

## ABSTRACT

The concept of developing BRT as sustainable urban transportation tool has become a trend in many countries. BRT offers low cost, fast speed, safety and comfort. In addition, it meets the *MSS* (Minimum Service Standards). This is what spurred the regional government to implement BRT in its area, as an innovative government in the provision of urban transportation. However, the implementation of BRT in developing areas often causes controversy from other public transport (city transport-mikrolet). Conflict arising between BRT and city transport is inequality in gaining access to resources, especially the overlap of BRT's and city transport's trajectory routes. Therefore, there is a need of a comprehensive breakthrough in overcoming the problem in order to realize an equity.

This study aims to describe the most acceptable policy instruments by stakeholders in overcoming the overlap of BRT Corridor VI's and City Transport's trajectory routes. Among these are physical access, access of income opportunity, and access of investment opportunity. The three instruments are analyzed through stakeholder perceptions. The stakeholder group is divided into three sections, namely decision maker, beneficiaries and influence groups. Each group received the same question through the questionnaire. Questions given regarding stakeholder assessment of three policy instruments with their respective characteristics based on MICD (management of infrastructure and community development), namely infrastructure, management, management risk, and delivery mechanism. Stakeholder responses are then processed and analyzed by using the stated preference method. After that, stakeholders are analyzed by identifying and mapping them based on their influence and importance.

This study shows that the policy instrument in overcoming the problem of BRT corridor IV's and city transport's line route overlap, which is deemed as most appropriate is "Access of Investment Opportunity". Based on the stakeholders' segmentation, there is a difference of perceptions, especially on city transport of Tembalang Area (beneficiaries). The group is of the view that access of income opportunity is the one that needs to be applied in the overlap of BRT Corridor VI's and City Transport's trajectory routes. But the group may be influenced by Organda as a mediator and favor access of investment opportunity just like any other groups. Access of investment opportunity is more acceptable. Moreover, it is easier to implement from a technical point of view. Based on stakeholder analysis, the strategies to be taken to realize access of investment opportunity are: coalition, collaboration, and cooperation among groups that have "high" importance, "high" influence level, and "high" importance and influence level in the formulation and implementation of the instruments of access of investment opportunity policy.

**Keywords:** BRT, mikrolet, support access, stakeholders

## INTISARI

Konsep pengembangan BRT sebagai transportasi perkotaan berkelanjutan sudah menjadi *tren* di berbagai negara. Keunggulan dari BRT adalah transportasi yang menawarkan biaya murah, cepat, aman dan nyaman serta memenuhi SPM (Standar Pelayanan Minimal). Hal inilah yang memacu pemerintah daerah untuk menerapkan BRT di daerahnya, sebagai pemerintah yang inovatif dalam penyediaan transportasi perkotaan. Namun implementasi BRT di daerah yang berkembang sering menimbulkan kontroversi dari angkutan umum lain (mikrolet). Konflik yang timbul antara BRT dan mikrolet adalah ketidaksetaraan dalam mendapatkan akses ke sumber daya akibat *overlapping* jalur trayek BRT dan mikrolet. Oleh sebab itu perlu adanya terobosan komprehensif dalam mengatasi masalah tersebut demi mewujudkan *equity*.

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan instrumen kebijakan yang paling dapat diterima oleh *stakeholders* dalam mengatasi masalah *overlapping* jalur trayek BRT Koridor VI dan Mikrolet. Diantaranya adalah akses fisik, akses kesempatan pendapatan, dan akses kesempatan investasi. Tiga instrumen tersebut dianalisis melalui persepsi *stakeholders*. Kelompok *stakeholders* dibagi menjadi tiga bagian, yakni *decision maker*, *beneficiaries* dan *influence groups*. Masing-masing kelompok menerima pertanyaan yang sama melalui kuisisioner. Pertanyaan yang diberikan terkait penilaian *stakeholders* terhadap tiga instrumen kebijakan dengan karakteristik masing-masing berdasarkan MICD (*management of infrastructure and community development*), yakni infrastruktur, pengelolaan, resiko pengelolaan, dan *mekanisme delivery*. Respon *stakeholders* kemudian diolah dan dianalisis menggunakan metode *stated preference*. Setelah itu, dilakukan analisis *stakeholders* dengan diidentifikasi dan di petakan berdasarkan pengaruh dan kepentingannya.

Studi ini menunjukkan bahwa instrumen kebijakan dalam mengatasi masalah *overlapping* jalur trayek BRT koridor IV dan mikrolet, yang dianggap paling sesuai adalah “Akses Kesempatan Investasi”. Berdasarkan segmentasi *stakeholders* terjadi perbedaan persepsi terutama pada pihak mikrolet Kawasan Tembalang (*beneficiaries*). Kelompok tersebut berpandangan bahwa akses kesempatan pendapatan yang perlu diterapkan dalam mengatasi *overlapping* jalur trayek BRT koridor VI dan mikrolet. Namun kelompok tersebut dapat dipengaruhi oleh Organda selaku mediator dan berpihak pada akses kesempatan investasi sama seperti kelompok lainnya. Akses kesempatan investasi lebih diterima dan dari segi teknis akan lebih mudah implementasinya. Berdasarkan analisis *stakeholders*, strategi yang harus dilakukan untuk mewujudkan akses kesempatan investasi adalah koalisi, kolaborasi, dan kerjasama antar kelompok yang memiliki tingkat kepentingan “tinggi”, tingkat pengaruh “tinggi”, dan kepentingan serta pengaruh “tinggi” dalam perumusan hingga implementasi instrumen kebijakan akses kesempatan investasi.

**Kata kunci:** BRT, transportasi mikrolet, akses pendukung, *stakeholders*