

PLS 592--Alternatives to Political Fragmentation in Metropolitan Areas

<i>Technique</i>	<i>Pol. Feasibility</i>	<i>Use</i>	<i>Limitations</i>	<i>Examples</i>
<i>Council of Govts.</i>	High	Two thirds of metro areas use	No legal or taxing powers	Cape Fear ABAG SEMCOG
<i>Contracting or Mutual Aid Agreements</i>	High	One half of metro areas use, esp. California	Usually only non-controversial services	Lakewood Plan in Southern Ca.
<i>Special Districts</i>	High	One fourth of metro areas use	Limited taxing powers and political representation	BART, CTA, NY Port Authority,
<i>Annexation</i>	Low to Moderate	N.C., Texas, Tenn., Az., Okla.	Land locked cities and approvals in outlying areas are needed	Houston, Phoenix, Dallas, Okla. City, Wilmington
<i>City/County Consolidation</i>	Low	Rare	Diminishes minority representation, does not help single county	Indianapolis Jacksonville Nashville
<i>Two Tier Federation</i>	Low	Miami-Dade, Toronto	Division of functions is critical	
<i>Exemplars</i>	low	Rare	Unwillingness to use land use control on metro basis	Portland and Minneapolis St. Paul