

Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

Fiscal Year 2022

Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program

Report of the Secretary of Transportation
to the United States Congress
Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 5309(o)(1) and
Section 3005(b)(11) of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act

May 2021

Prepared by:
Federal Transit Administration

Available from:
Federal Transit Administration
Office of Planning and Environment
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

<http://www.fta.dot.gov>

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
General Commitment Guidelines for Capital Investment Grants Program Projects	2
The FY 2022 Funding Allocations and Recommendations.....	5

Tables

Table 1 FY 2022 Funding Proposed for Capital Investment Grants Program.....	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grants Program FY 2021 Project Ratings	8
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	11
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Project Justification Ratings.....	13

Introduction

This *Annual Report on Funding Recommendations* is issued by the United States Secretary of Transportation to help inform the appropriations process for the upcoming fiscal year (FY) by providing information on projects that have been submitted to the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) discretionary Capital Investment Grants Program.

The Capital Investment Grants Program

The Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program, set forth in 49 U.S.C. § 5309 (Section 5309), was most recently authorized by the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act¹ (FAST Act).

The CIG Program is the Federal Government's primary financial resource for supporting transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. It provides funding for fixed guideway investments such as new and expanded heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, streetcars, bus rapid transit, and ferries, as well as corridor-based bus rapid transit investments that emulate the features of rail. Over the years, the program has helped to make possible dozens of new or extended transit systems across the country. These public transportation investments, in turn, have improved the mobility and quality of life of millions of Americans, provided alternatives to congested roadways, and fostered the development of more economically vibrant communities.

There are three categories of eligible projects under the CIG Program: New Starts, Small Starts, and Core Capacity. New Starts and Core Capacity projects are required by law to go through a three-phase process - Project Development, Engineering, and Construction. Small Starts projects are required by law to go through a two-phase process - Project Development and Construction. As defined in law, New Starts projects are those for which the sponsors request \$100 million or more in CIG Program funds or have an anticipated total capital cost of \$300 million or more. Core Capacity projects are substantial investments in existing fixed-guideway corridors that are at capacity today or will be in five years, where the proposed project will increase capacity by not less than 10 percent. Small Starts projects are those for which sponsors request less than \$100 million in CIG Program funds and have an anticipated total capital cost of less than \$300 million.

FTA awards Section 5309 CIG Program funding for a portion of the total project cost, including design and construction. Federal public transportation law limits New Starts projects to a maximum Section 5309 CIG Program share of 60 percent of the total project cost, while Core Capacity and Small Starts projects are limited to a maximum Section 5309 CIG Program share of 80 percent of the total project cost.

The law requires FTA to evaluate and rate all CIG projects on a set of statutorily defined project justification and local financial commitment criteria. Projects must receive and maintain a "Medium" or better overall rating to advance through the various phases and be eligible for CIG funding. Ratings are point-in-time evaluations by FTA and may change as proposed projects

¹ This Annual Report is required by 49 U.S.C. § 5309(o)(1).

proceed through planning and design, when information concerning costs, benefits, financial plans, and impacts is refined. The law does not require FTA to evaluate and rate projects once a construction grant agreement is awarded.

Section 3005(b) of the FAST Act established the Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) Pilot Program, which allows FTA to select up to eight projects for participation in the pilot. Eligible projects include New Starts, Small Starts, and Core Capacity projects that are seeking no more than 25 percent in Federal grant funding, are supported in part through a public private partnership, and will be operated and maintained by an existing public transportation provider. Similar to the requirements for the CIG Program, Section 3005(b)(11) of the FAST Act requires FTA to submit to Congress an annual report on the proposed amount of funding for this pilot program.

This Report provides general information about the CIG Program, including the guidelines that the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) uses to make funding recommendations. Table 1 identifies the FY 2022 funding amount recommended for individual CIG projects, with information on each project's cost and funding history. Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C provide the results of FTA's evaluation and rating of the CIG projects at this juncture.

Information Available on the FTA Website

More information on the CIG Program can be found on FTA's website at <https://www.transit.dot.gov/CIG>. Also, available on the website in the section labeled "Current Projects" are profiles of each of the projects currently in the CIG Program pipeline.

