agency has to spend that much more time and effort in its coordination activities. And coordination is not easy at all! It would be far simpler for the metropolitan planning agency to assume all the conventional planning board administrative power and not bother with local coordination. Such a policy, however, would definitely limit the amount of metropolitan planning that the metropolitan planning agency would be able to do.

#### Plan Accomplishment.

Although the accomplishment of a program is essentially the responsibility of an entire governmental unit, not solely that of the planning agency, the planning agency must be concerned with plan execution, for achievement of results is just as much a part of the planning process as is design. It must be remembered, however, that the planning agency is primarily a thinking, not an operating, agency.

In the formulation of a program for plan accomplishment the planning agency must recognize changes in the metropolitan situation that develop as various portions of the metropolitan master plan are executed. It is a primary responsibility of the planning agency to maintain its thinking ahead of the

current metropolitan situation.

The preparation of a capital budget is the formal means available to a planning agency for the execution of plan proposals in their proper order and in relation to other metropolitan government requirements. In the formation of a capital budget, departments should submit to the planning agency their estimates of a stipulated period program for the respective department; the executive should make known to the planning agency his desired emphasis in capital improvements for the forthcoming budgetary period; and the budget director should make available to the planning agency the amount and nature of the debt which the city can incur. With these estimates and with its own program the planning agency can prepare a detailed capital budget for the forthcoming year and less detailed estimates for the rest of the stipulated capital budgetary period. After comment by the controller, this should be submitted to the legislative body through the executive. After adoption by the legislative body and approval by the executive, no capital improvement project can be permitted for the respective period unless it is included in the capital budget.

A capital budget for a metro-

politan government need not be different from a good capital budget for an ordinary municipality. The capital budget is the formal mechanism for review of all governmental projects affecting the physical structure of the metropolis.

An effective policy of inter-departmental and inter-governmental coordination is very necessary for plan execution. This is true, of course, for all governmental activities with which the planning agency is concerned; it is especially true of assessment and taxation and budgeting and the debt structure. Close liaison by the planning agency with the respective departments concerned with these activities is essential if good and effective policies are to be developed.

Since the executive officer of a metropolitan government is responsible for the securing of essential and desired efforts by the government, the fundamental method available to a metropolitan planning agency of securing the accomplishment of its plans is the maintainance of close and effective relations with the executive. The executive is charged with government management and leadership; the responsibility for encouraging and persuading the legislative body to accept a particular planning agency proposal is that of the executive, not solely that of

the planning agency. Executive responsibility in a large government like a metropolitan unit is the primary reason for the necessity of having the metropolitan planning agency directly accountable to the executive.

#### Stimulation of Metropolitan Thinking.

A very important function of a metropolitan planning agency is the stimulation of metropolitan thinking. Since sound popular consent is essential for the accomplishment of any plan, perhaps the public relations duty of a metropolitan planning agency is its most important job.

Of course a metropolitan planning commission must conduct hearings on particular problems or standards as they become current. Hearings are the legal device for securing citizen participation in the planning process. While hearings are quite necessary, actually any proposals or standard to be submitted to the legislature should be much more widely publicized than just by hearings alone.

The public information section of a metropolitan planning agency would issue all reports and statement of the agency through or in the name of the executive of the metropolitan government. Since the planning agency would be directly accountable to the executive, it should not issue reports from an

arbitrary and aloof position but rather directly from the executive branch of the government.

A public information section of a metropolitan planning agency is the formal organizational repository of the agency's main function, education for metropolitan thinking. Actually every activity of the metropolitan planning agency should be premised on the same main function; all efforts of the metropolitan planning agency should tend to further metropolitan habits and attitudes.

#### Technical Staff.

The technical staff of a metropolitan planning agency would be comparable to that of the planning commission of a conventional city but be much larger and much more inclusive. The difficulty and number of metropolitan problems will necessitate a large staff no matter how much planning work is left or delegated to local planning boards.

Metropolitan planning technicians will be several in type. In addition to planning engineers, the designers and physical planning technicians, economists, administrative management specialists, and lawyers will be needed to accomplish the work of a metropolitan planning agency. The formulation of standards and uniform local planning legislation



will necessitate lawyers; economists will be a requisite for the preparation of economic base, population, and employment level studies; and administrative analysis will be necessary to aid the executive in administrative management. Librarians will be essential if the great amount of research material is not to be either lost or become unusable.

Field representatives of a metropolitan planning agency are necessary to help in the coordination and stimulation of local planning. The number required depends on the specific metropolitan situation.

The technical work of the metropolitan planning agency should be directed by one person, an executive director. The director should be responsible to only the chairman of the planning agency. The span of control principle works up as well as down; a person can have effective direct control over only a few subordinates and can receive direction from but one superior.

THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCY - A SUMMARY STATEMENT.

A metropolitan planning agency, in order to accomplish its function of planning for a large urban-suburban area, must be responsible directly to the executive of the metropolitan government. The planning agency should have a small, full-time, paid membership of uneven number; the central city and suburban representation on the planning agency should be equal; and the superior governments concerned with the metropolitan area, the state, federal, and other governmental units as necessitated by a particular metropolitan area, should have regular, voting members on the metropolitan planning agency.

