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# THE MINNESOTA FINANCIAL SURVEY 

## DIGEST OF A SURVEY OF THE FINANCES OF MINNESOTA IN 1932, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIGHWAYS, CONDUCTED BY THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS AND THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Reported by ELIZABETH CHURCH, Assistant Research Analyst, Division of Highway Transport, Bureau of Public Roads

THE DEVELOPMENT of highway systems, for the most part, has been a process of evolution. In the past but little information has been gathered concerning the location of roads, the sources of revenue, the places of expenditure, and highway laws-information upon which rational highway planning should be based. With a network of roads laid out and partially improved, the main problems now confronting highway officials are the coordination and improvement of service in accordance with traffic needs and local economic conditions.

This cooperative economic survey is intended to serve as an aid to highway planners. The primary objective of the survey was to determine all facts connected with the financing of roads and streets. This involved the determination of highway revenues, disbursements and debt, the relations of highway receipts and expenditures to all other public financial transactions, the mileage and surfacing of the various systems of roads, and general data concerning the distribution of wealth and population throughout the State.

In Minnesota a road-use study was made in addition to the economic survey. The purpose of this second study was to determine the amount and origin of travel upon the various systems of roads and streets in both rural and urban areas. By correlating the two types of studies a measurement of benefits as compared with expenditures can be made.

The Minnesota financial survey is the fifth of a series of similar investigations conducted in various States. It was carried on under a cooperative agreement between the Bureau of Public Roads, the Minnesota State Highway Department, and the University of Wisconsin. ${ }^{1}$

## PLAN OF STUDY OUTLINED

Information was gathered from all units of government within the State. This necessitated the consulting of records, personal visits to State officials and some county and local officials, frequent conferences, and the compilation of data obtained by many thousands of questionnaires. The data so gathered were tabulated, analyzed, and subsequently presented in such form as to facilitate comparisons.

Information is shown for the rural areas and urban places, the latter being grouped according to population in the 1930 census as follows:

Group 1-places having a population under 2,500.
Group 2-places having a population from 2,500 to 14,999.

Group 3-places having a population from 15,000 to 74,999.

Group 4-places having a population from 75,000 to 399,999.
Group 5-places having a population from 400,000 to 999,999 . St. Paul and Duluth are the only cities in group 4 and Minneapolis is the only city in group 5.

[^0]The data for taxes and receipts are shown by type of impost, and a tabulation showing the source of highway revenues was made. Taxes are also shown by the unit of government responsible for their levy and by the class of place liable for their payment. Expenditures are classified according to the purpose for which they were made-highways, education, public benefit, and government. They are shown both as expended by the several governmental agencies and as expended in and for the rural areas and the various classes of urban places. The outstanding indebtedness is classified by the unit of government incurring it and by the purposes for which originally contracted. Payments for debt service are divided between those made for principal and interest and are shown by the unit of government incurring the costs.

In this summary the general economic facts are presented first to form a background for the detailed discussion of highways and highway usage that follows.

The following definitions are basic in all of the surveys:
Highway refers to the construction, maintenance, and administration of all roads, streets, and alleys. Street cleaning and street lighting are considered items of public benefit and are not included in the definition of highways. Highways are classified as State, county, and rural roads and city streets. These highway classifications are further discussed later in this report.

Education consists of all activities in connection with the construction, maintenance, and administration of and teaching in all public schools. The functions of public libraries are considered to be educational activities.

Public benefit consists of all items pertaining to the protection of lives and property and the pleasure or well-being of the people. It includes police and fire protection, courts, sanitation, parks and playgrounds, and charitable and penal institutions.

Government includes all items concerning the general administration of public affairs not included in the definitions of the three preceding public purposes. These are primarily the executive and administrative functions of government.

Expenditures are public costs defrayed out of public funds. The net expenditures (the total expenditures less the earnings made by the public service charged with the costs) are shown. Interest but not principal payments on indebtedness are included in the definition of expenditures.

Debt service consists of the interest and principal payments on public obligations during the year. The total public disbursements can be obtained by adding debt principal payments to the expenditures. Debt retirement payments are not considered as a cost of the current year. Such practice would result in a duplication of costs, as the funds are considered as an expenditure of the year when borrowed and spent.

Imposts include every payment of any nature made to a public body in connection with the authority vested


Roads on the State Trunk Highway System.
within it. Thus, all licenses, fees, permits, special assessments, and taxes proper are shown as imposts.

User revenues are the imposts paid by the operators of motor vehicles in the form of vehicle license fees, motor-fuel taxes, and miscellaneous motor-vehicle imposts.

The data for Minnesota are shown for the calendar year 1932. In cases where the calendar and fiscal years did not coincide, slight adjustments were made to obtain comparable statistics.

## POPULATION AND VALUATION DATA PRESENTED

Minnesota is chiefly a farming State, with almost two-thirds of its total population of $2,563,953$ living in rural areas and small incorporated places. All but 3 percent of the remainder of the population live in the three cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. In Minnesota there are only 13 cities and one village (Hibbing) having populations over 10,000 . The population distribution between the various classes of places is shown in table 1.

Table 1.-Population and assessed valuation of the townships and incorporated places in Minnesota

| Class of place | Population ${ }^{1}$ |  | Valuation ${ }^{2}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { capita } \\ \text { calua- } \\ \text { viou- } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of persons | Percent | Amount | Percent |  |
| Townships (rural are | 966, 819 | 37.7 | \$808, 798, 600 | 42.9 | \$836.56 |
| Places to 2,499-1.1. | 339, 318 | ${ }_{13.3}^{13.2}$ | $192,788,800$ <br> 191 <br> 1944 <br> 1800 | 10.2 | 567.83 509 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | - 78,137 | ${ }_{3.1}^{13.3}$ | 102, 232, 600 | 5 | 1,308. 38 |
| St. Paul and Duluth | 373, 069 | 14.6 | 258, 220, 100 | 13.7 | 692.15 |
| Minneapolis | 464, 356 | 18.1 | 330, 853,600 | 17.6 | 712.50 |
| State total. | 2, 563, 953 | 100.0 | 1, 884, 238, 200 | 100.0 | 734.90 |



Highway Bridges in Minnesota: Upper, Bridge Over Redwood River at Redwood Falls; Lower, Bridge Over Mississippi River at Brainerd.

The total assessed valuation of Minnesota in 1932 was $\$ 1,884,238,200$, of which 42.9 percent was in the rural areas. The distribution between the various classes of places is shown in table 1. Hennepin, Ramsey, and St. Louis counties, assessed at more than 45 percent of the total valuation of the State, embody only 9 percent of the area. The assessed value of 29 counties comprising over 45 percent of the area of the State is only 12 percent of the total valuation.

The per-capita valuation ranges from $\$ 559$ in the places having a population from 2,500 to 14,999 to $\$ 1,308$ in the places having a population from 15,000 to 74,999 . The high per-capita valuation in the latter group is caused by the inclusion of the village of Hibbing, where mining property located within the corporate limits raises the per-capita valuation to $\$ 4,494$.

## GENERAL PROPERTY TAX PRINCIPAL SOURCE OF REVENUE

In Minnesota, as in most other States, the principal source of revenue is the general property tax, which yielded $\$ 127,496,900$ in 1932 . This amount is 75.1 percent of the total tax levy for that year. Considered as levies on general property and therefore included in the above total are $\$ 8,371,300$ of special assessments which are levied by the local units of government (table 2).

The State levied $\$ 14,856,000$, or 11.7 percent of the total general property tax; the counties levied $\$ 24,977$,700 , or 19.6 percent; and the urban and rural local units of government levied $\$ 87,663,200$, or 68.7 percent.

Of second importance as sources of revenue are the State motor-vehicle imposts. In 1932 the motor-vehicle owners contributed $\$ 20,368,100$ of user revenues. This amount was 12 percent of the total imposts received. The other sources of revenue are also shown in table 2.

Table 3 shows the units of government responsible for the levy of the taxes listed in the preceding table. The State governmentitself levied almost one-third of the total taxes. The counties for their purposes levied about half as much as did the State. The total county tax levy was $\$ 25,966,700$, or $\$ 10.13$ per capita. The remainder of the imposts, amounting to $\$ 90,791,600$, or $\$ 35.41$ per capita, were levied by the local units of government for their own purposes.
per-capita taxation highest
All State and county imposts are ultimately paid by taxpayers in the local communities. Table 4 shows the final incidence of taxes by type of tax and by class of place charged with the payment. By deducting the per-capita tax levied by the several classes of local units as shown in table 3 from the per-capita tax paid by these same residents (table 4), the percapita State and county taxes which the residents in the respective places must pay can be found.

## MINNESOTA TAXES IN 1932

Total taxes and imposts levied for all purposes in Minnesota in 1932 were $\$ 169,742,600$. Taxation of general property totaled $\$ 127,496$,900 ; all motor-vehicle imposts, including motorfuel tax, $\$ 20,368,100$; other taxes including insurance and inheritance taxes, money and credits tax, railroad taxes, and miscellaneous State and local revenues, $\$ 21,877,600$.

Of the total taxes and imposts levied, rural taxpayers were charged with $\$ 51,497,100$, or 30.3 percent; residents of incorporated places having a population to $2,499, \$ 21,780,800$ or 12.8 percent; in places of 2,500 to 14,999 population, $\$ 23,430,800$ or 13.8 percent; in places of 15,000 to 74,999 population, $\$ 8,942,300$ or 5.3 percent; in St. Paul and Duluth, $\$ 27,486,500$ or 16.2 percent; and in Minneapolis, $\$ 36,605$,100 or 21.6 percent.

The average actual tax rates on general property per $\$ 100$ valuation were as follows: Rural, $\$ 4.88$; incorporated places to 2,499 in population, $\$ 8.00$; places of 2,500 to 14,999 population, $\$ 8.97$; places of 15,000 to $\mathbf{7 4 , 9 9 9}$ population, $\$ 6.71$; St. Paul and Duluth, $\$ 8.16$; and Minneapolis, $\$ 8.33$.