General Funding Recommendation and Funding Commitment Guidelines for CIG Projects

- Any project recommended for CIG funding by FTA in the *Annual Report* must meet the project justification, local financial commitment, and process criteria established in Section 5309, and should be consistent with Executive Order 12893, *Principles for Federal Infrastructure Investments*, issued January 26, 1994.
- Funding recommendations are based on the results of the project evaluation process and resulting project justification, local financial commitment, and overall project ratings, as well as considerations such as project readiness and the availability of CIG funds.
- The decision whether to enter into a construction grant agreement is discretionary. Even if FTA decides to proceed with such an agreement, FTA does not sign a construction grant agreement committing CIG funding until after the project sponsor has demonstrated that its project is ready for such an agreement. This includes assurance that the project's development and design have progressed to the point where its scope, costs, benefits, and impacts are considered firm and final, the project sponsor has obtained all non-CIG funding commitments, and the project sponsor has completed all critical third-party agreements. Under the longstanding CIG Program framework, FTA establishes a maximum fixed CIG dollar amount upon entry into the Engineering phase for New Starts and Core Capacity projects, or at award of the construction grant agreement for Small Starts projects.

Thereafter, the project sponsor assumes the risk for any cost overruns or funding shortfalls that may occur on a project.

- The construction grant agreement, called either a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for New Starts and Core Capacity projects or a Small Starts Grant Agreement (SSGA) for Small Starts projects, defines the project, including its cost, scope, schedule, and level of service; commits to a maximum level of annual and total CIG financial assistance (subject to Congressional appropriation); establishes the terms and conditions of Federal financial participation; defines the period of time for completion of the project, and helps FTA oversee and the project sponsor manage the project in accordance with Federal law. Upon completion of the payment schedule outlined in an FFGA or SSGA, the CIG funding commitment has been fulfilled. Any additional costs are the responsibility of the project sponsor. FTA works closely with project sponsors to identify and implement strategies for containing capital costs at the level indicated in the FFGA or SSGA at the time it was signed.
- When preparing funding recommendations for the upcoming fiscal year, FTA's priority is to honor the commitments made in existing construction grant agreements. FTA recommends new projects not yet under construction grant agreements for funding only if proposed CIG Program funding levels are sufficient.
- Initial planning efforts conducted prior to entry into the first phase of the CIG process are not eligible for CIG funding, but funding may be provided for that work through grants under the Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program, the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, or Title 23 "flexible funding."
- FTA encourages project sponsors to provide an overmatch as a means of funding more projects and leveraging State, local and private financial resources.

FTA emphasizes that the process of CIG project evaluation and rating is ongoing. As a proposed CIG project proceeds through planning and design, information concerning costs, benefits, financial plans, and impacts is refined and the project rating may be reassessed to reflect new information.

Table 1 - FY 2022 Funding Recommendations for the Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program and the 3005(b) Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) Pilot Program

