**Abstract**

**Introduction**

**Notes**

I ignore government composition data for but it should be interesting for future use. That is what is the size, and racial and gender compositions of governing bodies?

**Methodology**

**Question**: Do places with increased levels of slavery have less jurisdictional overlap?

**Why**: The question is interesting because Berry (XXXX) finds that district with increased overlap have increased expenditure levels.

**Method 1**: The first goal was to develop an acceptable measure of jurisdictional overlap. Therefore, I relied on measures developed by Berry (XXXX) and Berry (XXXX). Such measures include:

1. Total Number of overlapping districts in the county
2. Number of distinct functional types of districts in a county
3. Number of overlapping districts per municipality
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Bollens (1975) – the potential for jurisdictional overlap is a function of the number of special districts relative to municipalities, all else equal.

**Measures of Jurisdictional Overlap**

1. Total Number of overlapping districts in the county (Simplest Measure)

Limitation is that large counties may be subdivided into several smaller communities, each with one overlapping jurisdiction. For example:

1. one county may have 10 cities within it, each with one overlapping jurisdiction.
2. Another county might have only one city with 10 districts overlapping it

Problem: is that a simple count of overlapping districts treats the two counties the same way, although the theory predicts the second county should have a more severe common-pool problem.

1. Compute the fraction of expenditures (or taxes) controlled by special districts, which should better reflect their importance in the local public sector.

Conversely, the fraction of expenditures controlled by municipalities should reflect the extent to which services are controlled by general-purpose, nonoverlapping governments.

The greater the share of taxation accounted for by one government the more likely that government is to internalize the effects of its policies on the aggregate tax base.

Problem:

1. Counting the number of distinct functional types of districts in a county thus represents another measure of jurisdictional overlap.

If each district type covers the entire county, then the number of functional layers corresponds perfectly with the notion of jurisdictional overlap introduced in Chapter 1.

To the extent that different functional layers cover only segments of the county, however, the number of layers will be a noisy measure of jurisdictional overlap. In addition, relating the number of functional layers of government in a county to total expenditures risks conflating jurisdictional overlap with the diversity of functional performance.

1. Number of overlapping districts per municipality

This measures approximates the number of jurisdictions that overlap the average city within a county. An important advantage of this measure is that the denominator encapsulates horizontal fragmentation (the number of municipalities), while the numerator represents vertical layering (the number of single-function governments).

Town (also called *township*) governments present a special case. First, town governments exist in only 20 states. Second, in some of these states, towns have the character of municipalities, while others they operate more like special districts.

**Overlap:** Specifically, towns may overlap the territory of municipalities in 11 states:

1. Connecticut
2. Illinois
3. Indiana
4. Kansas
5. Michigan
6. Minnesota
7. Missouri
8. Nebraska
9. New York
10. Ohio
11. Vermont

In the nine remaining states, towns are territorially separate from municipalities, with no overlap between the two kinds of units:

1. Maine
2. Massachusetts
3. New Hampshire
4. New Jersey
5. North Dakota
6. Pennsylvania
7. Rhode Island
8. South Dakota
9. Wisconsin

Compute the number of overlapping jurisdictions in county as the sum of special districts, school districts, and, where appropriate, townships.
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I exclude Alaska from the analysis because that state uniquely relies on borough rather than counties, and boroughs do not cover the entire land area of the state. In addition, a total of 110 observations from 18 counties did not contain data in both the COG and CPH and were therefore dropped from the analysis.

Finally, I dropped 447 observations from 61 counties that had no incorporated municipalities in one or more years. Beginning with a total of 3,138 counties in the COG data set, I retain a total of 3,302 counties for the analysis after deleting Alaska and other cases.