Rural motor-vehicle owners paid in license fees and gasoline taxes an average of $\$ 21.87$; those resident in incorporated places to $\mathbf{2 , 4 9 9}$ population, $\$ 27.36$; in places 2,500 to 14,999 population, $\$ 29.95$; in places 15,000 to $\mathbf{7 4 , 9 9 9}$ population, $\$ 34.36$; in St. Paul and Duluth, $\$ 36.05$; and in Minneapolis, $\$ 36.72$.
that, had general property been subject to pay all taxes, the rates would have been from 30 to 40 percent higher.

The taxes imposed for street and highway purposes will be shown in more detail later.

## HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES AMOUNT TO \$21.74 PER CAPITA

In 1932, $\$ 175,488,500$ was spent by the State, counties, and local units of government to support the varied activities carried on for the residents of Minnesota. The State itself spent $\$ 53,582,800$, or 30.5 percent of the total and the counties spent $\$ 29,708,100$, or 16.9 percent. The remainder, $\$ 92,197,600$, was expended by the rural and urban areas for maintaining the functions of the local governments.
Of the total amount expended by the State, $\$ 32$,149,900 was for highways, $\$ 5,902,800$ for education, $\$ 13,774,000$ for public benefit, and $\$ 1,756,100$ for government. It is evident from these figures that the main functions of the State, as measured by expenditures, are the construction and maintenance of highways and the protection of persons and property.
Table 3.-Total of all State and local charges imposed by the column of figures gives the actual rates needed to raise all funds by general property tax levies. The last column in the table gives the percentages that general property taxes were of the total tax levies, and shows

Table 2.-Sources of revenue by type of tax or revenue in 1932

| Type of revenue | Amount | Percent | Per capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ad valorem general property taxes | \$119, 125, 600 | 70.2 | \$46. 46 |
| Special assessments...-.-- | 8, 371, 300 | 4.9 | 3.26 |
| Telephone and telegraph taxes | 898, 100 | . 5 | $\bigcirc .35$ |
| State motor-vehicle imposts | 20, 368, 100 | 12.0 | 7.94 |
| Money and credits tax. | 1, 257, 400 | . 8 | . 49 |
| Other local imposts ${ }^{1}$ | 4, 117, 400 | 2.4 | 1. 61 |
| Inheritance taxes. | 2, 607,900 | 1.6 | 1. 02 |
| Insurance taxes. | 1,928, 800 | 1. 1 | . 75 |
| Railroad taxes | 4, 304, 400 | 2. 5 | 1. 68 |
| Miscellaneous State rever | 6,763, 600 | 4.0 | 2. 64 |
| Total. | 169, 742, 600 | 100.0 | 66. 20 |

RECAPITULATION

| General property taxes. | \$119, 125, 600 | 70.2 | \$46. 46 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Special assessments. | 8,371, 300 | 4.9 | 3. 26 |
| Motor-vehicle imposts | $20,368,100$ | 12.0 | 7.94 |
| Other local imposts ${ }^{1}$ | 4, 117, 400 | 2.4 | 1. 61 |
| Other State receipts | 17, 760, 200 | 10.5 | 6.93 |
| Total | 169, 742, 600 | 100.0 | 66. 20 |

[^1]State and its subdivisions for collection in 1932

| Unit of government imposing tax | Amount | Percent | Per capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | \$52, 984, 300 | 31.2 | \$20.66 |
| Counties.. | 25, 966, 700 | 15.3 | 10. 13 |
| Townships. | 20, 794, 400 | 12.2 | 21. 51 |
| Places to 2,499 | 11, 881, 900 | 7.0 | 35.00 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 14, 291, 700 | 8.4 | 41.78 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 4, 848, 100 | 2.9 | 62.05 |
| St, Paul and Duluth | 15, 876, 800 | 9.4 | 42. 56 |
| Minneapolis. | 23, 098, 700 | 13.6 | 49. 74 |
| Total | 169, 742, 600 | 100.0 | 66. 20 |

TABLE 4.-Total of all State and local charges payable by taxpayers in the local units of government in 1932

| Paid by taxpayers in- | General property tax | Motor vehicle and motor fuel taxes ${ }^{1}$ | Other taxes | All taxes | Percent | Per capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Townships. | \$39, 448, 100 | \$6, 289, 100 | \$5, 759, 900 | \$51, 497, 100 | 30.3 | \$53. 26 |
| Places to 2,499 | 15, 419, 200 | 3, 168,900 | 3, 192, 700 | 21, 780, 800 | 12.8 | 64. 15 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 17, 164, 600 | 2, 532, 600 | 3, 733, 600 | $23,430,800$ | 13.8 | 68.50 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 6, 857, 900 | 680,000 | 1, 404, 400 | 8, 942, 300 | 5.3 | 114. 44 |
| St. Paul and Duluth | 21, 058, 900 | 3, 131, 400 | 3, 296, 200 | 27, 486, 500 | 16.2 | 73. 68 |
| Minneapolis. | 27, 548, 200 | 4, 566, 100 | 4, 490,800 | $36,605,100$ | 21.6 | 78.83 |
| Total | 127, 496, 900 | 20,368, 100 | 21, 877, 600 | 169, 742, 600 | 100.0 | 66. 20 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 32,700$ out-of-State registration fees.
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Table 5.-Comparison between the tax rate on general property necessary to produce all revenues from property taxes and the actual tax rate on general property as levied, per $\$ 100$ valuation

| Unit of government | Actual tax rate on general property as levied | Tax rate needed to raise all funds by general property tax levies | Percentage <br> that general <br> property taxes are of all taxes and imposts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Townships. | \$4.88 | \$6. 37 | 76.6 |
| Places to 2,499. | 8.00 | 11. 30 | 70.8 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999. | 8.97 | 12. 25 | 73.2 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 6.71 | 8.75 | 76.7 |
| St. Paul and Duluth | 8.16 | 10.64 | 76.7 |
| Minneapolis. | 8.33 | 11.06 | 75.3 |
| Average for State | 6.77 | 9.01 | 75.1 |

Of the total county expenditures of $\$ 29,708,100$, $\$ 24,452,900$, or 82.3 percent, was for highways and public benefit. Only a relatively small amount was spent for education by the counties.

The local rural and urban areas expended 11.8 percent of their money for highways, 56.5 percent for education, 26.3 percent for public benefit, and but 5.4 percent for government (table 6).

Comparisons between the amounts spent by the various governmental units for the several purposes are more obvious when expressed in expenditures per capita (table 7). Since the amount spent for a given purpose is an indication of the extent to which a unit of government performs that service for residents, a comparison of the functions of the several governments can also be made from the tables.

From table 8 it can be seen that the amount spent for education in Minnesota was 33.2 percent of the
total expenditures, for highways 31.8, for public benefit 28.3, and for government 6.7.

Sixty percent of the expenditures made by the State government was for highways. This was 57.7 percent of the total amount spent for roads and streets in the entire State. This large expenditure is to be expected, for although the mileage of roads administered by the State is comparatively small, the high types of construction and high standards of maintenance require extensive outlays.

TABLe 6.-Total expenditures in Minnesota in 1932 by purpose and by governmental unit

| Purpose | State |  | County |  | Local |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent |
| Highways: Amount |  | 60.0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 12,720,700 \\ 22.8 \\ \$ 4.96 \end{array}$ | 42.8 | $\begin{array}{\|} \$ 10,862,000 \\ 19.5 \\ \$ 4.24 \end{array}$ | 11.8 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 55,732,600 \\ 100.0 \\ \$ 21.74 \end{array}$ | 31.8 |
| Percent. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 32,149,900 \\ 57.7 \\ \$ 12.54 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education: Amount | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5,902,800 \\ 10.1 \\ \$ 2.30 \end{array}$ | 11.0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 301,600 \\ 0.5 \\ \$ 0.12 \end{array}$ | 1.0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 52,072,100 \\ 89.4 \\ \$ 20.31 \end{array}$ | 56.5 | $\$ 58,276,500$100.0 | 33.2 |
| Percent, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public benefit: Amount.- | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 13,774,000 \\ 27.7 \\ \$ 5.37 \end{array}$ | 25.7 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 11,732,200 \\ 23.6 \\ \$ 4.57 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 24,246,200 \\ 48.7 \\ \$ 9.46 \end{array}$ | 26.3 | \$49, 752, 400 100. | 28.3 |
| Percent |  |  |  | 39.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government: | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,756,100 \\ 15.0 \\ \$ 0.69 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4,953,600 \\ 42.2 \\ \$ 1.93 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5,017,300 \\ 42.8 \\ \$ 1.95 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 11,727,000 \\ 100.0 \\ \$ 4.57 \end{array}$ | 6.7 |
| Amount-...- |  | 3.3 |  | 16.7 |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| Per capita.-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,582,800 \\ 30.5 \\ \$ 20.90 \end{array}$ | 100.0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 29,708,100 \\ 16.9 \\ \$ 11.58 \end{array}$ | 100.0 | $\left.\begin{array}{r} \$ 92,197,600 \\ 52.6 \\ \$ 3596 \end{array}\right]$ | 100.0 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{r} \$ 175,488,500 \\ 100.0 \\ \$ 68.44 \end{array}\right.$ | 100.0 |
| Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLe 7．－All State and local expenditures in 1932，and per capita expenditures by purpose，based on the population in 1930

| Expended by－ | Total amount | Per capita expenditure for－ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\underset{\text { Ways }}{\text { High－}}$ | Educa－ tion | Public benefit | Govern－ ment | Total |
| State | \＄53，582， 800 | \＄12． 54 | \＄2． 30 | \＄5． 37 | \＄0． 69 | \＄20．90 |
| Counties．．． | 29，708， 100 | 4.96 | ． 12 | 4.57 | 1.93 | 11． 58 |
| Places to 2，499 | 14， 8589,100 | 4． 03 | 9．66 | － 6.44 | －．95 | 15.08 |
| Places 2，500 to 14，999 | 17，288， 200 | 3． 74 | 32，92 | 11．39 | 2． 2.49 | 40． 54 |
| Places 15，000 to 74，999 | 5，030， 000 | 6． 22 | 34． 22 | 19.96 | 2． 3 | 64.38 |
| St．Paul and Duluth | 14，743， 900 | 4.61 | 19．14 | 11.33 | 4.44 | 39.52 |
| Minneapolis． | 24，695， 400 | 5． 65 | 20.76 | 25.63 | 1.15 | 53.19 |
| Total | 175，488， 500 | 21． 74 | 22.73 | 19.40 | 4.57 | 68.44 |

