

North State Super Region

1255 East Street, Suite 202, Redding, CA 96001 (530) 262-6190 nssr16@gmail.com
www.superregion.org
Tamera Leighton, Chair

February 5, 2013

Jon Clark

Butte County Assn. of Governments

James Bell

Colusa County Transportation Comm.

Tamera Leighton

Del Norte Local Transportation Comm.

John Linhart

Glenn County Transportation Comm.

Marcella Clem

Humboldt Co Assn. of Governments

Lisa Davey-Bates

Lake Co City/Area Planning Comm.

Larry Millar

Lassen County Transportation Comm.

Phil Dow

Mendocino County Council of Govts

Debbie Pedersen

Modoc County Transportation Comm.

Daniel Landon

Nevada County Transportation Comm.

Robert Perreault

Plumas County Transportation Comm.

Daniel S. Little

Shasta Regional Transp. Agency (SRTA)

Tim Beals

Sierra County Transportation Comm.

Melissa Cummins

Siskiyou County Local Trans. Comm.

Gary Antone

Tehama County Transportation Comm.

Richard Tippett

Trinity County Transportation Comm.

NORTH STATE SUPER REGION MAP-21 PRINCIPLES

"ANY AREA" SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) FUNDS

- Put California first: Build a transportation program, not a population program. For regional STP funds not required to be suballocated by population under MAP-21 (any area funds), distribute funds by an alternative formula that factors in where our transportation resources are located, such as highway miles or federal aid eligible road miles.
- Let it add up to at least one project for the little guys. Increase the minimum guarantees of RSTP funds for the smallest regions in proportion to any increase in STP funds over SAFETELU levels.

STATE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

- Shattering federal dollars into a bunch of little pieces is inefficient. Continue the RSTP exchange program which consolidates federal dollars on larger projects, while allowing smaller regions to utilize state cash.
- But, we'd rather use federal cash than have it taken away. To the extent state cash for RSTP may not be available to allow 100% obligation authority, provide the difference with federal dollars. Federal funds can still be effectively managed and used for rehabilitation or programs that require federal match (such as onsystem bridges).
- STP is not always the most efficient target for exchange dollars Let us choose. Within each region's exchange allowance, provide flexibility to exchange among the STP, TAP or HSIP programs. This would enable regions to strategically reduce the number of locally federalized projects, and eliminate the inefficiencies of federalizing small projects.

ON-SYSTEM BRIDGE MATCH

> The burden of on-system bridge match is more than smaller regions can bear. Set aside "any area" STP funds or HSIP funds to provide the 11.47% match for on-system bridges (thru toll-credits), thereby freeing up more flexible local and state transportation funds for use on non-federalized projects.

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP)

Regions are in the best position to make community decisions. Maintain maximum decision-making authority at the regional level for the state's new active transportation program. Regions, through their governing boards, are in the best position to ensure community involvement and select projects that meet Regional Transportation Plan goals and objectives.

HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP)

> Safety projects from safety plans. Establish a new project selection methodology that reflects the needs and opportunities identified in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and the new statewide data system. This alignment will enable compliance with MAP-21 performance standards.

Differences caused by distributing funds by an STP population-based formula compared to a more equitable highway-weighted STIP formula



