Wayne State University DigitalCommons@WayneState

Working Group on Interlocal Services Cooperation

Political Science

9-23-2005

Patterns of Interlocal Services Collaboration: A Preliminary Analysis

Jered B. Carr *Wayne State University,* jcarr@wayne.edu

Recommended Citation

Carr, Jered B., "Patterns of Interlocal Services Collaboration: A Preliminary Analysis" (2005). *Working Group on Interlocal Services Cooperation*. Paper 12. http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/interlocal_coop/12

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Political Science at DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Working Group on Interlocal Services Cooperation by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

2005 Annual MML Convention Grand Rapids

CRC's Survey of Local Government Services Patterns of Local Government Collaboration on Services: A Preliminary Analysis Jered Carr Department of Political Science Wayne State University

Joint Services Measures

- Function Indices
 - All Services (113 possible functions)
 - Police (13 functions)
 - Fire (8 functions)
 - Parks & Recreation (11 functions)
- Possible Partners

 Local general purpose governments: county, city, village, or township

Demographic, Fiscal Variables (Years 2000, 2001, or 2002)

- Measures
 - Unit Population
 - Pop Chg 1990-2000
 - County Population
 - City FOG (C-M, M-C)
 - Total Govs in County
 - City Pop as % of Cnty Pop
 - Total Revenues
 - Total Expenses
 - PCPI
 - Number of Persons below Poverty Level

Four Groups

- All local governments
- Cities Only
- Villages Only
- Townships Only
- Four Function Indices
 - All functions shared w/another general purpose gov
 - Police, Fire, Parks & Recreation

Findings: Correlation Analysis

- Modest to no association between the demographic and fiscal measures for all four groups of local governments.
- Absence of links between collaboration and FOG, population growth, numbers of governments is surprising.
- Service decisions are more complex than these simple bivariate measures. Also, financial measures do not reflect fiscal stress.

Descriptive Statistics (All local governments)

- Index of All functions
 - 113 possible functions
 - 371 valid responses
 - Min: 0, Max: 79
 - Mean: 30.54
 - Median: 29.00
 - Percentiles:
 - 25: 19 (8 responses)
 - 50: 28 (14 responses)
 - 75: 41 (6 responses)

- Index of Police Servs
 - 12 possible functions
 - 425 valid responses
 - Min: 0, Max: 18
 - Mean: 5.23
 - Median: 5.00
 - Percentiles:
 - 25: 1 (45 responses)
 - 50: 4 (39 responses)
 - 75: 7 (43 responses)

Descriptive Statistics— Continued

- Index of Fire Services
 - 8 possible functions
 - 433 valid responses
 - Min: 0, Max: 14
 - Mean: 3.03
 - Median: 2.00
 - Percentiles:
 - 25: 1 (73 responses)
 - 50: 2 (71 responses)
 - 75: 5 (30 responses)

Index of Parks & Rec

- 11 possible functions
- 423 valid responses
- Min: 0, Max: 13
- Mean: 1.34
- Median: 0
- Percentiles:
 - 25:0
 - 50:0 (231)
 - 75: 2 (42)

Analysis of Differences in Mean Levels of Services Collaboration

- City vs. Village
 - No difference in total number of functions unit cooperates on.
 - Villages show higher levels of collaboration on police and fire services.
 - Cities show higher levels of collaboration on parks and recreations.

City vs. Township

- Townships cooperated on larger numbers of functions than do cities.
- Townships show
 higher levels of
 collaboration on
 police, fire, and parks
 and recreation
 services.

Difference in Mean Levels— Continued

- General Law Township vs. Charter Township
 - No difference in total number of functions unit cooperates on.
 - No difference in levels of cooperation on police and parks and recreation.
 - General Law Townships show higher levels of collaboration on fire.