Table 8．－Classification of expenditures by purpose and by units of government in 1932

| Unit of government | Percentage of expenditures by the units of govern－ ment for the purposes in－ dicated |  |  |  |  | Percentage of the total expendi－ ture for each purpose made by each unit of government |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { E } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言 } \\ & \text { at } \\ & \text { = } \end{aligned}$ |  | 路： | － | 号品 | 言号 |
| State． | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \\ & 60.0 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cent } \\ 11.0 \end{gathered}$ | Per－ cent 25.7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ $3.3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | Per－ cent 57.7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cent } \\ 10.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \\ & 27.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \\ & 15.0 \end{aligned}$ | Per－ cent 30.5 |
| Counties．．． | 42.8 | 1.0 | 39．5 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 22.8 | ． 5 | 23.6 | 42.2 | 16.9 |
| Townships－ | 26．7 | 64． 1 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 100.0 | 7.0 | 16．0 | 9 | 7.8 | 8.3 |
| Places to 2，499 | 5． 4 | 75.8 | 14． 1 | 4． 7 | 100.0 | 1.5 | 20．6 | 4.5 | 6.3 | 9.0 |
| Places 15，000 to 74，999－ | 7.4 | 65.1 | 22.6 | 4.9 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 19.3 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 9.9 |
| St．Paul and Duluth． | 11.7 | 48.4 | 28.7 | 11．2 | 100.0 | $\stackrel{.9}{3.1}$ | 4．6 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| Minneapolis．．．．－．－．－－ | 10.6 | 39.0 | 48.2 | 2． 2 | 100.0 | 4.7 | 16．6 | 23.9 | 4．6 | 14．1 |
| Total | 31.8 | 33.2 | 28.3 | 6.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100． 0 | 100.0 |

About 26 percent of the State expenditure was for public benefit．The largest part of this cost was for relief purposes and for the maintenance of charitable and penal institutions．The amount spent by the State for the protection and care of persons and property was 27.7 percent of the total expended for public benefit．
The chief functions of the counties，too，are the con－ struction and maintenance of highways and the protec－ tion and care of the people．The State and counties together spent 80.5 percent of the total expenditures made in Minnesota for highways and 51.3 percent of the total for public benefit．
The proportion of county expenditures for govern－ ment to those for other purposes was relatively high， and represented 42.2 percent of the total expenditures for governmental purposes made by all units of gov－ ernment．This resulted from the large expenditures incurred in connection with the collection and administration of taxes and interest payments on bonds．

The greatest proportion of expenditures by the local units of government was for education．Of the total expenditure of $\$ 35.96$ per person，$\$ 20.31$ ，or 56 percent， was for education．Minneapolis is the only place where the expenditure for education is not the largest single item；the amount spent for public benefit in Minneapo－ lis exceeded by $\$ 4.87$ per capita the amount spent for education．

In the rural areas a relatively small amount was spent for public benefit．Except for St．Paul and Duluth，the per－capita expenditure for public benefit tended to increase as the size of place increased．

Expenditures by the State and counties are made in and for the benefit of the residents in the rural areas

Table 9．－Per－capita expenditures by purpose in the several classes of places，based on the population in 1930

| Class of place in which expend－ iture was made | High－ ways | Educa－ tion | Public benefit | Govern－ ment | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Townships． | \＄46． 05 | \＄12．10 | \＄9．91 | \＄3．47 | \＄71． 53 |
| Places to 2，499 | 10．07 | 37.84 | 15． 92 | 4． 70 | 68． 53 |
| Places 2，500 to 14，999 | 8.21 | 35． 36 | 21.28 | 4.99 | 69.84 |
| Places 15，000 to 74，999 | 6． 88 | 36． 64 | 29．70 | 6.23 | 79.45 |
| St．Paul and Duluth | 4.89 | 21.52 | 23． 93 | 9． 13 | 59.47 |
| Minneapolis．．．．．．．． | 5． 65 | 23.12 | 34.97 | 2.54 | 66． 28 |
| Total． | 21.74 | 22.73 | 19.40 | 4.57 | 68.44 |

Table 10．－Per－capita taxation and expenditures in 1932，based on the population in 1930

| Class of place | Per－ capita taxation | Per－ capita expendi－ tures | Ratio of ex－ penditures to taxation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Townships． | \＄53． 26 | \＄71． 53 | 1． 34 |
| Places to 2，499 | 64.15 | 68.53 | 1． 07 |
| Places 2，500 to 14，999． | 68.50 | 69.84 | 1． 02 |
| Places 15，000 to 74，999． | 114.44 | 79.45 | ． 69 |
| St．Paul and Duluth． | 73.68 | 59.47 | ． 81 |
| Minneapolis． | 78.83 | 66.28 | ． 84 |
| Average for State | 66.20 | 68.44 | 1.03 |

and the several classes of urban places．For example， the total amount spent in the rural areas for all pur－ poses by the State，counties，and townships was $\$ 69,160,-$ 200 ，or 39.4 percent of the total of all expenditures． This was $\$ 71.53$ per capita，of which the townships themselves spent $\$ 15.08$ per capita．Nearly two－thirds of the amount spent in the rural areas was for highways．

It is not to be inferred，however，that this highway expenditure in rural areas confers an undue benefit upon those localities，as these expenditures were primarily for through highways traveled by vehicles from all parts of the State．

Table 9 shows the entire amount per capita spent in each class of place by all governmental agencies for all purposes．

PER－CAPITA EXPENDITURES IN RURAL AREAS EXCEEDED PER－ CAPITA TAXATION
A comparison of the taxes and expenditures per capita in the various localities is given in table 10．The taxes are those paid by residents of the communities；the expenditures are those made in and for the residents of the localities by all units of government．The table indi－ cates that there is a flow of funds to the rural areas and smaller urban places．The per－capita expenditures in the rural areas exceeded the per－capita taxation by $\$ 18.27$ ．On the other hand the expenditures in the larger urban areas were less than the taxes．

The expenditures for the entire State exceeded the taxation by $\$ 2.24$ per capita．This lag of taxes behind expenditures reflects the effect of financing current costs from borrowings and balances．

Comprehensive figures regarding the flow of funds from urban to rural communities are given in tables 11， 12 ，and 13．These tables show that $\$ 69,160,200$ was expended in the rural areas by all governmental agen－ cies for all purposes，while the same communities paid $\$ 51,497,100$ in taxes．Of the total expenditures in the rural areas， 21.1 percent was made by the townships and 78.9 percent by the State and counties．This flow of funds to the rural areas is due mainly to the large

Table 11.-Total of all taxes paid by residents of rural and urban areas


Table 12.-Total expenditures by purpose as made by all units of government for residents of rural and urban areas

| Area | Purpose | Local governments |  |  | State and county governments |  |  | All governments |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Amount | Percent | Per capita | Amount | Percent | Per capita | Amount | Percent | Per capita |
| Rural. | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Highways } \\ \text { Education....... } \\ \text { Public benefit. } \\ \text { Government }\end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,894,300 \\ 9,342,900 \\ 424,900 \\ 918,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.7 \\ 64.1 \\ 2.9 \\ 6.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4.03 \\ 9.66 \\ .44 \\ .95 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,628,800 \\ 2,361,800 \\ 9,155,000 \\ 2,433,600 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 74.4 \\ 4.3 \\ 16.8 \\ 4.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2.02 \\ 2.44 \\ 9.47 \\ 2.52 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 44,523,100 \\ 11,704,700 \\ 9,579,900 \\ 3,352,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 64.4 \\ 16.9 \\ 13.9 \\ 4.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 46.05 \\ 12.10 \\ 9.91 \\ 3.47 \end{array}$ |
|  | Total | 14, 581, 000 | 100.0 | 15.08 | 54, 579, 200 | 100.0 | 56. 45 | 69, 160, 200 | 100.0 | 71. 53 |
|  | $\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { Highways...-- } \\ \text { Education-- } \\ \text { Public benefit } \\ \text { Government.- }\end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,967,700 \\ 42,729,200 \\ 23,821,300 \\ 4,098,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.0 \\ 55.0 \\ 30.7 \\ 5.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.36 \\ 26.75 \\ 14.92 \\ 2.57 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,241,800 \\ 3,842,600 \\ 16,351,200 \\ 4,276,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.8 \\ & 13.4 \\ & 56.9 \\ & 14.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.66 \\ 2.41 \\ 10.23 \\ 2.68 \end{array}$ | 11, 209, 500 <br> 46, 571, 800 <br> 40, 172, 500 <br> 8, 374, 500 | $\begin{array}{r} 10.5 \\ 43.8 \\ 37.8 \\ 7.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.02 \\ 29.16 \\ 25.15 \\ 5.25 \end{array}$ |
| Total | Total | 77,616, 600 | 100.0 | 48.60 | 28, 711, 700 | 100.0 | 17.98 | 106,328, 300 | 100.0 | 66. 58 |
|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Highways....- } \\ \text { Education } \\ \text { Public benefit } \\ \text { Government. }\end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 10,862,000 \\ 52,072,100 \\ 24,246,200 \\ 5,017,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.8 \\ 56.5 \\ 26.3 \\ 5.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.24 \\ 20.31 \\ 9.46 \\ 1.95 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 44,870,600 \\ 6,204,400 \\ 25,506,200 \\ 6,709,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 53.9 \\ 7.4 \\ 30.6 \\ 8.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.50 \\ 2.42 \\ 9.94 \\ 2.62 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55,732,600 \\ & 58,276,500 \\ & 49,752,400 \\ & 11,727,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31.7 \\ 33.2 \\ 28.4 \\ 6.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21.74 \\ 22.73 \\ 19.40 \\ 4.57 \end{array}$ |
|  | Total | 92, 197, 600 | 100.0 | 35.96 | 83, 290, 900 | 100.0 | 32.48 | 175, 488, 500 | 100.0 | 68.44 |

