

power to compel action in areas outside the jurisdiction of urban governments and, in many cases, their greater capital resources.

It is unlikely that the urban areas will secure an active State role unless they have sufficient political resources to force State action. In New Jersey and California, the strength of urban electorates has been great enough to maintain the support of a succession of Governors and a majority of the lower house of the State legislature (apportioned on the basis of population) for an active State urban water role. The predominance of the urban electorate in New Jersey also assured passage of a bond referendum after sections of the State and the political parties had reconciled their differences.

In California, the heavily populated southern counties, sometimes by a margin of over 4 to 1, provided enough votes to predominate in the California water bond referendum. Although 45 of California's 58 counties voted against the proposal, it was approved by a vote of 3,008,328 to 2,834,384. In effect, the southern water-short counties were able to prevail over the less populated, but more richly endowed, northern counties.

When a State undertakes to provide its urban areas with water, a variety of urban and nonurban interests are directly affected. As a result, solutions must be acceptable to statewide rather than regional or municipal interests. For example, one possible solution to northern New Jersey's water shortage is diversion of Delaware River water. While the northern New Jersey urban areas saw the Delaware only as a source of water, the State had a dual interest. From the point of view of State officials, the Delaware was an eventual source of water for northern New Jersey, but even more important was the requirement for sufficient Delaware water to maintain streamflows essential to industrial development in the Trenton and Camden areas.

These complexities do not necessarily negate the role of the State in developing future water supplies. There is every reason to believe that such activity will increase and, indeed, in such a situation the State is the most appropriate unit of government to make decisions between a number of metropolitan areas and industrial and rural users competing for the same water supply. Even a metropolitan water authority embracing, for example, the entire New York City-New Jersey metropolitan area could not take full and objective account of Trenton and Camden area needs. The point is simply that urban interests must accept reduced control over their own utility development when they seek to utilize the increased capabilities that some State governments can offer.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

Federal water resource activities affect urban water supply and waste disposal both directly and indirectly. Federal research, planning, and assistance programs in the fields of water pollution control, sewage treatment, and water supply have a direct impact on utility service in urban areas. The major Federal water resource activities—navigation, flood control, irrigation, and multipurpose river basin development—have important indirect effects on urban water users. Navigation and flood control projects reduce the amount of water available for other uses, including urban water supply and waste dilution. Federal irrigation policy is extremely important to western urban interests since irrigation, because of its high consumption of