	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 CIG Request	Section 5309 CIG Share	CIG Funds Allocated through FY 2021	Remaining Funding Needed After FY2021	FY 2022 Recommended Funding	
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)							\$1,117,578,973	
Existing Core Capacity Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)							\$442,343,407	
Proposed New Starts Projects							\$158,122,079	
Proposed Small Starts Projects							\$303,004,865	
Other Projects That May Become Ready for CIG or EPD Funding During FY22							\$427,220,676	
Oversight - 1% takedown							\$24,730,000	
Total							\$2,473,000,000	
Existing New Starts FFGAs								
AZ	Phoenix, South Central/Downtown Hub Light Rail	LRT	\$1,345,088,335	\$529,830,295	39.4%	\$297,710,967	\$232,119,328	\$100,000,000
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 1	HR	\$2,821,957,153	\$1,250,000,000	44.3%	\$762,710,967	\$487,289,033	\$100,000,000
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	HR	\$2,499,239,536	\$1,187,000,000	47.5%	\$597,710,967	\$589,289,033	\$100,000,000
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 3	HR	\$3,599,267,008	\$1,300,000,000	36.1%	\$397,710,967	\$902,289,033	\$100,000,000
CA	San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	LRT	\$2,171,200,545	\$1,043,380,000	48.1%	\$627,735,707	\$415,644,293	\$100,000,000
IN	Northern Indiana, Double Track	CR	\$491,121,424	\$172,964,251	35.2%	\$100,000,000	\$72,964,251	\$50,000,000
IN	Northern Indiana, West Lake Corridor	CR	\$944,892,265	\$354,572,704	37.5%	\$197,710,967	\$156,861,737	\$100,000,000
MA	Boston Green Line Extension	LRT	\$2,297,618,856	\$996,121,000	43.4%	\$947,710,967	\$48,410,033	\$48,410,033 *
MD	Maryland National Capital Purple Line	LRT	\$2,407,030,286	\$900,000,000	37.4%	\$805,253,159	\$94,746,841	\$94,746,841 *
MN	Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	LRT	\$2,003,152,549	\$928,840,370	46.4%	\$212,710,967	\$716,129,403	\$100,000,000
MO	Kansas City, Streetcar Main Street Extension	SC	\$351,706,565	\$174,059,270	49.5%	\$149,637,171	\$24,422,099	\$24,422,099 *
WA	Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension	LRT	\$3,160,704,706	\$790,000,000	25.0%	\$297,710,967	\$492,289,033	\$100,000,000
WA	Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	LRT	\$3,260,357,587	\$1,172,730,000	36.0%	\$497,710,967	\$675,019,033	\$100,000,000
Subtotal			\$27,353,336,815	\$10,799,497,890		\$5,892,024,740	\$4,907,473,150	\$1,117,578,973
Existing Core Capacity FFGAs								
CA	San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	CR	\$1,930,670,934	\$647,000,000	33.5%	\$572,956,593	\$74,043,407	\$74,043,407 *
CA	San Francisco, BART Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Project	HR	\$2,705,720,281	\$1,169,000,000	43.2%	\$1,025,700,000	\$143,300,000	\$143,300,000 *
NJ	Seacaucus, Portal North Bridge	CR	\$1,732,168,451	\$766,500,000	44.3%	\$248,000,000	\$518,500,000	\$125,000,000
IL	Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project Phase 1	HR	\$2,066,702,783	\$956,607,772	46.3%	\$691,131,640	\$265,476,132	\$100,000,000
Subtotal			\$8,435,262,449	\$3,539,107,772		\$2,537,788,233	\$1,001,319,539	\$442,343,407
Proposed New Starts Projects								
+	AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II	LRT	\$401,325,074	\$158,122,079	39.4%	\$100,000,000	\$58,122,079	\$58,122,079 *
+	MN St Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	BRT	\$531,879,000	\$239,345,550	45.0%	\$0	\$239,345,550	\$100,000,000
Total for Proposed New Starts Projects			\$933,204,074	\$397,467,629		\$100,000,000	\$297,467,629	\$158,122,079
Proposed Small Starts Projects								
+	MN Rochester, Rapid Transit	BRT	\$114,541,900	\$56,085,700	49.0%	\$0	\$56,085,700	\$56,085,700 *
+	TX Austin, Expo Center Bus Rapid Transit	BRT	\$35,618,149	\$17,809,074	50.0%	\$0	\$17,809,074	\$17,809,074 *
+	TX Austin, Pleasant Valley Bus Rapid Transit	BRT	\$36,557,281	\$18,278,641	50.0%	\$0	\$18,278,641	\$18,278,641 *
+	WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	BRT	\$117,634,531	\$55,628,995	47.3%	\$0	\$55,628,995	\$55,628,995 *
+	WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	BRT	\$169,997,716	\$75,202,455	44.2%	\$0	\$75,202,455	\$75,202,455 *
+	WI Madison, East-West BRT	BRT	\$160,000,000	\$80,000,000	50.0%	\$0	\$80,000,000	\$80,000,000 *
Total for Proposed Small Starts Projects			\$634,349,577	\$303,004,865		\$0	\$303,004,865	\$303,004,865
Other Projects That May Become Ready for CIG or EPD Funding During FY22							\$427,220,676	
CA	San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension	HR						
NJ-NY	Secaucus, Hudson Tunnels	CR						
NY	New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	HR						
WA	Seattle, RapidRide Roosevelt Project	BRT						

