

were 174 counties with more than 100,000 population in metropolitan areas; by 1960 this number had grown to 217. In addition, in 1960 there were 46 counties over 100,000 outside of metropolitan areas, making a total of 263 urban counties. The urbanization of counties has affected their organization, administration, and functions, although in greatly varying degrees. Seven counties now have elected executives. A 1953 survey indicated that 10 counties had county managers. A similar survey in 1962 indicated that 45 out of 129 counties responding had appointed chief administrative officers. In the 1962 survey, the urban counties reported that they provided varying numbers and kinds of services to unincorporated areas. The most common services were police protection, street construction, libraries, and parks and recreation. There were county zoning ordinances in 104 of 221 urban counties reporting in 1962, and county subdivision regulations in 135. Many of the largest counties, however, had neither zoning nor subdivision controls.¹¹

The reorganization of county government to keep pace with urbanization is hindered considerably by State constitutional restrictions that prevent counties from providing urban services and raising revenues to finance them.¹² States vary with respect to the strait-jacket they have placed on their counties. The most liberal toward their counties have county home rule provisions in their constitutions, statutory authorization of optional county charters, or general statutory grants to counties to perform new functions and reorganize their structure. Thirteen States have constitutional home rule for their counties: California, Maryland, Ohio, Texas (counties over 62,000 population), Missouri (counties over 85,000), Louisiana (for East Baton Rouge and Jefferson Parishes only), Washington, Florida (for Dade County only), Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Alaska (for boroughs), and Hawaii. Six States have laws authorizing optional county charters: Virginia, Montana, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Oregon. California has been outstanding in granting counties structural flexibility through general statutes. But even where States have liberalized their provisions on county organization and functions, communities have not always made full use of their powers.¹³

Dade County, Fla., and the California counties are illustrative of counties with extensive urban functions. They also represent two extremes of urban county approaches: the assumption of certain urban functions by the county practically overnight in Dade County, and the gradual assumption of functions through intergovernmental agreements over a long period in California. Dade County is additionally interesting as a two-tier government in a metropolitan area, which has led some to consider it a "federation" approach to reorganization of local governments in metropolitan areas.

¹¹ Victor Jones, "Urban and Metropolitan Counties," *Municipal Year Book 1962* (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1962), pp. 57-66. For earlier summaries of urban county trends, see Betty Tableman, *Governmental Organization in Metropolitan Areas* (Michigan Government Studies No. 21; Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press: 1951), pp. 24-55; and Victor Jones, "Urban Counties," *Municipal Year Book 1954* (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1954), pp. 133-147.

¹² William N. Cassella, Jr., *Metropolitan Government*, vol. II of *Constitutional Aspects of State-Local Relationships* (Con-Con Research Paper No. 5) (Lansing, Mich.: Citizens Research Council of Michigan, 1961), p. 4.

¹³ Arthur W. Bromage, *Municipal and County Home Rule*, vol. I of *Constitutional Aspects of State-Local Relationships* (Con-Con Research Paper No. 3) (Lansing, Mich.: Citizens Research Council of Michigan, 1961), pp. 16-22.