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- State gov’ts interact with each other often; known as horizontal federalism
- States compete with each other – over appropriate levels of taxation and expenditures. E.G. Boeing
- States cooperate to solve various problems, including environmental and energy problems. E.G. Great Lakes states
- Legal equality between the states: Bigger states can’t boss around smaller states. Thus, each state has relative influence
- The Constitution legitimates these interactions: Full faith and credit clause (reciprocity); interstate rendition clause; privileges and immunities clause; Interstate compact clause
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- Multi-state legal actions: Demonstrates strength in numbers. Often why you may see 15 states charging one person with various crimes
- Substantive focus is often on consumer and/or environmental protection
- Research analysis indicates that states with a more “liberal” populace enter into more multi-state legal actions
- Uniform State Laws: Congress often adopts uniform state laws, but another way is for states to do this themselves via the Uniform Law Commission
- Cooperation of Administrative Agreements: Do not require legislative action, thus enacted more quickly, but sometimes less durable
Competition

- State gov’ts may compete over federal grants
Competition

- State gov’ts may compete over federal grants
- States compete in the private sectors for specific companies to move there; tourism
Competition

- State gov’ts may compete over federal grants
- States compete in the private sectors for specific companies to move there; tourism
- Competition for Economic Development: Tax burden, training programs, wage rates, regulatory environment, venture capital possibilities, quality of life, union membership

Do indicators of economic development have any effect on firm locational decisions? Perhaps individually, but trend data do not support this.
• State gov’ts may compete over federal grants
• States compete in the private sectors for specific companies to move there; tourism
• Competition for Economic Development: Tax burden, training programs, wage rates, regulatory environment, venture capital possibilities, quality of life, union membership
• Do indicators of economic development have any effect on firm locational decisions? Perhaps individually, but trend data do not support this.
• Competition over Tax Systems: States rely on different revenue sources to fund their gov’ts. From NJ (12.2%) to TN (7.6%)
Competition

- Competition over Tax Systems: States rely on different revenue sources to fund their gov’ts. From NJ (12.2%) to TN (7.6%)
- Example: Washington State and Texas, tax increase ballot initiative
Competition

- Competition over Tax Systems: States rely on different revenue sources to fund their gov’ts. From NJ (12.2%) to TN (7.6%)
- Example: Washington State and Texas, tax increase ballot initiative
- Lawmakers more likely to propose tax increases when neighboring states do the same
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- States are important revenue source to their local jurisdictions. States provide about 1/3 revenue of local gov’t.
- States give local gov’ts mandates to ensure the latter perform vital activities and achieve goals. E.G.: State spending on local education.
- Second Order Devolution: Shift in power from state level to local level. Can be administrative or substantive (policymaking)
- Over time, states have tended to centralize power (Ross Stephens index). States most centralized: AK, DE, HI, VT; lease centralized: CA, FL, IL, NV. Why?