NOTES:

* CIG payout completed with receipt of proposed FY 2022 funding recommendation

+ Indicates first time included as a funding recommendation in the President's budget

BRT = Bus Rapid Transit, CR = Commuter Rail, HR = Heavy Rail, LRT = light rail transit, SC = Streetcar

The FY 2022 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

FTA is requesting in the President's Budget a total appropriation of \$2.473 billion in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants Program funds in FY 2022, with the proposed distribution as follows:

- \$1.560 billion for 17 existing FFGAs, including 13 New Starts and four Core Capacity projects;
- \$158.12 million for two New Starts projects not yet under construction grants;
- \$303.00 million for six Small Starts projects not yet under construction grants;
- \$427.22 million in funding for other projects that may become ready for Section 5309 CIG funding or Section 3005(b) EPD Pilot Program funding during FY 2022;
- \$24.73 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2022 funding level).

The funding proposed for the existing FFGAs includes the negotiated payment outlined in each FFGA or the amount needed to complete the CIG commitment if the project is in the last year of its payment schedule. Funding is also recommended for two New Starts and six Small Starts projects not yet under construction agreements. FTA also recommends an amount of funds that is not tied to specific projects at this time but would be available for projects currently in the CIG program or EPD Pilot Program that might successfully advance and become ready for funding in FY 2022. A list of projects that might fall into this category is provided for illustrative purposes. By providing projects in the pipeline the potential to advance to construction grant agreements when they are ready, rather than making them wait for the next federal budget cycle to be completed, an opportunity exists to advance the projects more quickly and thereby minimize cost escalation and possible financing costs.

Project Evaluation and Ratings

The CIG project evaluation and ratings included in this report are based on a process specified in statute. Section 5309 establishes various criteria on which proposed projects must be evaluated and specifies a five-point rating scale: *High*, *Medium-High*, *Medium*, *Medium-Low*, and *Low*. To advance in the CIG process toward a construction grant agreement, a project must be rated *Medium* or better overall. FTA awards CIG Program funding only once the project sponsor can assure FTA that the proposed project scope, cost estimate, and budget are firm and reliable, all non-CIG funding commitments are in place, and all critical third-party agreements are completed. If a project receives a construction grant agreement, FTA does not have to continue to evaluate and rate the project.

FTA does not require project sponsors to submit information annually for evaluation and rating for the *Annual Report*. Rather, FTA only requires sponsors to submit information for an updated evaluation and rating of the project for the *Annual Report* if: 1) the project sponsor wants the project to be considered as a candidate for funding; 2) significant issues have been raised in prior year evaluations that warrant a re-rating; or 3) there has been a significant change to the project since the last evaluation.

Projects can be expected to continue to change as they progress through the CIG process. Hence, the ratings included in this *Annual Report* should not be construed as statements about the ultimate success or failure of those projects. Rather, the ratings provide assessments of the projects' strengths and weaknesses at the point in time when they were rated.

Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C present the ratings for projects currently in the Project Development or Engineering phase of the CIG Program. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2022 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Project Justification Ratings.

Between publication of the FY 2021 *Annual Report* in February 2020, and publication of this report in May 2021, FTA awarded 12 construction grant agreements. In addition, FTA approved five projects into the New Starts Engineering phase and one project into the Core Capacity Engineering phase. Lastly, two projects entered the New Starts Project Development phase and nine projects entered the Small Starts Project Development phase. Each of these approvals are shown below:

New Starts Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since February 2020

- AZ Phoenix South Central Light Rail Extension/Downtown Hub
- CA Los Angeles Westside Purple Line Extension Section 3
- IN Gary Double Track - Northwest Indiana (NWI)
- IN Lake County West Lake Corridor
- MN Minneapolis Southwest LRT
- MO Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extension

Core Capacity Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since February 2020

- CA San Francisco Transbay Corridor
- NJ Hudson County Portal North Bridge Project

Small Starts Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since February 2020

- FL Miami-Dade County South Corridor Rapid Transit Project
- FL St. Petersburg Central Avenue BRT
- TX El Paso Montana Corridor BRT
- WI Milwaukee East-West BRT

