

# Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

## Fiscal Year 2023

### 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),  
Section 3005(b)(11) of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act,  
and Division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

**March 2022**

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 2023 Funding Allocations and Recommendations .....	6

## **Tables**

Table 1 FY 2023 Funding Proposed for Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program.....	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program Projects.....	9
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2023 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	12
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2023 Project Justification Ratings .....	14



## Introduction

This *Annual Report on Funding Recommendations* is issued by the United States Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) 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 (CIG) Program and Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) Pilot Program.

### *The Capital Investment Grants Program*

The CIG Program, set forth in 49 U.S.C. § 5309 (Section 5309), was most recently authorized by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, enacted as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). In addition to funding Congress may appropriate annually, the IIJA also provided \$1.6 billion per year in advance appropriations annually for the CIG Program from FY 2022 through 2026.

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 Section 5309 as amended by the IIJA, New Starts projects are those for which the sponsors request \$150 million or more in CIG Program funds or have an anticipated total capital cost of \$400 million or more. Core Capacity projects are substantial investments in existing fixed-guideway corridors that are at capacity today or will be in 10 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 \$150 million in CIG Program funds and have an anticipated total capital cost of less than \$400 million.

FTA awards Section 5309 CIG Program funding for a portion of the total project cost, including planning, 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 of the CIG process and be eligible for CIG funding. Ratings are point-in-time evaluations by FTA and may change as

proposed projects 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.

### ***The Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program***

Section 3005(b) of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act established the 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 and EPD Program, including the guidelines that the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) uses to make funding recommendations. Table 1 identifies the FY 2023 funding amount recommended for individual CIG and EPD projects, with information on each project's cost and funding history. Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C provide information on the CIG and EPD projects as well as 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.

More information on the EPD Pilot Program can be found on FTA's website at <https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/grant-programs/expedited-project-delivery-pilot-program-section-3005b>.

## **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 2023 Funding Recommendations for the Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program**