Table 13.-Highway taxes paid by residents of rural and urban areas ${ }^{1}$

| Area | Type of impost | Tax-levying agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Local governments |  |  | State and county governments |  |  | All governments |  |  |
|  |  | Amount | Percent | Per capita | Amount | Percent | Per capita | Amount | Percent | Per capita |
| Rural.Urban | $\left\{\begin{array}{r}\text { Property imposts } \\ \text { Other imposts.............................................................................................. }\end{array}\right.$ | \$5, 562, 700 | 100.0 | \$5. 75 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5,028,200 \\ 6,276,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44.5 \\ & 55.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5.20 \\ 6.50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,590,900 \\ 6,276,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.8 \\ & 37.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.95 \\ 6.50 \end{array}$ |
|  |  | 5, 562,700 | 100.0 | 5. 75 | 11, 304, 200 | 100.0 | 11.70 | 16, 866, 900 | 100.0 | 17. 45 |
|  | $\mid \int \text { Property imposts }$ | 4, 110, 100 | 100.0 | 2.57 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,613,000 \\ 14,059,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.7 \\ & 75.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.89 \\ & 8.80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,723,100 \\ 14,059,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.3 \\ & 61.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.46 \\ & 8.80 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{PrC} \\ \mathrm{Otl} \end{array}\right.$ | 4, 110, 100 | 100.0 | 2. 57 | 18,672,400 | 100.0 | 11.69 | 22, 782, 500 | 100.0 | 14.26 |
|  |  | 9, 672, 800 | 100.0 | 3.77 | $\begin{array}{r} 9,641,200 \\ 20,335,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.2 \\ & 67.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.76 \\ & 7.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,314,000 \\ & 20,335,400 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.7 \\ & 51.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.53 \\ & 7.93 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 9, 672, 800 | 100.0 | 3.77 | 29, 976, 600 | 100.0 | 11.69 | 39, 649, 400 | 100.0 | 15.46 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include $\$ 32,700$ out-of-State registration fees.
expenditures for highway purposes. This does not mean that subsidies are being granted to rural areas. The residents of urban areas perform travel on these rural roads approximately commensurate with their contributions.

Table 13, which classifies highway taxes, is of particular interest. It shows: (1) That the only taxes levied for highways by the local governments were property imposts; (2) that the property taxes accounted for one-third of the levies made for highways
by the State and counties; (3) that of the imposts used for roads and streets, about one-half is from other-than-property taxes, mainly motor-vehicle revenues; (4) that the per-capita property taxes levied for highways in the rural areas were more than twice those levied in the urban areas; and (5) that the property taxes for highways were almost two-thirds of the total highway taxes paid by rural residents, while in the urban areas they represented but a little over one-third of the total paid by urban residents.

## INDEBTEDNESS IN MINNESOTA DISCUSSED

The total outstanding indebtedness of all units of government in Minnesota in 1932 was $\$ 334,597,800$. This consisted of $\$ 321,580,700$ of bonded debt and $\$ 13,017,100$ of temporary obligations. Table 14 gives the data for bonded debt only.

The bonded indebtedness of the State government was $\$ 111,335,300$, of which rural credit bonds of over $\$ 60,000,000$ comprised the greater portion. These rural credit bonds were agricultural loans intended as advances during an emergency. The State guaranteed their payment, and as the interest is in default upon this debt it has become a State liability. The debt of the State government itself was 34.6 percent of the total for all units of government.

The county bonded debt was $\$ 45,890,600$, of which over $\$ 24,000,000$ was for drainage ditches. The counties had no indebtedness for education.

The indebtedness of the townships, villages, and cities was $\$ 164,354,800$, or 51.1 percent of the total bonded debt. The cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth incurred \$109,523,200 , or 66.6 percent of this total. The townships or rural areas incurred only $\$ 7,346,100$, or 4.5

Table 14.-Total bonded indebtedness of various units of government by purpose in 1932

percent, and the municipalities of less than 75,000 population incurred $\$ 47,485,500$, or 28.9 percent of the total local rural and urban bonded debt.

Of the total debt of $\$ 95,051,900$ outstanding for highways, 62.3 percent was contracted by the State and counties for use on trunk and other main highway routes.
The indebtedness outstanding for public benefit was the largest amount incurred for any one purpose. Of the total debt of $\$ 130,999,300$ incurred for public counties contracted $\$ 92,-$ 653,300 , or 70.7 percent. Large issues of rural credit and drainage ditch bonds account for approximately 90 percent of the public benefit debt incurred by the State and counties.

Indebtedness for education totaled $\$ 69,339,500$, most of which was incurred by the local units of government. The debt for governmental purposes amounted to only 8 percent of the total.

Debt service consists of interest and principal payments on indebtedness. Interest payments are included in the total expenditures, principal payments are not. The total debt service in 1932 was $\$ 35$,732,800 , of which $\$ 20,304,-$ 400 was for principal and $\$ 15,428,400$ for interest (table 15). Over 20 percent of the total revenues of all the governmental units in 1932 was used for interest and debt-retirement payments.

Table 15.-Payments for debt service in 1932

| Unit of government | Principal | Interest | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State: Amount.. Per capita | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,969,400 \\ 1.55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4,648,100 \\ 1.81 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 8,617,500 \\ 3.36 \end{array}$ |
| Counties: Amount-. Per capita. | $\begin{array}{r} 3,776,800 \\ 1.47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,580,300 \\ 1.01 \end{array}$ | $6,357,100$ 2.48 |
| Local: 1 Amount Per capita | $\begin{array}{r} 12,558,200 \\ 4.90 \end{array}$ | $8,200,000$ 3.20 | $20,758,200$ 8.10 |
| Total: Amount ... Per capita. | $\begin{array}{r} 20,304,400 \\ 7.92 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,428,400 \\ 6.02 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 35,732,800 \\ 13.94 \end{array}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Townships and incorporated places.

## MINNESOTA HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESCRIBED

There are four main classes of highways in Minnesota: (1) The State trunk system, which includes the Federalaid system; (2) county roads; (3) local rural roads; and (4) city and village streets.

The routes included in the State trunk system are designated and described in the State constitution and are identical with the numbered State routes. The
entire construction and maintenance costs of the trunk routes are met with funds available to the State, and these State roads are entirely under the administration of the State highway department.

County roads are of three classes: (1) The legally designated State-aid roads; (2) county-aid roads; and (3) in some counties, special county roads. All are administered by the county, although some of the support for the State-aid roads comes from the State.

Local rural roads are those roads other than State and county highways lying outside corporate limits. They are administered and entirely financed by the townships.

Urban streets are thoroughfares within corporate units. They are administered by municipal authorities and the funds for their support are derived from local sources. For the most part the State trunk roads lying within the corporate limits are financed and administered by the cities in the same manner as in the case of all urban streets. This is particularly true of the larger cities. The city expenditures, therefore, include amounts spent by municipalities, both on the streets primarily carrying local traffic and also on those streets within the corporate limits that form part of the State routes.

The total mileage of the roads and streets comprising a transportation system must be known in making a complete highway analysis. Except in a few States, however, there is a general lack of adequate and reliable data on this subject. In Minnesota no information is available concerning the mileage of city streets, and the accuracy of the figures for rural highways is questionable.

One of the primary difficulties connected with the problem is the lack of uniformity regarding the meaning of the term "road." Roads may vary from strips of land to which the public has a title for highway purposes to highways open and available to vehicular traffic the year round. Because of the presence in northern Minnesota of so many roads that have legal status but are not actually utilized, field measurements might show the total mileage annually suitable for ordinary vehicular traffic to be as much as 5 percent below the totals that have been compiled

Table 16 presents information on the mileages, by types, for rural highways. In $1933,4,500$ miles of highway were added to the State trunk system by legislative act, thus making a total of 11,272 miles of trunk routes now under the administration of the State highway department.

Table 16. - Mileage and degree of improvement of rural highways in 1932

| System | Bituminous concrete and portland cement concrete |  | Bitumi-nons-treated surface |  | Gravel |  | Earth |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{y}{y}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \text { U0 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\unrhd}{\Sigma}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { 20 }}{\vec{Z}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{G} \\ & \stackrel{U}{0} \\ & \text { a } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{ٌ}{\underset{\sim}{z}}$ | 免 | $\stackrel{y y}{\ddot{Z}}$ | + |  |
| State | 2, 407 | 35. 5 | 2, 460 | 36.3 | 1,83y | 27.2 | 66 | 1.0 | 6, 772 | 100.0 |  |
| County | 115 |  | 890 | 2.8 | 22, 269 | 69.3 | 8,852 | 27.5 | 32, 126 | 100.0 | 28.8 |
| Township | 2 | (1) | 21 | (i) | 22,624 | 31.2 | 49, 930 | 68.8 | 72, 577 | 100. 0 | 65.1 |
| Total | 2, 524 | 2.3 | 3,371 | 3.0 | 46, 732 | 41.9 | 58,848 | 52.8 | 111, 475 | 100.0 | 00.0 |

[^2]
## HIGHWAY FUNDS OBTAINED FROM SEVERAL SOURCES

The construction and maintenance of roads and streets in Minnesota are financed from the proceeds of property taxes, motor-vehicle imposts, Federal-aid apportionments, and temporary and long-term borrowings. Federal funds in 1932 amounted to $\$ 4,457,200$, of which $\$ 3,039,600$ was regular Federal aid and $\$ 1,417,600$ was from emergency appropriations.

Table 17 shows that, of the taxes used for highways in 1932, 48.7 percent came from the general property tax and 51.3 percent from motor-vehicle revenues. All of the special assessments were made by the local units of government.

The State property tax for highway purposes is a 1 -mill levy, the proceeds of which are allocated to the counties for use upon State-aid roads.

The funds for the local township roads and the streets in villages and cities were derived from local sources entirely from levies against property. In the urban communities there were three general types of property imposts used for street purposes: (1) Special assessments; (2) property taxes levied specifically for highway purposes; and (3) property taxes levied for general fund purposes. The proceeds from this last type of levy were not specifically designated as highway taxes, but highway costs were met out of them.