New Starts Projects Approved into Engineering since February 2020

- AZ Phoenix Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension
- IN Gary Double Track - Northwest Indiana (NWI)
- MN St Paul METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit
- MO Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extension
- MN St. Paul Gold Line BRT

Core Capacity Projects Approved into Engineering since February 2020

- NJ Hudson County Portal North Bridge Project

New Starts Projects That Entered Project Development since February 2020

- IL Chicago Red Line Extension
- VA Fairfax County Richmond Highway BRT

Small Starts Projects That Entered Project Development since February 2020

- CA Monterey SURF! Highway 1 Busway and BRT
- MN Rochester Downtown Circulator BRT
- NC Raleigh Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor
- TN Memphis Innovation Corridor
- TX Austin South Lamar BRT
- TX Austin Expo Center BRT
- TX Austin Pleasant Valley BRT
- WI Madison East-West BRT
- UT Salt Lake County Midvalley Connector Project

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2022 Project Ratings

<u>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</u>								
Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
Core Capacity Engineering NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	\$336.8	\$36.2	\$372.9	\$100.0	26.8%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
<u>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</u>								
Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
New Starts Engineering AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II	\$376.8	\$24.6	\$401.3	\$158.1	39.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
# MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$522.8	\$9.1	\$531.9	\$239.3	45.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
New Starts Project Development ^ IL Chicago, Red Line Extension	\$2,507.0	---	\$2,507.0	---	---	---	---	---
* NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	\$10,404.7	\$2,037.6	\$12,442.3	\$5,509.7	44.3%	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
^ NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project	\$345.0	---	\$345.0	\$170.8	49.5%	---	---	---
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	\$5,731.0	\$659.3	\$6,390.3	\$2,000.0	31.3%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT	\$2,600 - \$2,800	---	\$2,600 - \$2,800	\$1,395.0	---	---	---	---
^ SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	\$387.5	---	\$387.5	---	---	---	---	---
^ VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	\$730.0	---	\$730.0	\$285.0	39.0%	---	---	---

In March 2021, the project sponsor began a process of public outreach on several revised alignments under consideration.

^ This project entered Project Development (PD) under the MAP-21 and FAST process. PD is the phase when a project sponsor completes the environmental review process, selects a locally preferred alternative, gets it adopted into the fiscally constrained long range plan, and develops the information necessary for the project to be evaluated and rated by FTA. Thus, the project cost, including financing charges, may not yet be known.

* In March 2021, the Gateway Development Commission (GDC) held its first meeting, officially selected its co-chair leadership, and is now in the process of building out its organization. The GDC is expected to transition into the project sponsor role to lead the project, which may affect project details that influence the rating.

--- This project has not been rated because it entered PD under the MAP-21 and FAST procedures, which do not require a rating to be assigned upon entry into PD.

