

From the standpoint of political feasibility, the use of extraterritorial controls has the advantage of creating relatively little disturbance in the status quo. Extraterritorial regulation usually affects areas where government controls are either weak or lacking, so that existing powers are seldom threatened. While extraterritorial regulation in these circumstances does allow the central city to protect itself, it gives the residents of fringe areas no voice in determining their own affairs, and is thus objectionable as a permanent solution. It may, however, serve as a useful interim step on the way to either annexation or incorporation.

The use of extraterritorial power is severely limited by two factors. First, many States do not permit the extraterritorial exercise of the most important regulatory powers for coping with metropolitan growth problems: planning, zoning, and subdivision regulations. Second, even where the authorization exists, it can be used only when there is unincorporated territory adjacent to a city, a condition which is long past for many urban centers.

2. INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Intergovernmental agreements are arrangements under which a local community conducts an activity jointly or cooperatively with one or more other governmental units, or contracts for its performance by another governmental unit. The agreements may be permanent or temporary; pursuant to special act or general law; effective with or without voter approval; and may be formal or informal in character. Intergovernmental agreements may be for the provision of direct services to citizens of two or more jurisdictions, such as water supply or police protection; or they may be for governmental housekeeping activities, such as joint purchasing or personnel administration activities.

Local governments in California make extensive use of this approach, with counties contracting to provide services to cities. This procedure has become known as the Lakewood plan, since Lakewood on becoming a city contracted to have practically all its governmental services provided by Los Angeles County. In March 1959, there were 887 contracts between cities and Los Angeles County, covering functions from assessing to dog control and street maintenance. Other types of intergovernmental agreements are also popular in California. Under the Joint Powers Act, two or more public agencies exercising common powers may agree that one of them should exercise power for all of them.⁵

Elsewhere, a survey of intermunicipal contracts indicated that between 1950 and 1957, Cleveland had 30 contracts with 12 of its suburbs, and the 12 suburbs had 43 contracts with one another to provide services.⁶ And between 1950 and 1959, 81 of St. Louis County's 98 municipalities signed a total of 241 contracts for provision of municipal services by the county, including law enforcement, health and sanitation, and building regulation.⁷

⁵ Samuel K. Gove, *The Lakewood Plan*, Commission Papers of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs (Urbana: University of Illinois, May 1961), p. 7.

⁶ Cleveland Metropolitan Services Commission, *Intergovernmental Agreements in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area*, Staff Report to Study Group on Governmental Organization (July 16, 1958).

⁷ Governmental Research Institute, *Municipal Services Made Available to Cities, Towns, and Villages by the St. Louis County Government* (St. Louis, December 1959).