

buses and park-and-ride, would be technically feasible and more workable in the area east of Sacramento than other options studied (HOV lanes and freeway widening). It also found that Folsom corridor facilities had been relieving congestion in the I-80 corridor; therefore, further studies should evaluate both corridors simultaneously.

MTS first suggested an LRT line to California State University, Sacramento, in its 1975 paper (above). In 1978, the Director of Caltrans, Adriana Gianturco, endorsed the idea in a letter to Sacramento Mayor Phil Isenberg. Gianturco agreed with Councilman Connelly and the MTS that the historic trolley idea, updated to modern light rail transit, should be considered and extended beyond the downtown area to California State University (about 4.5 miles) and beyond.

This study started in April 1979. A Policy Advisory Committee was appointed by RT to oversee the Folsom corridor work. It was chaired by Connelly and included representatives from the City Council, County Supervisors, RT Board, and Caltrans. An MTS member also was appointed to the study's Technical Advisory Committee.

Northeast Sacramento Phase II Alternatives Analysis

Early in 1980, RT's rail planner was selected to manage the Phase II alternatives analysis for Northeast Sacramento and loaned to SRAPC for that purpose. The start of the analysis overlapped the Folsom corridor study; because of the corridor's demonstrated value in relieving congestion in the I-80 area, it was decided to expand the Phase II study to include both the I-80 and Folsom corridors.

This expansion was a key topic in several neighborhood workshops held during project "scoping". MTS continued to monitor the study and, as it neared completion, began to plan a major campaign to build broad support for LRT.

This effort received a substantial boost from the new RT general manager, who had been in charge of the San

Diego LRT project. Faced with limited operating resources and growing transit needs in an era of inflation, he endorsed the need for higher transit productivity and convinced a new RT board to support development of efficient LRT trunks in Northeast Sacramento. Working with the MTS, a Community Task Force for LRT set out to build community consensus for the project, and by the time the Northeast Sacramento Draft Environmental Impact Statement was circulated (April-June 1981), their campaign was successful. The community was nearly unanimous that LRT should be selected and that it should be built in both the I-80 and Folsom corridors as a through route. The decision received 10 of 11 votes from the study's policy committee, 8 of 9 from the City Council, and unanimous votes from the RT Board and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG, formerly SRAPC). Workshops and public hearings were attended by MTS members and representatives of other community organizations. A high point occurred when the Sacramento Board of Realtors president followed a Sierra Club representative and commented that it was probably the first time the two organizations had agreed on an issue. Another high point was the Central Labor Council speaker's self-introduction as representing "the 80,000 organized workers in greater Sacramento". Resolutions and letters of support for LRT were received from 46 community organizations, and 5,000 area residents signed a petition circulated by the MTS.

Since the spring 1981 decision, additional planning has been under way to set the final alignment in neighborhoods where community concerns needed to be addressed. Sacramento congressmen have worked to ensure funding for project engineering during 1982, and a joint powers authority, including the city, county, RT, and Caltrans, has been formed to design and build the project. The community was pulling together again to convince UMTA that authorization to begin LRT preliminary engineering should be granted.

LRT Development: State Perspective

ARTHUR E. BAUER, Arthur Bauer & Associates

San Diego has received considerable attention for its imaginative deployment of light rail transit technology and for its decision to eschew federal funds and rely on state and local revenues to meet the capital and operating requirements of the LRT system. California's commitment to funding urban transportation encouraged the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) to pursue a policy of fiscal independence. Equally important was the legislature's assignment of powers and responsibilities to MTDB. A product of state and local politics, MTDB represented a rejection of the nationalization of urban transportation policy of the past 20 years. Indeed, MTDB's success raised questions about the wisdom of a national policy that sought to bypass state governments in its efforts to achieve a national urban transportation policy and ignored the fiscal capability of state governments to support programs and moderate conflicts, and the state's authority to constitute local agencies. MTDB may serve as a model for a reformed national urban transportation policy that would give priority to state governments in urban transportation policy formulation and not seek to specify organizational arrangements for carrying out urban transportation planning. This paper describes the role of California's state government in the evolution of MTDB and its LRT system. It concludes with some remarks regarding federalism.

In 1971, California's Governor Reagan signed the Transportation Development Act (TDA) which established a transit funding program that has since produced \$2.1 billion for funding and operating public transit in the state. The program sets aside 0.25 percent of sales tax revenues and permits the funds in urban areas of the state to be used for public transit; in the nonurban areas funds may be used either for transit or for local streets and roads. Although the state legislature establishes guidelines, the revenues are identified as local and are returned to the county of origin for allocation. The program offers certainty of funds and opportunities to develop transit programs. The funds are allocated by regional transportation agencies (in federal parlance, MPOs).

Another funding decision was a constitutional amendment approved in June 1974 that permits gasoline tax revenues, previously constitutionally reserved for highway construction, to be used to construct rail transit systems but not to purchase rolling stock or subsidize operations. The amendment requires a local election be held to authorize a county to participate in the program. Nine counties, including San Diego, have made that decision. A state statute implements the amendment and allows the equivalent of up to 25 percent of the state highway revenues spent in a county to be allocated for guideway construction.