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2022 Project Ratings

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS								
Phase	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
State, City, Project								
Small Starts Project Development								
^ AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	\$32.9	---	\$32.9	---	---	---	---	---
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	\$282.2	\$14.2	\$296.4	\$100.0	33.7%	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Highway 1 Busway and BRT	\$55.0	---	\$55.0	\$40.0	72.7%	---	---	---
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	\$117.0	---	\$117.0	\$50.0	42.7%	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT Project	\$261.5	\$1.2	\$262.7	\$86.8	33.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	\$175 - \$225	---	\$175 - \$225	---	---	---	---	---
& FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension and Modernization	\$234.5	---	\$234.5	\$99.9	42.6%	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	\$209.7	\$10.3	\$220.0	\$100.0	45.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	\$151.7	\$3.3	\$155.0	\$77.5	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	\$169.8	---	\$169.8	\$84.0	49.5%	---	---	---
MN Rochester, Rochester Rapid Transit	\$114.5	\$0.0	\$114.5	\$56.1	49.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit	\$141.3	\$0.0	\$141.3	\$100.0	70.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue Project	\$71.5	\$0.0	\$71.5	\$35.1	49.1%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - Western Corridor Project	\$180.0	---	\$180.0	---	---	---	---	---
NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	\$81.2	\$0.0	\$81.2	\$60.9	75.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$258.8	\$0.0	\$258.8	\$97.2	37.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
OR Portland, MAX Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvements	\$206.0	\$0.0	\$206.0	\$100.0	48.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	\$249.9	\$0.0	\$249.9	\$100.0	40.0%	High	Medium-High	High
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	\$87.0	\$1.6	\$88.6	\$43.8	49.4%	---	---	---
TX Austin, Expo Center Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$35.6	\$0.0	\$35.6	\$17.8	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
TX Austin, Pleasant Valley Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$36.6	\$0.0	\$36.6	\$18.3	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ TX Austin, South Lamar Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$26.0	---	\$26.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ TX Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	\$18.3 - \$19.4	---	\$18.3 - \$19.4	---	---	---	---	---
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	\$99.7	\$0.0	\$99.7	\$64.5	64.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector Project	\$85 - \$105	---	\$85 - \$105	---	---	---	---	---
^ VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	\$119 - \$140	---	\$119 - \$140	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	\$81.0	\$0.0	\$81.0	\$37.2	45.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	\$133.4	\$0.0	\$133.4	\$59.9	44.9%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	\$117.6	\$0.0	\$117.6	\$55.6	47.3%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	\$89.8	---	\$89.8	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	\$90.2	\$0.0	\$90.2	\$45.0	49.9%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	\$285.5	\$0.0	\$285.5	\$75.0	26.3%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	\$170.0	\$0.0	\$170.0	\$75.2	44.2%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Mill Plain BRT	\$49.9	\$0.0	\$49.9	\$24.9	49.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WI Madison, Madison East-West BRT	\$157.2	\$2.8	\$160.0	\$80.0	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High

^ This project entered Project Development (PD) under the MAP-21 and FAST process. PD is the phase when a project sponsor completes the environmental review process, selects a locally preferred alternative, gets it adopted into the fiscally constrained long range plan, and develops the information necessary for the project to be evaluated and rated by FTA. Thus, the project cost, including financing charges, may not yet be known.

+++ In September 2020, the project sponsor adopted a shortened project alignment but has not yet provided FTA with the information needed to update the rating.

& In February 2021, the Florida Supreme Court ruled a key funding source is unconstitutional.

--- This project has not been rated because it entered PD under the MAP-21 and FAST procedures, which do not require a rating to be assigned upon entry into PD.

Table 2A-EPD -- Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program Summary for FY 2022

<u>EXPEDITED PROJECT DELIVERY (EPD) PROJECTS</u>	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total EPD Funding Request (millions)	EPD Share of Capital Costs	Project Selection
<p>State, City, Project</p> <p>New Starts EPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension 	\$6,551.0	\$390.0	\$6,941.0	\$1,735.0	25.0%	Under Review

◆ This project is currently in the Project Development phase of the CIG Program, but is pursuing EPD Program funding. If selected for the EPD Program, this project will be withdrawn from the CIG Program.

Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
Phase State, City, Project					
Core Capacity Engineering NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	Medium	High	Medium-Low	26.8%	Medium-High

If the summary local financial commitment rating is rated at least Medium and the CIG Program share is less than 50 percent of the project’s capital cost, then the summary local financial commitment rating is raised one level.

NEW STARTS PROJECTS	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
Phase State, City, Project					
New Starts Engineering AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II # MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	Medium Under Review High	High Under Review High	Medium-Low Under Review Medium-Low	39.4% TBD 45.0%	Medium-High Under Review High
New Starts Project Development IL Chicago, Red Line Extension * NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2 OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	--- Under Review --- Medium --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- Medium --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- Medium-Low --- --- ---	--- 44.3% 49.5% 31.3% --- --- 39.0%	--- Under Review --- Medium-High --- --- ---

If the summary local financial commitment rating is rated at least Medium and the CIG Program share is less than 50 percent of the project’s capital cost, then the summary local financial commitment rating is raised one level.

In March 2021, the project sponsor began a process of public outreach on several revised alignments under consideration.

* In March 2021, the Gateway Development Commission (GDC) held its first meeting, officially selected its co-chair leadership, and is now in the process of building out its organization. The GDC is expected to take a sponsor role to lead the project, which may affect project details that influence the rating.

