

The last criterion applies not only to the size and powers of a government, but also to the number and responsibility of elected officials, provisions for notice and hearings on proposed policy changes, methods for receiving and acting on complaints and other citizen initiatives, and appropriate review of government actions in the courts. Size is also at issue here, for the advantages of small size for citizen control and participation must be weighed against the merits of larger size for democratic government as well as economy in providing services. The larger the area of government, as James Madison argued in *The Federalist*, the less likely is it that any one special group will dominate the government, and thus the more likely is it that many diverse groups of the community will have their interests respected.¹ The prevalence of social and economic disparities between different parts of metropolitan areas lends additional weight to the case for drawing governmental boundaries broadly enough to encompass a diversity of social and economic interest groups.

The many approaches to governmental reorganization will be taken up in a sequence that moves generally from smaller to larger structural modifications: use of extraterritorial powers, intergovernmental agreements, voluntary metropolitan councils, the urban county, transfer of functions to State governments, metropolitan special districts, city-county separation, city-county consolidation, and federation.

1. EXTRATERRITORIAL POWERS

Extraterritorial powers are powers that a city is permitted to exercise outside its boundaries to regulate activities there or to assist in providing services to people within its boundaries. The use of these powers varies considerably among the States and according to the type of power authorized.² State governments are relatively generous in permitting cities to go beyond their boundaries to provide services to their residents, such as obtaining water or disposing of sewage in other jurisdictions. Many cities also exercise police powers in health matters, such as milk and meat inspection, beyond their borders. About 30 States have given cities jurisdiction for regulating subdivisions in unincorporated territory lying a specified distance beyond their boundaries.³ Few States, however, have given cities power of extraterritorial zoning.⁴

Considerable attention has been given to extraterritorial planning, zoning, and subdivision regulations, which can be effective in dealing with the problems of rapid growth in unincorporated fringe areas, particularly where county governments do not provide this regulation. There is further justification for this extraterritorial regulation in that uncontrolled fringe development can have deteriorating effects on neighboring areas of the city, and can complicate the provision of such services as fire protection and traffic control within the city.

¹ *The Federalist* (New York: The Modern Library, n. d.), pp. 53-62.

² Russell W. Maddox, *Extraterritorial Powers of Municipalities* (Corvallis, Ore.: Oregon State College, 1955). See also W. W. Crouch, "Extraterritorial Powers of Cities as Factors in California Metropolitan Government," *American Political Science Review*, XXXI (April 1937), p. 291; William Anderson, "The Extraterritorial Powers of Cities," *Minnesota Law Review*, X (1926), pp. 475-497 and 564-583.

³ *Municipal Year Book 1962* (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1962), pp. 64-65.

⁴ American Society of Planning Officials, *Extraterritorial Zoning, Planning Advisory Service, Information Report No. 42* (September 1952).