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## Fragmented System of Local Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Government</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total units</td>
<td>89,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>89,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>19,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township and town</td>
<td>16,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district</td>
<td>13,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special district</td>
<td>37,381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Case of Los Angeles
The city and metropolis

- City of Los Angeles
  3.8 mil

- Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana
  Metropolis  12.8 mil

- Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CSA
  17.6 mil
Regional Actors

- **Southern California Association of Governments** covers 6 counties (CSA +1)
  - the Metropolitan Planning Organization for transportation planning
  - 70 member regional council

- **South Coast Air Quality Management District** covers counties (CSA -1)
  - responsible for regional air quality plans including ability to regulate traffic congestion
  - 13 member board (county supervisors, city council members and state designees)
Assessment

- Weak regional platform in divided and fragmented metropolis
- Middle class secession efforts in Los Angeles
The Case of Louisville
The city and metropolis

- new City of Louisville
  562,000

- Louisville Metropolis
  1.2 mil (13 counties)

- Louisville/Jefferson County-Elizabethtown-Scottsburg, KY-IN CSA
  1.4 million
the new city of Louisville (consolidated city-county)

- merged city of Louisville with county government in 2003
- left taxes and services alone
Regional Actors

Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA)

the local MPO covering 5 urban counties of metropolis

big issue was building 2 new bridges
Assessment--city county consolidation

- results in minority dilution and suburban dominance
- ensures city remains largest in state
- expected economic boom, but not occur
I.M. Barlow provides a useful benchmark for minimal conditions of "effective" metropolitan governance, including the existence of

"area-wide coordination and integration" among governments in the metropolis and

"an 'umbrella' body that has the capacity to view matters from a metropolitan perspective and to act in the metropolitan interest."
Federal Role

- No formal or constitutional role in local government
- Federal law requires MPOs to access federal transportation funding
New Regionalists propose greater federal role

Regionalism proposed as a solution to concentrated poverty in the city

- tear down public housing
- open suburbs to poor and access to jobs and better lifestyles
- build coalitions between inner city and first ring suburbs
State role

- Dillons rule—states create and destroy
- Political system, political culture reinforce localist values
  - state and federal representatives represent a state or local interest in legislative bodies
  - rural interests favored over urban
Governance structure

- No metropolitan or regional government and unlikely to create
- Limited and special purpose regional bodies or agencies for selective purposes
- Focus on “governance” but limited expectations
Roles, Responsibilities, Revenues

- Limited federal role in urban affairs,
- Entirely under state government authority (disinterested)
- Cities have strong revenue generation
- Strong mayor system
Lessons from US

- Weak and selective regionalism
- What’s the problem trying to fix?