--- This project entered Project Development (PD) under the MAP-21 and FAST process, which does not require FTA to perform an evaluation and rating of projects entering PD.

Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
Phase State, City, Project					
Small Starts Project Development					
AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	---	---	---	---	---
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	Medium-High	Low	Low	33.7%	Medium-Low
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Highway 1 Busway and BRT	---	---	---	72.7%	---
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	42.7%	Under Review
CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	High
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---
& FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension and Modernization	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	42.6%	Under Review
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.5%	High
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	49.5%	---
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	70.7%	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.1%	High
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - Western Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---
MN Rochester, Rochester Rapid Transit	Medium-High	Low	Medium-High	49.0%	Medium-High
NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	75.0%	Medium
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	37.5%	High
OR Portland, MAX Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvements	N/A	N/A	N/A	48.5%	High
PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	40.0%	High
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---
TX Austin, Expo Center Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
TX Austin, Pleasant Valley Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
TX Austin, South Lamar Bus Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---
TX Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	64.7%	Medium
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector Project	---	---	---	---	---
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.9%	High
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	44.9%	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.3%	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	High
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	N/A	N/A	N/A	26.3%	High
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	44.2%	High
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Mill Plain BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	High
WI Madison, Madison East-West BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High

If the summary local financial commitment rating is rated at least Medium and the CIG Program share is less than 50 percent of the project's capital cost, then the summary local financial commitment rating is raised one level.

+++ In September 2020, the project sponsor adopted a shortened project alignment but has not yet provided FTA with the information needed to update the rating.

& In February 2021, the Florida Supreme Court ruled a key funding source is unconstitutional.

--- This project entered Project Development (PD) under the MAP-21 and FAST process, which does not require FTA to perform an evaluation and rating of projects entering PD.

"N/A" signifies that this subfactor does not apply because the project qualified for the financial rating "warrant" outlined in FTA's Final Interim Policy Guidance.

Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Project Justification Ratings

<u>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</u>	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Capacity Needs Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Phase State, City, Project							
Core Capacity Engineering NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High

<u>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</u>	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Phase State, City, Project							
New Starts Engineering AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II # MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-High Under Review Medium	Medium-Low Under Review Low	Medium Under Review Medium	Medium Under Review Medium-Low	Medium Under Review Medium	Medium-Low Under Review Medium-High	Medium Under Review Medium
New Starts Project Development IL Chicago, Red Line Extension * NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2 OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	--- Under Review --- Medium-Low --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- High --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- Medium --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- Medium-High --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- High --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- High --- --- ---	--- Under Review --- Medium-High --- --- ---

In March 2021, the project sponsor began a process of public outreach on several revised alignments under consideration.

* In March 2021, the Gateway Development Commission (GDC) held its first meeting, officially selected its co-chair leadership, and is now in the process of building out its organization. The GDC is expected to transition into the project sponsor role to lead the project, which may affect project details that influence the rating.

--- This project entered Project Development (PD) under the MAP-21 and FAST process, which does not require FTA to perform an evaluation and rating of projects entering PD.

Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2022 Project Justification Ratings

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Phase State, City, Project							
Small Starts Project Development							
AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	High	Medium
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Highway 1 Busway and BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT Project	Medium	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
& FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension and Modernization	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	Medium-High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MN Rochester, Rochester Rapid Transit	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue Project	Medium-High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - Western Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
■ NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
■ NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ OR Portland, MAX Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvements	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	Medium-High	Medium
■ PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Austin, Expo Center Bus Rapid Transit Project	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
TX Austin, Pleasant Valley Bus Rapid Transit Project	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
TX Austin, South Lamar Bus Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	Medium	Low	Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium-High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	High	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	Medium-High
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
■ WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Mill Plain BRT	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ WI Madison, Madison East-West BRT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

+++ In September 2020, the project sponsor adopted a shortened project alignment but has not yet provided FTA with the information needed to update the rating.

& In February 2021, the Florida Supreme Court ruled a key funding source is unconstitutional.

--- This project entered Project Development (PD) under the MAP-21 and FAST process, which does not require FTA to perform an evaluation and rating of projects entering PD.

■ Project qualifies for Project Justification warrants outlined in FTA's Final Interim Policy Guidance.