

metropolitan problems within the confines of one metropolitan area. The heavy interflow of people and goods between adjoining metropolitan areas has led the States to assume more than the usual responsibility for highway planning and construction, traffic control, mass transit and air pollution control in these areas. Moreover, the States have extended their responsibilities for the provision of such services as inspection of food, environmental sanitation, and the control of crime in the undeveloped enclaves between the urban centers of these metropolitan clusters.

In southern California, after individual metropolitan areas, such as Los Angeles and San Diego, had developed all their available local water resources, the State undertook a statewide water plan to meet the growing metropolitan needs as well as other needs in flood control, agriculture, and recreation. Similarly, New Jersey has come to the assistance of groups of metropolitan areas in the northern and southern parts of the State with planning and acquisition of land to assure them of adequate water supply, while also providing additional recreational facilities.

Transfer of metropolitan functions to the State government substantially broadens the geographical base for planning and control of areawide problems. It permits economies of scale and the avoidance of duplication. It has a relatively high degree of political feasibility because it creates little disturbance of the local political power structure and does not require approval by local referenda. If the State's performance of the function is dictated by statewide rather than metropolitan considerations alone—as in the case of protecting water resources for communities outside metropolitan areas—support in the legislature may be statewide, and may even be stimulated by nonmetropolitan areas. Transfer to the State may appeal to local officials as a way of taking the financing of a function off the local tax bill.

The transfer of metropolitan functions to the States is particularly adaptable to States where the metropolitan areas make up a substantial part of the total State, or where the State itself is small. It is also especially adaptable, and sometimes necessary, for the effective handling of functions involving the conservation of scarce natural resources, such as water supply, open lands, and the control of water and air pollution. Compared with continued performance of a function by municipalities, State performance also has the advantage of greater flexibility in keeping pace with the constantly changing geographic area over which the function needs to be performed.

From the point of view of local government, the transfer of functions to the States has the weakness of taking away a portion of local responsibility and authority. It tends to diminish the stature of local governments as general-purpose governments, with a consequent diminution of their viability, their ability to coordinate the provision of governmental services, and their strength as a focus for local interest and participation in government. Removing control to the State government tends to expose decisions on metropolitan matters to the disinterest, if not the opposition, of representatives from nonmetropolitan areas.