Motor-vehicle registration fees.-Minnesota is one of the few States that tax motor vehicles on the basis of valuation. Vehicles for which this tax is paid are exempt from the regular tax on personal property. Unregistered vehicles in the hands of dealers are subject to the personal property tax, however.
Tabre 17.-Taxation imposed for strcet and highway purposes in 1939

${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 32,700$ nonresident fees.
A total of $\$ 10,019,600$ in registration fees was collected in 1932. Minnesota residents paid $\$ 9,986,900$ of this amount and out-of-State residents contributed $\$ 32,700$. The cost of collecting the registration fees was $\$ 367,000$ or 3.7 percent of the total gross receipts. This was 52 cents per vehicle registered. The withdrawal from the highway fund was $\$ 420,000$ for this cost. Of the total proceeds, $\$ 2,418,900$ was committed to retire trunk highway bonds and to pay the interest on this debt. Only $\$ 7,180,700$, therefore, remained for use by the State highway department on the trunk highways.

The motor-vehicle license fee data were obtained from records in the State offices. A representative sample of registrations was listed and analyzed, and questionnaires were sent to motor-vehicle owners to
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Table 18.-Comparison of the several classes of local governmental units as to motor-vehicle imposts paid, population, number of vehicles registered, and contribution to total travel


Registered by Minnesota residents.
Paid by Minnesota residents only.
${ }^{8}$ Includes $\$ 347,900$ of miscellaneous motor-vehicle revenıes.
determine the exact allocation of motor vehicles in the rural areas and several classes of urban places. The questionnaires covered the situs of ownership in the year 1934 but the results were applied to 1932 registration figures. On the basis of the records and the replies to the questionnaires, the distribution shown in table 18 was made.

There were 706,186 motor vehicles registered in Minnesota in 1932, of which 704,896 were registered by Minnesota residents and 1,290 by nonresidents. Of the resident vehicles, 82.4 percent or 580,549 were passenger cars, 14.4 percent or 101,318 were trucks and busses, and 3.2 percent or 23,029 were other vehicles such as trailers, motorcycles, and tractors.
Approximately 40 percent of the motor vehicles were registered in the rural areas and paid 33.9 percent of the registration fees. This amounted to $\$ 12.06$ per vehicle. The registration fees in the urban areas amounted to $\$ 6,603,400$ or $\$ 15.56$ per vehicle licensed. As the size of place increased the average license fee paid increased. The average fee per motor vehicle in Duluth, St. Paul, and Minneapolis was \$17. The difference in fees is attributed to the fact that the less valuable cars tend to be registered in the rural areas. The trend is even more pronounced when the data for passenger cars and trucks and busses are analyzed
separately. It is also interesting to note that the spread between the average fee paid for passenger cars and that paid for trucks and busses tended to increase as the size of the place increased.

Motor-fuel tax.-Minnesota collects a fuel tax of 3 cents per gallon on gasoline consumed by vehicles operating on the highways. Refunds are allowed for nonhighway use. The figures shown in table 18 are the net amounts collected. Collections are made by oil inspectors of the State department of agriculture, dairy, and food. Two-thirds of the net amount collected is given to the State highway department for use on the trunk highway system and one-third is given to the counties for use on the county-aid roads.

Of the State road and bridge funds that are apportioned to the counties, not less than 20 percent must be used for maintenance. While the apportionments under the State-aid act may vary from 1 percent to 3 percent of the total funds a vailable, the statutes do not specify the determining factors as to the amount that may be made available. There is also an indefinite provision relating to the apportionment of the gasoline tax funds. While no less than 0.75 percent, and no more than 3 percent, may be apportioned to any one county, the method of apportionment is simply that "* * * in the making of such apportionment regard
shall be had to the mileage of county and town roads and the traffic needs and conditions of the respective counties."

The State-aid funds paid out of the State property tax are utilized for certain county roads known as State-aid roads. The allotment of gasoline tax money to the counties is used in connection with funds raised by the towns on roads primarily having the characteristics of local rural highways, although they are designated as county-aid roads and are generally treated in the same classification as other county roads.
The cost of collecting the motor-fuel taxes was only $\$ 14,100$, or 0.14 percent of the gross receipts. The cost amounted to 2 cents per vehicle.

After deducting the amount paid to the State road and bridge fund for apportionment to the counties, there remained $\$ 6,651,000$ for use on State trunk routes.
To determine the incidence of the motor-fuel tax, questionnaires were sent to 22,000 motor-vehicle owners selected at random. The questionnaire requested the owner to give information regarding the average annual travel performed, the amount of gasoline consumed, and the average number of miles obtained per gallon.

The replies were analyzed and from them a distribution of motor-fuel taxes was made. Table 18 contains a tabulation of the results.
The rural areas paid 33.9 percent of the motorvehicle registration fees and 27.5 percent of the gasoline taxes. The gasoline taxes amounted to $\$ 9.81$ per vehicle. As was the case with motor-vehicle registration fees, the gasoline tax per vehicle increases as the size of place increases. Minneapolis motor-vehicle owners paid $\$ 19.77$ per vehicle in gasoline taxes, and St. Paul and Duluth vehicle owners paid $\$ 18.97$. This trend is explained as follows: Because of traffic conditions, the automobiles in urban areas get less mileage per gallon; the heavier vehicles are concentrated in the cities; and the average number of miles traveled annually is greater for vehicles owned in the cities.

Other motor-vehicle imposts.-Miscellaneous motorvehicle imposts total $\$ 347,900$. These imposts include minor charges against motor-vehicle owners such as chauffeurs' licenses, duplicate plates, property tax on motor vehicles in the hands of dealers, and similar charges.

Table 18 presents interesting data regarding motorvehicle fees, and for purposes of comparison shows in addition population, registration, and travel data for the various places.

FIFTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF ALL HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES MADE: ON STATE TRUNK SYSTEM

The contributions in 1932 by residents of the rural and urban areas to the costs of the highway program are shown in table 19. The table shows the total amounts that residents in each class of place contributed, both in State and local revenues. The proportion each impost bears to the total taxes levied can also be seen from this table.

Tables 20 and 21 show the sources of revenue for road and street purposes classified by type of revenue and by contributing agency. The highway systems upon which the revenues were used are also shown. These tables summarize all information on the sources of highway imposts and the highway systems upon which they were expended.

## EIGHTY PERCENT OF ALL ROAD AND STREET EXPENDITURES MADE ON RURAL ROADS

Sufficient data have been obtained so that the figures on road costs for the State, county, and townships are reasonably accurate. The total expenditures for city streets were also obtained, but very little information was found concerning the respective amounts spent for construction and maintenance. For this reason it has been deemed inadvisable to estimate the proportionate amounts spent for these purposes.
Table 22 shows that of the total of $\$ 55,732,600$ spent for highways in $1932, \$ 32,149,900$ or 57.7 percent was expended by the State; ${ }^{2} \$ 12,720,700$ or 22.8 percent was expended by the counties; and the remainder, $\$ 10,862,000$ or 19.5 percent, was expended by the local communities for rural roads and urban streets.

The amount spent on the State trunk highways includes expenditures on the urban as well as the rural portions of the trunk routes. About 11.5 percent or $\$ 3,712,100$ was spent on the State trunk rontes in corporate limits. Of the total of $\$ 32,149,900$ spent on trunk routes, $\$ 26,299,500$ or 81.8 percent was spent for construction, $\$ 3,818,400$ or 11.9 percent for maintenance, and $\$ 2,032,000$ or 6.3 percent for overhead.

[^3]Table 19.-Incidence of taxalion for street and highway purposes

| Paid by taxpayers in- | Type of impost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Motor-fuel tax |  | Registration fees ${ }^{1}$ |  | Other motor-vehicle imposts |  | Special assessments |  | Property tax |  |  |  |
|  | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent |
| Townships | \$2, 754, 000 | 27.5 | \$3, 396, 600 | 33.9 | \$138, 500 | 39.8 |  |  | \$10,590, 900 | 65.1 | \$16, 880, 000 | 42.5 |
| Places to 2,499. | 1, 565, 100 | 15.7 | 1,547, 800 | 15.5 | 56, 000 | 16.1 | \$221, 400 | 7.3 | 1, 563, 600 | 9.6 | 4,953,900 | 12. 5 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 1, 276, 300 | 12.8 | 1, 215, 300 | 12.1 | 41,000 | 11.8 | 464, 200 | 15.2 | 1, 341,800 | 8.3 | 4,338, 600 | 10.9 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 359,100 | 3.6 | 311,300 | 3.1 | 9,600 | 2.8 | 101,600 | 3.3 | 729,900 | 4.5 | 1,511,500 | 3.8 |
| St. Paul and Duluth. | 1,623, 400 | 16.2 | 1, 465, 700 | 14.6 | 42, 300 | 12.1 | 815, 300 | 26.7 | 890, 500 | 5. 5 | 4,837, 200 | 12.2 |
| Minneapolis_ | 2, 422, 700 | 24.2 | 2,082,900 | 20.8 | 60,500 | 17.4 | 1,450,400 | 47.5 | 1,144, 400 | 7.0 | $7,160,900$ | 18.1 |
| Tota | 10,000,600 | 100.0 | 10,019,600 | 100.0 | 347, 900 | 100.0 | 3,052,900 | 100.0 | 16, 261, 100 | 100.0 | 39,682, 100 | 100.0 |
| Percentage of total. |  | 25.2 |  | 25.2 |  | . 9 |  | 7.7 |  | 41.0 | ------------ | 100.0 |

[^4]

