

with statutory requirements, metropolitan service corporations or authorities for the performance of governmental services that can best be handled on an areawide basis. These corporations should have appropriate borrowing and taxing power, but their initial establishment and any subsequent broadening of responsibilities should be subject to voter approval on the basis of an areawide majority.³

Many areawide authorities are now operating successfully in such fields as water supply, transportation, and port development. Despite the popularity and effectiveness of many of these agencies, they have been subject to several significant criticisms. They tend to foster a piecemeal approach to metropolitan services by singling out particular functions for independent handling, often without adequate coordination with governments responsible for related activities. They add to the number of local governments and the complexity of government structure. Since they are usually governed by a board of directors of private citizens appointed for staggered terms, they are somewhat removed from normal political channels of public control; to some critics, these authorities are "The Untouchables."

To meet legitimate criticisms while retaining the advantages of areawide authorities, the Commission proposes State legislation similar to the metropolitan municipal corporation law adopted by the State of Washington in 1957. The authority should either be multifunctional or, if limited to a single function at the start, should be capable of absorbing additional responsibilities with the approval of a majority vote in the area served. If the residents of the area choose to limit the authority to a single function, they should be precluded from establishing separate authorities to perform other responsibilities on an areawide basis. The board of directors should consist of elected officials—mayors, city councilmen, county commissioners—from the governments of the metropolitan area. The Commission thus proposes that the people of a metropolitan area should be authorized to establish a multipurpose functional authority or a single-purpose functional authority, or neither, as they choose by areawide popular vote.

5. AUTHORIZATION FOR VOLUNTARY TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS FROM MUNICIPALITIES TO COUNTIES AND VICE VERSA

The States should authorize municipalities and counties in metropolitan areas to take mutual action to transfer responsibility for specified services from one unit of government to the other.⁴

The "urban county" approach is a very promising possibility for meeting problems created by the spread of service needs beyond municipal boundaries. County governments can be equipped to meet urban needs by a transfer of individual functions from local governments within the county or by a more thorough reorganization of the county government. Obstacles resulting from State limitation of county government organization and responsibility are formidable, however. County governments have been strengthened recently in Virginia, California, Tennessee, Florida, and other States. In the

³ See "Metropolitan Functional Authorities," ACIR 1966 *State Legislative Program* (Washington, D.C.: October 1965), pp. 126-151.

⁴ See "Voluntary Transfer of Functions Between Municipalities and Counties," ACIR 1966 *State Legislative Program* (Washington, D.C.: October 1965), pp. 407-410.