The basic responsibility of a planning agency for a metropolitan government is the stimulation and encouragement of metropolitan thinking in order that the metropolitan area may maintain and increase its vitality in whatever direction is considered most proper and beneficial by and for the area. A metropolitan planning agency is the board most qualified to consider the trend toward decentralization in metropolitan areas; it must not be afraid in its planning to take advantage

of the trend. Decentralization is a powerful influence on metropolitan affairs; the planning agency must guide and direct it.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT, Victor Jones;  
University of Chicago Press,  
Chicago, 1942, 364 pp.
2. THE GOVERNMENT OF METROPOLITAN AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES;  
Paul Studenski and the Committee on  
Metropolitan Government;  
National Municipal League, New York, 1930, 403 pp.
3. THE METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY, R. D. McKenzie;  
McGraw Hill Book Co. New York, 1933, 352 pp.
4. REDEFINING THE METROPOLITAN AREA, Albert Lepawsky;  
in National Municipal Review, XXV-7,  
July 1936, pp. 417-422
5. THE METROPOLITAN PROBLEM - 1941, Thomas H. Reed;  
in National Municipal Review, XXX-7,  
July 1941, pp. 400-408
6. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE METROPOLITAN REGION OF CHICAGO,  
Charles E. Merriam, Spencer D. Parratt,  
Albert Lepawasky; University of Chicago  
Press, Chicago, 1933, 193 pp.
7. ORGANIZATION FOR METROPOLITAN PLANNING;  
FOUR PROPOSALS FOR REGIONAL COUNCILS;  
American Society of Planning Officials,  
Chicago, 1943, 73 pp.
8. PAPERS ON THE SCIENCE OF ADMINISTRATION,  
Luther Gulick and L. Urwick, Editors;  
Institute of Public Administration,  
Columbia University, New York, 1937, 195 pp.
9. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE,  
Chester I. Barnard; Harvard University  
Press, Cambridge, 1938, 322 pp.
10. THE PLANNING FUNCTION IN URBAN GOVERNMENT,  
Robert A. Walker; University of Chicago  
Press, Chicago, 1941, 337 pp.
11. THE FOURTH POWER, Rexford G. Tugwell;  
in Planning and Civic Comment, V-2,  
April-June 1939, Part II, 31 pp.

12. OUR CITIES; THEIR ROLE IN THE NATIONAL ECONOMY, Report of the Urbanism Committee to the National Resources Committee; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1937, 87 pp.
13. URBAN GOVERNMENT, Volume I of the Supplementary Report of the Urbanism Committee to the National Resources Committee; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1939, 303 pp.
14. RECENT TRENDS IN MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES, A.D.H. Kaplan; Dalhousie University Bulletins on Public Affairs, Toronto, 1941, 19 pp.
15. REGIONAL SURVEY OF NEW YORK AND ITS ENVIRONS, Volume II, POPULATION, LAND VALUES, AND GOVERNMENT, Thomas Adams, Harold M. Lewis, Theodore T. McCrosky; New York, 1929, 320 pp.
16. The Fifteenth Annual Report of the Regional Plan Association; New York, 1944, 10 pp.
17. REGIONAL PLANNING, THE REGION - PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE, Regional Planning Federation of the Philadelphia Tri-State District; Philadelphia, 1931, 54 pp.
18. REGIONAL PLANNING, Progress Report No. 4, Regional Association of Cleveland; Cleveland, 1941, 12 pp.
19. PUBLIC WORKS, CURRENT PROGRESS, Public Works Committee Report No. 1; Regional Association of Cleveland, Cleveland, 1941, 11 pp.
20. THE BALTIMORE PLAN, A Progress Report of the Baltimore Committee for Post-War Planning, 1943, 23 pp.
21. DISCOVERING ANEW THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST, Two Year Report of the Northwest Regional Council; Portland, 1940, 34 pp.
22. REVIEW OF REFERENCES ON INTERSTATE COMPACTS, J.T. Howard; New England Regional Planning Commission, Boston, 1936, 15 pp.
23. THE TRI-CITIES PLANNING PROJECT, A PILOT CASE IN COOPERATIVE PLANNING, Paul Opperman; in The Planners' Journal, VIII-3, July-September, 1942, pp. 11-17

24. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION OF PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS IN THE LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA, George W. Bemis; Haynes Foundation, Los Angeles, 1945, 25 pp.
25. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONTRACTS IN CALIFORNIA, Frank M. Stewart and Ronald M. Ketcham; in Public Administration Review, 1-3, Spring 1941, pp. 242-248
26. A REPORT TO THE MAYOR OF LOS ANGELES ON ORGANIZATION OF PLANNING AGENCIES, Remsen D. Bird and William H. Schuchardt for the Los Angeles City Planning Commission; Los Angeles, 1942, 13 pp.
27. LOS ANGELES ATTACKS THE METROPOLITAN PROBLEM, John McDiarmid; in National Municipal Review, XXIX-7, July 1940, pp. 459-466
28. THE MASTER PLAN - REPORT ON PROGRAM AND PROGRESS, Cincinnati City Planning Commission; Cincinnati, 1946, 40 pp.
29. OUTLINE OF ORGANIZATION, OPERATION, AND PROGRAM FOR REGIONAL DEFENSE COUNCIL FOR HAMPTON ROADS AREA, Virginia State Planning Board; Richmond, 1940, 4 pp.
30. PROGRESS REPORT, NOVEMBER 1941 - APRIL 1942, Volume I, Harrisburg Regional Planning Commission; Harrisburg, 1942, 9 pp.
31. NIAGARA FRONTIER PLANNING BOARD, Nineteenth Annual Report; Buffalo, 1943, 35 pp.
32. PLANNING AND ZONING POWERS AND PROCEDURES IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Pennsylvania State Planning Board; Harrisburg, 1938, 97 pp.
33. LOCAL PLANNING IN TENNESSEE, Tennessee State Planning Board; Nashville, 1945, 53 pp.
34. SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MASTER PLAN, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI, St. Louis County Planning Commission; St. Louis, 1940, 4 pp.
35. WHAT ABOUT OUR FUTURE? Toledo and Lucas County Plan Commission; Toledo, 1944, 45 pp.
36. REPORT ON THE PLAN OF MAIN THOROUGHFARES FOR HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO, Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission; Cincinnati, 1936, 126 pp.

37. ANNEXATION STUDY, DAYTON METROPOLITAN AREA,  
Dayton City Plan Board; Dayton, 1946, 95 pp.
38. MAKING MILWAUKEE MIGHTIER, Arthur M. Werba and  
John L. Grunwald; The Board of Public Land  
Commissioners, Milwaukee, 1929, 64 pp.
39. EXTRATERRITORIAL POWERS OF CITIES AS FACTORS IN  
CALIFORNIA METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT, Winston W. Crouch;  
in American Political Science Review, XXXI-2,  
April 1937, pp. 286-291
40. MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT AND SPECIAL-PURPOSE AUTHORITIES,  
William T.R. Fox and Annette Baker Fox;  
in Annals of the American Academy of Political  
and Social Science, CCVII, January 1940,  
pp. 176-184.
41. METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COMMISSION, DEVELOPMENT AND  
ORGANIZATION, Office of the Secretary, M.D.C.;  
Boston, 1945, 12 pp.
42. THE BOSTON CONTEST OF 1944; Prize Winning Programs;  
Boston University Press, Boston, 1945, 148 pp.
43. REGIONAL FACTORS IN NATIONAL PLANNING, National  
Resources Committee; U.S. Government Printing  
Office, Washington, 1935, 223 pp.
44. FEDERAL AIDS TO LOCAL PLANNING, National Resources  
Planning Board; U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, 1941, 151 pp.
45. FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL FISCAL RELATIONS, Thomas H. Reed;  
Municipal Finance Officers Association,  
Chicago, 1942, 60 pp.
46. GRANTS-IN-AID AND OTHER FEDERAL EXPENDITURES WITHIN  
THE STATES, Council of State Governments;  
Chicago, 1945, 47 pp.
47. THE T.V.A., LESSONS FOR INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION,  
Herman Finer; International Labour Office,  
Montreal, 1944, 289 pp.
48. REGULATIONS FOR CARRYING INTO EFFECT THE PROVISIONS  
OF TITLE V OF THE WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION  
ACT OF 1944, Federal Works Authority, Bureau of  
Community Facilities; Washington, 1945, 10 pp.
49. GREATER LONDON PLAN, 1944, Patrick Abercrombie;  
His Majesty's Stationery Office, London,  
1945, 231 pp.

50. THE GOVERNMENT AND MISGOVERNMENT OF LONDON,  
William A. Robson; George Allen and Unwin,  
Ltd., London, 1939, 469 pp.
51. TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT OF 1944,  
7 & 8 Geo. 6, Ch. 47, 99 pp.
52. THE PLANNING ACT, 1944, AND NATIONAL POLICY,  
Lord Balfour of Burleigh; National Housing  
and Town Planning Council, London, 1945, 16 pp.
53. WARTIME PLANNING FOR PHYSICAL RECONSTRUCTION  
IN GREAT BRITAIN; British Information  
Services, London, 1945, 31 pp.
54. PILOT GUIDE TO POLITICAL LONDON, E.C.R.Hadfield  
and James E. MacColl, J.P.; Pilot Press,  
London, 1945, 195 pp.
55. THE ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT SYSTEM, J.H. Warren;  
George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London,  
1946, 182 pp.
56. A SURVEY IN RESPECT TO THE DECENTRALIZATION  
OF THE BOSTON CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT,  
William H. Ballard and Matthew L. Rockwell;  
Urban Land Institute, Chicago, 1940, 91 pp.