Snow Removar Is an Item of Highway Maintenance Expenditure.
Table 20.-Funds expended on the several highway systems and the city streets in 1932, and the approximate amounts and percentages of these funds provided by imposts made by the various governmental units and by loan and reserve funds

| Highway system and form of revenue | Governmental agency providing funds |  |  |  |  | Percentage of total current tax funds | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percentage } \\ \text { of total } \\ \text { funds } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Federal Government | State | Counties | Local goveraments | Total |  |  |
| State trunk system: Loans and reserves. . |  | \$13, 861, 000 |  |  | \$13, 861, 000 |  |  |
| Current taxes......- | \$1, 457, 200 | 13, 831, 700 |  |  | 18.288, 900 | 43.8 |  |
| Total | 4, 457, 200 | 27, 692, 700 |  |  | 32, 149, 900 | ----------- | 57.7 |
| Percentage of total. | 13.9 | 86.1 | ------..... |  | 100.0 | ------------ | -------.--- |
| County highways: <br> Loans and reserves |  |  | \$94, 600 |  | 94,600 |  |  |
| Current taxes..... |  | 5,219,700 | 7, 406, 400 |  | 12, 626, 100 | 30.3 |  |
| Total. |  | 5, 219, 700 | 7, 501, 000 |  | 12, 720,700 |  | 22.8 |
| Percentage of total. |  | 41.0 | 59.0 | --1. | 100.0 | ------------ | --------..-- |
| Local township roads: Loans and reserves. Current taxes. ..... |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 43,500 \\ 3,850,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 43,500 \\ 3,850,800 \end{array}$ | 92 |  |
| Total. |  |  | ----..-- | 3, 894, 300 | 3, 894,300 | ------------ | 7.0 |
| Percentage of total |  | ----....... |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | -...------..- | -----.------ |
| City streets: <br> Loans and reserves. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current taxes.. |  |  |  | 6,967,700 | 8,967,700 | 16.7 |  |
| 'Iotal |  | ---------- | ----.... | 6, 967, 700 | 6,967, 700 |  | 12.5 |
| Percentage of total |  |  |  | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
| All roads and streets: Loans and reserves. Current taxes | 4, 457, 200 | $\begin{aligned} & 13,861,000 \\ & 19,051,400 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94,600 \\ 7,406,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 43,500 \\ 10,818,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,999,100 \\ & 41,733,500 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |  |
| Total. | 4, 457, 200 | 32, 912, 400 | 7,501, 000 | 10, 862, 000 | 55, 732, 600 |  | 100.0 |
| Percentage of total. | 8.0 | 59.0 | 13.5 | 19.5 | 100.0 |  |  |

Table 21.-Approximate amounts of the 1932 taxes and imposts expended on the current highway and street program listect according to highway system, type of tax, and class of local unit in which the tax is paid
IMPOSTS ON GENERAL PROPERTY LEVIED SPECIFICALLY FOR HIGHWAYS

| Paid by taxpayers in-- | Highway system |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | State trunk |  | County trunk |  | Township |  | Urban streets |  | All highways and streets |  |  |
|  | Amount | Percent | A mount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Percentage of total |
| Townships <br> Places to 2,499 <br> Places 2,500 to 14,999. <br> Places 15,000 to 74,999 <br> St. Paul and Duluth <br> Minneapolis. <br> Total |  |  | \$4, 830, 000 | 55.6 | \$3, 850, 800 | 44.4 |  |  | \$8,680, 800 | 100.0 | 54.8 |
|  |  |  | 1, 295, 700 | 70. 1 |  |  | \$551, 600 | 29.9 | 1, 847, 300 | 100.0 | 11.6 |
|  |  |  | 1, ${ }_{664} 12060$ | 64. 6.8 |  |  | 631,000 345,300 | 35.9 34.2 | $1,756,400$ $1,009,900$ | 100.0 100.0 | 11.1 6.4 |
|  |  |  | 865, 500 | 59.8 |  |  | 581, 600 | 40.2 | 1, 447, 100 | 100.0 | 6. 9.1 9. |
|  |  |  | 509, 400 | 45.9 |  |  | $6.90,600$ | 54.1 | 1, 110,000 | 100.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  |  | 9, 290,600 | 58.6 | 3, 850,800 | 24.3 | 2, 710, 100 | 17.1 | 15, 851, 500 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

IMPOSTS ON MOTOR VEHICLES

| Townships. | \$4, 263, 300 | 82.3 | \$917,300 | 17.7 |  |  |  |  | \$5,180, 600 | 100.0 | 30.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Places to 2,499. | 2, 157, 200 | 80.5 | 523, 700 | 19.5 |  |  |  |  | 2,680,900 | 100.0 | 15.6 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 1,720, 200 | 80.1 | 426, 900 | 19.9 |  |  |  |  | 2, 147, 100 | 100.0 | 12.5 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999. | 462,000 | 79.4 | 120, 100 | 20.6 |  |  |  |  | 582, 100 | 100.0 | 3.4 |
| St. Paul and Duluth | 2, 125, 900 | 79.7 | 540, 300 | 20.3 |  |  |  |  | 2, 666, 200 | 100.0 | 15.5 |
| Minneapolis | 3, 103, 100 | 79.4 | 807, 200 | 20.6 |  |  |  |  | 3, 910, 300 | 100.0 | 22.8 |
| Total | 13, 831, 700 | 80.6 | 3, 335, 500 | 19.4 |  |  |  |  | 17, 167, 200 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

OTHER IMPOSTS (INCLUDING GENERAL FUND PROPERTY LEVIES)


ALL TAXES AND IMPOSTS

| Townships, | \$4, 263, 300 | 30.7 | \$5, 747, 300 | 41.5 | \$3, 850, 800 | 27.8 |  |  | \$13, 861, 400 | 100.0 | 37. 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Places to 2,499 | 2, 157, 200 | 44.6 | 1,819,400 | 37.6 |  |  | \$862, 400 | 17.8 | 4, 839, 000 | 100.0 | 13.0 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 1,720, 200 | 37.8 | 1,552, 300 | 34. $1:$ |  |  | 1,278,200 | 28. 1 | 4,550, 700 | 100.0 | 12.2 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 462,000 | 26. 7 | 784, 700 | 45.3 |  |  | 485, 800 | 28.0 | 1,732,500 | 100.0 | 4. 6 |
| St. Panl and Duluth. | 2, 125, 900 | 40.5 | 1,405, 800 | 26.8 |  |  | 1, 718, 300 | 32.7 | 5, 250, 000 | 100. 0 | 14.1 |
| Minneapolis........ | 3, 103, 100 | 44.1 | 1,316, 600 | 18. 7 |  |  | 2, 623,000 | 37.2 | 7.042, 700 | 100.0 | 18.9 |
| Tota | 13, 831, 700 | 37.1 | 12,626, 100 | 33.9 | 3, 850, 800 | 10.3 | 6,967, 700 | 18.7 | 37, 276, 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Federal aid ......... Loans and reserves | $\begin{array}{r} 4,457,200 \\ 13,861,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 99.0 \end{array}$ | 94, 600 | 0.7 | 43,500 | 0. 3 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4,457,200 \\ 13,999,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Grand total. | 32, 149, 900 | 57.7 | 12, 720, 700 | 22.8 | 3,894, 300 | 7.0 | 6,957, 700 | 12.5 | $55,732,600$ | 100.0 |  |

Table 22.-Highway and street expenditures in 1932, including prorated overhead costs

| Expended by- | Amount | Percent | Expended on- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Rural roads | Urban streets |
| State (State system) | \$32, 149,900 | 57.7 | \$28, 437, 800 | \$3,712, 100 |
| Counties (county system) | 12,720, 700 | 22.8 | 12, 191, 000 |  |
| Townships... | 3, 894, 300 | 7.0 | 3, 894, 300 |  |
| Places to 2,499 | 862.400 | 1.5 |  | 862,400 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 1, 278, 200 | 2.3 |  | 1, 278, 200 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 485, 800 | 9 |  | 485, 800 |
| St. Paul and Duluth.. | 1,718,300 | 3.1 |  | 1, 718,300 |
| Minneapolis. | 2, 623,000 | 4.7 |  | 2, 623, 000 |
| Total | 55, 732, 600 | 100.0 | 44, 523, 100 | 11, 209, 500 |

Table 23 shows the expenditures on the rural and urban portions of the State trunk system divided between construction and maintenance. The expenditures for general administration and other overhead are not included.

Expenditures for construction include costs of planning and engineering, grading, draining, surfacing, and

Table 23.-Construction and maintenance expenditures in 1.9 .30 on the State trunk system, in both rural and urban areas '

| Section of State trunk system | Construction |  | Maintenance |  | Construction and maintenance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent |
| Rural <br> Urban. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 23,204,200 \\ 3,095,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.2 \\ & 11.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,413,600 \\ 404,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89.4 \\ & 10.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 26,617,800 \\ 3,500,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.4 \\ & 11.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total | 26, 299, 500 | 100.0 | 3, 818,400 | 100.0 | 30, 117, 900 | 100.0 |

${ }^{1}$ Interest, engineering, supervision, and other undistributed overhead costs are not included.
the machinery used in connection with construction work. Expenditures for the construction of bridges and grade separations and reconstruction are also included. The costs of engineering, patching, patroling, machinery, marking, and temporary improvements such as light oiling and regraveling comprise the maintenance expenditures.
All engineering costs and highway department salaries that cannot be definitely allocated to construction
or maintenance are included in overhead expenditures. The cost of administering the motor-fuel taxes, interest payments on bonds (but not principal payments), and damages and claims are also overhead expenditures.
Of the $\$ 12,720,700$ spent by county governments for highways in both urban and rural areas, $\$ 5,181,000$, or 40.7 percent, was for construction; $\$ 5,700,500$, or 44.8 percent, was for maintenance, and $\$ 1,839,200$, or 14.5 percent, was for overhead.

The counties spent $\$ 529,700$, or 4.2 percent, of the total spent on the urban portions of the county roads (table 22).

Township expenditures for local rural roads were $\$ 3,894,300$. The construction costs were $\$ 2,697,300$, or 69.3 percent; the maintenance costs were $\$ 1,097,400$, or 28.2 percent; and the overhead costs were $\$ 99,600$, or 2.5 percent. The expenditures by urban places on streets were $\$ 6,967,700$ (table 22).

The annual travel on the various highway systems was determined by the road-use survey. The total expenditures on the several highway systems reduced to cost per vehicle-mile are shown in table 24.

Table 24.-Highway expenditures per vehicle-mile of travel in 1932 on the several systems of roads as determined by the Minnesota road-use survey

| Highway system | Highway expenditures per vehiclemile | Annual travel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State system County roads Township roads. City streets. | Cents <br> 1.4 <br> 1.3 <br> 1. 3 <br> . 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vehicle-miles } \\ & 2,276,400,000 \\ & 1,016,500,000 \\ & 311,200,000 \\ & 1,527,600,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| All highways.. | 1.1 | $5,131,700,000$ |

## HIGHWAY TAXES AND EXPENDITURES COMPARED

Expenditures by the State and counties are made for the benefit of residents in both the rural and urban areas. The total highway expenditure in these areas, therefore, is the sum of the State and county highway expenditures plus the amount spent by the locality itself.