In 1974, regional transportation planning in San Diego was supervised by the Comprehensive Planning Organization (CPO). Because of San Diego's single-county urban-area status, the activities of CPO, by agreement of local agencies, were regulated by the San Diego County government; however, as development pressures mounted and because the county was viewed as an overly dominant force in local politics, the members of CPO, by means of a cooperative agreement, separated the agency from county government in 1973. In 1974, on the basis of several years' planning effort, CPO recommended a \$2 billion, high-capacity exclusive right-of-way, urban rail transit system for San Diego. The magnitude of this proposal created uncertainty in the community.

In response to the CPO proposal and to the funding opportunity presented by the constitutional amendment, legislation was introduced to create the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board. The legislation

- Assigned to CPO long-term transportation system planning, including identification of travel corridors, definition of land use goals, and recommendation of priority corridors for guideway development;
- Assigned to MTDB near-term operational planning, including determination of funds available for transportation development, selection of transportation technology, and determination of routes, performance criteria, and station locations for guideway systems;
- Assigned to MTDB responsibility for allocating all state funds in its area of jurisdiction, including operating subsidies;
- Identified MTDB as the designated recipient;
- Assigned to MTDB responsibility for near-term, 5-year transportation planning and for development of the annual Transportation Improvement Program;
- Assigned to MTDB responsibility for building and operating transit guideways, provided off-the-shelf technology is used; and
- Designated 10 percent of the TDA revenues to offset the cost of MTDB's operations if San Diego County's allocation of guideway construction funds could be set aside for up to 5 years while MTDB explored the feasibility of developing a rail transit system.

Two extremely important decisions were made during the legislative process. The first concerned the San Diego region. It was clear to the legislature that in San Diego County there was no countywide or regional consensus regarding transportation development. The areas of the county outside metropolitan San Diego wanted out of the plan, and thus "metropolitan" was added to the title.

The second decision, linking multiagency planning, programming, and allocation of revenues with the authority to operate transit services, was made in order to ensure accountability. A perceived error in the development of San Francisco's BART system was superimposing it on the existing transportation system. To avoid this, the transit operators and city and county street and road personnel would need to join forces so that realistic decisions could be made about transportation investments, the assumption being that accountability is directly linked to the authority to operate a public service. To assign such important elements as planning and allocation of resources to non-operating agencies diminishes accountability of public agencies, although not the public's expectation of accountability. Therefore, MTDB was assigned the responsibility both to plan and to operate the transit facility.

In essence, MTDB was constituted to take advantage of funding arrangements in state law, to accommodate the political culture of San Diego, and to draw on the lessons learned from another transit development experience in California.

FEDERALISM AND MTDB

MTDB's enabling legislation did not escape notice. Agreement between CPO and MTDB was imperative, and the two agencies achieved agreement in a memorandum of understanding that continues to regulate their interaction. Both agencies sought UMTA's opinion of the arrangement and the administrator had no choice but to approve the memorandum of understanding. He concluded his letter of approval with a curious note, however:

The Federal Government does not regard this arrangement as a binding national precedent in any event. We will consider such arrangements on a case-by-case basis as they may be presented to us.¹

That remark implies that the federal government has the right to approve a state's decisions regarding the organization of substate jurisdictions. There is no constitutional foundation for such an assumption, although perhaps the federal government can establish national precedents for organizing urban transportation development processes. The administrator simply had no concept of American federalism. He viewed the system as an administrative hierarchy, not as a noncentralized political system with many independent centers of power.

State and local governments are not middle and lower layers of a national administrative hierarchy. Constitutionally, state governments establish local political systems within their jurisdiction. Perhaps, in the spirit of federalism, national transportation development policy-makers should consider states as creators of institutions, interpreters of political culture and norms, and financiers capable of raising revenues that serve to meet certain national transportation priorities. The issue and options paper on metropolitan transportation planning, issued in November 1981 by UMTA and FHWA, mentioned no alternate strategies for taking advantage of the unique role of state government. It simply reiterated what already exists and did not examine what might be done to encourage a greater state role.

For years the national government has sought a coherent transportation policy process in urban areas but has been frustrated by its inability to comprehend local arrangements. The political and administrative relationships among local jurisdictions result from state actions, and the necessary reforms can come only from state government. Perhaps this should be reflected in federal policy.

The Metropolitan Transit Development Board is a good example of the vitality of federalism. Federal policy should encourage state and local institutional and fiscal support and not worry if a "binding national precedent" is being created. In drafting the bill, the state legislature forged an innovative instrument on the basis of established funding, programmatic planning, and accommodation to local political factors. MTDB has responded with vigor and imagination.

REFERENCE

1. Letter from Robert E. Patricelli, UMTA Administrator, to the Chairman of the CPO Board of Directors and the Chairman of MTDB, dated May 24, 1976.