The total amount spent for highways in the rural areas of the State was $\$ 44,523,100$, or 79.9 percent, of the total. The balance, $\$ 11,209,500$, was spent in the urban places. Table 25 shows the allocation of highway expenditures and highway taxes by the several local units of government. In the entire State the highway expenditures were 40 percent more than the taxes collected for them.

The outstanding highway debt of all governmental units in Minnesota in 1932 was $\$ 95,051,900$. The

Table 25.-Comparison of street and highway taxes and expenditures in 1932 by places

| Type of place | Street and highway taxes paid |  | Street and highway expenditures |  | Ratio of ex-penditures to taxes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent |  |
| Townships, | \$16, 880,000 | 42.5 | \$44, 523, 100 | 79.9 | 2. 64 |
| Places to 2,499 | 4, 953, 900 | 12.5 |  | 6.1 | . 69 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 4, 338, 600 | 10.9 | 2, 808, 800 | 5.0 | . 65 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 1,511,500 | 3.8 | 537, 400 | 1.0 | . 35 |
| St. Paul and Duluth | 4, 837, 200 | 12.2 | 1, 822, 700 | 3.3 | . 38 |
| Miuneapolis. | 7, 160,900 | 18.1 | 2, 623, 000 | 4.7 | 37 |
| Total. | 39, 682, 100 | 100.0 | 55, 732, 600 | 100.0 | 1. 40 |

Table 26.-Average number of miles traveled per vehicle on the highway systems and local streets of Minnesota by Minnesota motor vehicles in 1932

| Place of ownership vehicle and type of | State trunk highways | County trunk highways | Local roads and streets | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Townships: Passenger cars Trucks and busses All vehicles | Miles per vehicle 2,202 3,329 2,375 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Miles per } \\ \text { vehicle } \\ 2,315 \\ 2,491 \\ 2,342 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Miles per } \\ \text { vehicle } \\ 866 \\ 1,158 \\ 912 \end{array}$ | Miles per vehicle 5, 383 6,978 5,629 5, 629 |
| Percentage of total | 42.2 | 41.6 | 16.2 | 100.0 |
| Places to 2,499: <br> Passenger cars. Trucks and busses All vehicles. | $\begin{aligned} & 4,602 \\ & 5,735 \\ & 4,755 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,858 \\ & 2,762 \\ & 1,979 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,122 \\ & 2,552 \\ & 1,311 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,582 \\ 11,049 \\ 8,045 \end{array}$ |
| Percentage of total | 59.1 | 24.6 | 16.3 | 100.0 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999: Passenger cars Trucks and busses All vehicles. $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,404 \\ & 4,686 \\ & 4,441 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,077 \\ & 1,611 \\ & 1,157 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,846 \\ & 4,094 \\ & 2,166 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,327 \\ 10,391 \\ 7,764 \end{array}$ |
| Percentage of total | 57.2 | 14.9 | 27.9 | 100.0 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999: Passenger cars Trucks and busses All vehicles. $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,799 \\ & 2,815 \\ & 4,381 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 825 \\ 1,504 \\ 973 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,247 \\ & 6,424 \\ & 3,909 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,871 \\ 10,743 \\ 9,263 \end{array}$ |
| Percentage of total | 47.3 | 10.5 | 42.2 | 100.0 |
| St. Paul and Duluth: Passenger cars Trucks and busses All vehicles | $\begin{aligned} & 2,720 \\ & 3,349 \\ & 2,824 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 264 \\ & 231 \\ & 262 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,259 \\ & 7,437 \\ & 5,632 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,243 \\ 11,017 \\ 8,718 \end{array}$ |
| Percentage of total | 32.4 | 3.0 | 64.6 | 100.0 |
| Minneapolis: <br> Passenger cars Trucks and busses All vehicles........ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,626 \\ & 3,860 \\ & 3,656 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 362 \\ 35 \\ 32 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,787 \\ & 7,767 \\ & 6,040 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,775 \\ 11,662 \\ 10,017 \end{array}$ |
| Percentage of total. | 36.5 | 3.2 | 60.3 | 100.0 |
| State total ... Passenger cars Trucks and busses All vehicles. | $\begin{aligned} & 3,240 \\ & 3,897 \\ & 3,342 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,455 \\ & 1,690 \\ & 1,490 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,506 \\ & 3,803 \\ & 2,694 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,201 \\ & 9,390 \\ & 7,526 \end{aligned}$ |
| Percentage of total | 44.4 | 19.8 | 35.8 | 100.0 |

Table 27.-Percentage distribution of travel on the various highway systems in Minnesota in 1932 provided by vehicles in the various classes of places

DISTRIBUTION BY PLACE OF ORIGIN OF TRAFFIC

| Unit of government where traffic originated | Highway system on which travel was performed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | State system | County roads | Local roads and streets | All highways |
| Townships. | Percent 28.0 | Percent 61.8 | Percent $13.3$ | Percent 29.4 |
| Places to 2,499 | 22.8 | 21.2 | 7.8 | 17.1 |
| Places to 2,500 to 14,997 | 15.8 | 9.2 | 9.5 | 12.2 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 4. 0 | 3.4 |
| St. Paul and Duluth. | 10.5 | 2. 2 | 25. 9 | 14.4 |
| Minneapolis. | 19.3 | 3. 8 | 39.5 | 23.5 |
| Total. | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

DISTRIBUTION BY HIGHWAY SYSTEM ON WHICH TRAVEL WAS PERFORMED

| Townships | 42.2 | 41.6 | 16.2 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Places to 2,499 | 59.1 | 24.6 | 16. 3 | 100 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 57.2 | 14.9 | 27.9 | 100 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 47.3 | 10.5 | 42.2 | 100 |
| St. Paul and Duluth. | 32.4 | 3. 0 | 64.6 | 100 |
| Minneapolis. | 36.5 | 3.2 | 60.3 | 100 |
| Total | 44.4 | 19.8 | 35.8 | 100 |

State accounted for $\$ 42,759,200$ or 45 percent of the total; the counties accounted for $\$ 16,430,100$ or 17.3 percent; the cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth accounted for $\$ 30,041,300$ or 31.6 percent;
and the townships and smaller municipalities accounted for $\$ 5,821,300$ or 6.1 percent. Twenty-nine million dollars of trunk highway bonds and $\$ 13,759,200$ of county highway reimbursement bonds assumed by the State comprise the State highway debt. The county highway debt was contracted to provide through traffic facilities to supplement the State trunk system. Hennepin and Ramsey counties alone incurred $\$ 10,922,200$ or 66.4 percent of the total county highway indebtedness.

The townships bonded themselves to the extent of $\$ 1,233,300$ or 3.4 percent of the local debt for highways. Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth incurred 83.8 percent of the total local rural and urban highway debt. As the size of place increases the demand for transportation facilities increases. This fact is reflected in per-capita debts for highway purposes which range from $\$ 1.28$ in the townships to $\$ 40.28$ in Minneapolis.

Highway debt service in 1932 was $\$ 8,487,200$, of which $\$ 4,085,000$ was for interest and $\$ 4,402,200$ for principal payments. The State paid $\$ 4,150,800$, of which $\$ 1,713,900$ was for interest and $\$ 2,418,900$ for principal. The counties spent $\$ 1,284,400$, of which $\$ 739,300$ was for interest and $\$ 545,100$ for principal. The various other units spent $\$ 3,052,000$, of which $\$ 1,613,800$ was for interest and $\$ 1,438,200$ for debt retirement.

Part of the motor-vehicle registration fees are impounded for the payment of interest and principal on the State highway debt. The debt service of other units of government is paid from property tax receipts.

## RELATIONS BETWEEN HIGHWAY TAXES PAID, HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES, AND TRAVEL

The total mileage of rural highways in Minnesota in 1932 was 111,475 . The State highway system consisted of 6,772 miles; the county highway system contained 32,126 miles; and the local township roads consisted of 72,577 miles. No data are available on mileage of village and city streets.

The total travel (exclusive of travel by out-of-State vehicles) on all roads and streets in Minnesota during the year 1932 was over 5 billion vehicle-miles, of which 29.4 percent was performed by vehicles of rural ownership; 17.1 percent by vehicles owned in incorporated places having a population to 2,$499 ; 12.2$ percent by vehicles owned in places 2,500 to 14,999 population; 3.4 percent by vehicles owned in places 15,000 to 74,$999 ; 14.4$ percent by vehicles owned in St. Paul and Duluth; and 23.5 percent by vehicles owned in Minneapolis.

Expenditures on the State highway system in 1932 were $\$ 32,149,900$; on the county system, $\$ 12,720,700$; on local township roads, $\$ 3,894,300$; and on city streets, $\$ 6,967,700$.

Of the total property taxes expended on all roads and streets, 58.6 percent was expended on county highways, 24.3 percent on the local township roads, and 17.1 percent on urban streets.

Of the total motor-vehicle taxes expended on all roads and streets, 80.6 percent was expended on State trunk highways, 19.4 percent on county trunk highways, and none on urban streets.

Of all taxes and imposts expended on all roads and streets, rural property and motorvehicle owners paid 36.8 percent, and travel by rural-owned vehicles made up 29.4 percent of the total travel on all roads and streets; city and village property and motor-kehicle owners paid 63.2 percent, and travel by city- and villageowned vehicles made up 70.6 percent of the total travel.
sample. The obtaining of an accurate cross-section was thus insured. During the work statistical checks were constantly made. The results obtained in one section were compared with those obtained in other sections and with the total; and the average mileages and gasoline consumption for specific localities obtained from the questionnaires used to allocate the gasoline taxes were compared with similar figures obtained from the interviews.
The extent of tourist and other travel by out-ofState vehicles was not disclosed by the road-use survey. It is estimated, however, that this constitutes but a small fraction of the total traffic and is almost entirely on the State system.
Minnesota motor vehiclesin 1932 traveled approximately $5,131,700,000$ vehicle miles upon all highways in the State. Of this mileage traveled, $2,276,400,000$ miles or 44.4 percent was upon the State trunk routes, $1,016,500,000$ or 19.8 percent upon county roads, $311,200,000$ or 6.1 percent upon local town roads, and $1,527,600,000$ or 29.7 percent was upon urban streets.

Of the total travel, 4,180,300,000 vehicle-miles was the travel by passenger cars and $951,400,000$ vehiclemiles the travel by trucks and busses.

In table 26 the figures for the travel performed by passenger cars and by trucks and busses owned in the several classes of places upon the State, county, and local roads are shown as the average annual miles per vehicle. It is evident that: (1) Trucks and busses travel more than do passenger cars; (2) urban-owned vehicles travel more than do rural-

NEARLY TWO-THIRDS OF ALL MOTOR-VEHICLE TRAVEL PERFORMED ON STATE AND COUNTY TRUNK HIGHWAYS
Data regarding the average annual travel of motor rehicles have been developed from the gasoline tax questionnaires and the road-use survey. The road-use survey discloses further the approximate amount of travel upon the different highway systems in the several classes of localities and the origin of that travel.

The road-use survey is not a traffic count. For the information necessary to make the study, 7,500 personal interviews were made. Motor-vehicle, population, and occupation data were used as bases for the selection of a
owned vehicles; (3) the amount of travel tends to increase as the size of place increases; and (4) almost half of the total travel was upon State trunk highways.

Table 27 expresses in percentages the origin of travel on the various highway systems. From this table it is seen that the primary use of the county roads is by rural residents. The extensive use of the State system by the vehicles of all communities is again emphasized. Table 27 also gives the percentage of travel divided among the highway systems upon which it was performed.

Common-carrier vehicles do not contribute heavily to the total travel on Minnesota highways. Data concerning the travel of all motor vehicles under the jurisdiction of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission were analyzed and tabulated. This travel accounts for only about $18,800,000$ vehicle-miles, or 0.4 percent of a total of over $5,000,000,000$ vehicle-miles.

## TRAVEL PER VEHICLE GREATEST FOR VEHICLES OWNED IN LARGE CITIES

From the gasoline tax questionnaires and the roaduse interviews the average gallons of gasoline purchased annually in the State by Minnesota motorvehicle owners were computed. Table 28 shows this tabulation in detail. The gasoline consumption per vehicle increases as the size of place increases and the average for trucks and busses is higher than for passenger cars.

Table 28.- Average annual travel and gasoline consumption per vehicle in 1932 by place of ownership

| I'ace of ownership | Average annual gasoline consumption by-- |  |  | Average | annua <br> by- | travel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passenger cars | Trucks and busses | All vehicles | Passenger cars | Trucks and busses | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { ve* } \\ & \text { hicles } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Gallons | Gallons | Gallons | Miles | Miles | Miles |
|  | per | per | per | per | per | per |
| Townships | - 345 | - 616 | $370$ | $5,383$ | $6,978$ | 5,629 |
| Places to 2,499 | 487 | 886 | 519 | 7,582 | 11, 049 | 8,045 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 520 | 1,048 | 579 | 7,327 | 10,391 | 7,764 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 629 | 1,020 | 694 | 8,871 | 10,743 | 9,263 |
| St. Paul and Duluth | 608 | 1,277 | 714 | 8,243 | 11, 017 | 8,718 |
| Minneapolis | 678 | 1,315 | 745 | 9,775 | 11,662 | 10,017 |
| Entire State | 488 | 921 | 534 | 7,201 | 9,390 | 7,526 |

Table 29 presents in concise form the relations existing between the various classes of places with respect to five of the major sets of facts determined by this survey.

Table 30 presents more clearly the relation between the taxes received and expenditures as finally made. The figures are based on results found in previous sections of the report. This table shows the source of each $\$ 1,000$ in taxes by type of impost and by class of place responsible for its payment. Highway expenditures are further shown by highway system and source of
revenue. It should not be inferred from this table that taxes equal expenditures or that the $\$ 1,000$ unit is identical; the figures have been assembled on this basis only to facilitate comparisons between taxes and expenditures.

Table 29.-Percentage distribution of population, motor-vehicle ownership, property valuation, taxes paid, and expenditures made in the several classes of places in 1932

| Class of place | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Popula- } \\ & \text { tion } \end{aligned}$ | Motorvehicle ownership | Taxable valuation | Total taxes paid | Total expendimade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Townships | 37.7 | 39.8 | 42.9 | 30.3 | 39.4 |
| Places to 2,499 | 13.2 | 16.1 | 10.2 | 12.8 | 13.3 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 13.3 | 11.8 | 10.2 | 13.8 | 13.6 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999. | 3.1 | 2.8 | 5. 4 | 5.3 | 3.5 |
| St. Paul and Duluth | 14.6 | 12.1 | 13.7 | 16.2 | 12.7 |
| Minneapolis. | 18.1 | 17.4 | 17.6 | 21.6 | 17.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100. 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

SUMMARY

1. There were no expenditures of funds from general property taxes on State highways.
2. Rural property paid no tax for local urban streets and urban property paid no tax for local township roads.
3. Of the total rural property taxes expended for highway purposes-
(a) 55.6 percent was expended on county trunk highways;
(b) 44.4 percent was expended on local township roads.
4. Of the total property tax raised from urban communities and expended forstreet and highway purposes-
(a) 62.2 percent was expended on county highways;
(b) 37.8 percent was expended on urban streets.
5. Since, of the total assessed property valuation of $\$ 1,884,238,200,42.9$ percent or $\$ 808,798,600$ was in rural areas, and 57.1 percent, or $\$ 1,075,439,600$ was in the urban units-
(a) Expenditures from property taxes for all highways and streets were at the following rates per $\$ 100$ of assessed valuation:

Rural- 107.3 cents.
Urban- 66.7 cents.

Table 30.-Comparison of taxation and expenditures in Minnesota in 1932

(b) Expenditures from property taxes for county highways were at the following rates per $\$ 100$ valuation:

Rural- 59.7 cents.
Urban- 41.5 cents.
(c) Expenditures from property taxes for local township roads were at the following rates per $\$ 100$ valuation:

Rural-47.6 cents.
Urban-No tax.
(d) Expenditures from property taxes for local urban streets were at the following rates per $\$ 100$ valuation:

Rural-No tax.
Urban- 25.2 cents.
6. Of the total property taxes expended on all roads-
(a) 58.6 percent was expended on county highways;
(b) 24.3 percent was expended on local township roads;
(c) 17.1 percent was expended on urban streets.
7. Of the total motor-vehicle imposts expended on all classes of roads and streets-
(a) Rural motor-vehicle owners paid 30.2 percent and contributed 29.4 percent of the total travel on all roads and streets;
(b) Urban motor-vehicle owners paid 69.8 percent and contributed 70.6 percent of the total travel.
8. Of the total motor-vehicle imposts expended on all classes of roads and streets-
(a) 80.6 percent was expended on the State trunk highways;
(b) 19.4 percent was expended on the county highways.
9. Of all taxes and imposts expended on all roads and streets-
(a) 37.1 percent was expended on State trunk highways;
(b) 33.9 percent was expended on county highways;
(c) 10.3 percent was expended on local township roads;
(d) 18.7 percent was expended on urban streets.
10. Of all taxes and imposts expended on all roads and streets-
(a) Rural property and motor-vehicle owners paid 36.8 percent and contributed 29.4 percent of the total travel on all roads and streets;
(b) City and village property and motor-vehicle owners paid 63.2 percent and contributed 70.6 percent of the travel.
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# PUBLICATIONS of the BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS 

Any of the following publications may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. As his office is not connected with the Department and as the Department does not sell publications, please send no remittance to the United States Department of Agriculture.

## ANNUAL REPORTS

Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1924. 5 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1927. 5 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1928. 5 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1929. 10 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1931. 10 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1932. 10 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1933.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1934.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1935.

## DEPARTMENT BULLETINS

No. 347D . . Methods for the Determination of the Physical Properties of Road-Building Rock. 10 cents.
No. 583D . . Reports on Experimental Convict Road Camp. Fulton County, Ga. 25 cents.
No. 1279D . . Rural Highway Mileage, Income, and Expenditures, 1921 and 1922.

## TECHNICAL BULLETINS

No. 55 T . . Highway Bridge Surveys. 20 cents.
No. 265 T . . Electrical Equipment on Movable Bridges. 35 cents.

## MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

No. 76MP . . The Results of Physical Tests of Road-Building Rock. 25 cents.
Federal Legislation and Regulations Relating to Highway Construction. 10 cents.

## MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS.-Cont.

Supplement No. 1 to Federal Legislation and Regulations Relating to Highway Construction.
No. 191 . . . Roadside Improvement. 10 cents.
The Taxation of Motor Vehicles in 1932. 35 cents.
An Economic and Statistical Analysis of Highway-Construction Expenditures. 15 cents.

Single copies of the following publications may be obtained from the Bureau of Public Roads upon request. They cannot be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents.

## MISCELLANEOUS CIRCULARS

No. 62MC . . Standards Governing Plans, Specifications, Contract Forms, and Estimates for FederalAid Highway Projects.
SEPARATE REPRINT FROM THE YEARBOOK
No. 1036Y . . Road Work on Farm Outlets Needs Skill and Right Equipment.

## TRANSPORTATION SURVEY REPORTS

Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highway System of Ohio (1927).
Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highways of Vermont (1927).
Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highways of New Hampshire (1927).
Report of a Plan of Highway Improvement in the Regional Area of Cleveland, Ohio (1928).
Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highways of Pennsylvania (1928).
Report of a Survey of Traffic on the Federal-Aid Highway Systems of Eleven Western States (1930).

A complete list of the publications of the Bureau of Public Roads, classified according to subject and including the more important articles in PUBLIC ROADS, may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, Willard Building, Washington, D. C.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The study was made during 1934 under the immediate direction of Dr. Henry R. Trumbower, professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin and economist Trumbower, professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin and economist
    for the Bureau of Public Roads, and H. R. Briggs, field investigator and statistician.

[^1]:    1 Includes county, township, city, and village fees, fines, licenses, etc.

[^2]:    1 Less than 0.1 percent.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Differences will be found between some of the figures contained in this report and figures previously released by the Bureau. The same basic figures were used in preparing the Bureau's previous reports, reports made by the Minnesota State Bighway Department, and this financial survey, but there are differences in their interpretation.
    This report reflects the actual net costs during the year. In the official accounts there are often credits and charges for previous years carried over into the accounts of the current yoar and reflected in the annual financial statements of the highway department. Such transactions have been eliminated in this survey.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 32,700$ of nonresident fees.