	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 CIG Request	Section 5309 CIG Share	CIG/EPD Funds Allocated through FY 2021	FY 2022			FY 2023		
						FY22 Advance Appropriation \$1.600 B	FY22 Consolidated Appropriations Act \$2.248 B	Total FY22	FY23 Advance Appropriation \$1.600 B	FY23 Budget Proposal \$2.850 B	Total FY23 Funding \$4.450 B
New Starts Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)						\$ 731,854,451	\$ 1,117,578,973	\$ 1,849,433,424	\$ 350,000,000	\$ 1,522,404,158	\$ 1,872,404,158
Proposed New Starts Projects For FFGAs						\$ 139,345,549	\$ 158,122,079	\$ 297,467,628	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 558,080,000	\$ 658,080,000
Funding for Other New Starts Projects That May Become Ready and for Project Development and Engineering Grants						\$ -	\$ 183,318,948	\$ 183,318,948	\$ 421,200,000	\$ -	\$ 421,200,000
<b>Total New Starts</b>						<b>\$ 871,200,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,459,020,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,330,220,000</b>	<b>\$ 871,200,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,080,484,158</b>	<b>\$ 2,951,684,158</b>
Core Capacity Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)						\$ 316,800,000	\$ 345,000,000	\$ 661,800,000	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 139,519,539	\$ 339,519,539
Funding for Other Core Capacity Projects That May Become Ready						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 116,800,000	\$ -	\$ 116,800,000
<b>Total Core Capacity</b>						<b>\$ 316,800,000</b>	<b>\$ 345,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 661,800,000</b>	<b>\$ 316,800,000</b>	<b>\$ 139,519,539</b>	<b>\$ 456,319,539</b>
Small Starts Projects Proposed for Construction Grants						\$ 95,163,308	\$ 321,500,000	\$ 416,663,308	\$ 106,165,996	\$ -	\$ 106,165,996
Funding for Other Small Starts Projects That May Become Ready and for Project Development and Engineering Grants						\$ 142,436,692	\$ -	\$ 142,436,692	\$ 131,434,004	\$ 151,496,303	\$ 282,930,307
<b>Total Small Starts</b>						<b>\$ 237,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 321,500,000</b>	<b>\$ 559,100,000</b>	<b>\$ 237,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 151,496,303</b>	<b>\$ 389,096,303</b>
Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program						\$ 158,400,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 258,400,000	\$ 158,400,000	\$ 450,000,000	\$ 608,400,000
FTA Oversight						\$ 16,000,000	\$ 22,480,000	\$ 38,480,000	\$ 16,000,000	\$ 28,500,000	\$ 44,500,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 1,600,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,248,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,848,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,600,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,850,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 4,450,000,000</b>
<b>Existing New Starts FFGAs</b>											
* AZ	Phoenix, South Central/Downtown Hub Light Rail	LRT	\$1,345,088,335	\$529,830,295	39.4%	\$ 297,710,967	\$ 132,119,328	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 232,119,328	\$ -	\$ -
# CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 1	HR	\$2,821,957,153	\$1,250,000,000	44.3%	\$ 762,710,967	\$ 74,272,734	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 174,272,734	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 263,016,299
	CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	HR	\$2,499,239,536	\$1,187,000,000	47.5%	\$ 597,710,967	\$ 74,272,734	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 174,272,734	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 200,000,000
	CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 3	HR	\$3,599,267,008	\$1,300,000,000	36.1%	\$ 397,710,967	\$ 74,272,734	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 174,272,734	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 200,000,000
# CA	San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	LRT	\$2,171,200,545	\$1,043,380,000	48.1%	\$ 627,735,707	\$ 74,272,734	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 174,272,734	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 191,371,559
* IN	Northern Indiana, Double Track	CR	\$491,121,424	\$172,964,251	35.2%	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 22,964,251	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 72,964,251	\$ -	\$ -
* IN	Northern Indiana, West Lake Corridor	CR	\$944,892,265	\$354,572,704	37.5%	\$ 197,710,967	\$ 56,861,737	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 156,861,737	\$ -	\$ -
* 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	\$ 74,272,734	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 174,272,734	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 200,000,000
* 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	\$ 74,272,734	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 174,272,734	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 268,016,299
WA	Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	LRT	\$3,260,357,587	\$1,172,730,000	36.0%	\$ 497,710,967	\$ 74,272,734	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 174,272,734	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 200,000,000
<b>Total for Existing New Starts FFGAs</b>						<b>\$ 5,892,024,740</b>	<b>\$ 731,854,451</b>	<b>\$ 1,117,578,973</b>	<b>\$ 1,849,433,424</b>	<b>\$ 350,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,522,404,158</b>
<b>Existing Core Capacity FFGAs</b>											
* CA	San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	CR	\$1,930,670,934	\$647,000,000	33.5%	\$ 572,956,593	\$ 29,043,407	\$ 45,000,000	\$ 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	\$ 43,300,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 143,300,000	\$ -	\$ -
# NJ	Seacaucus, Portal North Bridge	CR	\$1,732,168,451	\$766,500,000	44.3%	\$ 248,000,000	\$ 78,980,461	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 178,980,461	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 139,519,539
* IL	Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project Phase 1	HR	\$2,066,702,783	\$956,607,772	46.3%	\$ 691,131,640	\$ 165,476,132	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 265,476,132	\$ -	\$ -
Funding for Other Core Capacity Projects That May Become Ready						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 116,800,000	\$ -	\$ 116,800,000
<b>Total for Existing Core Capacity FFGAs</b>						<b>\$2,537,788,233</b>	<b>\$316,800,000</b>	<b>\$345,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 661,800,000</b>	<b>\$ 316,800,000</b>	<b>\$ 139,519,539</b>
<b>Proposed New Starts Projects</b>											
* 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	\$239,345,549	45.0%	\$ -	\$ 139,345,549	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 239,345,549	\$ -	\$ -
+ NJ-NY	Seacaucus, Hudson Tunnels ^	CR	\$12,685,490,487	\$5,582,613,600	44.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000,000	\$ -
+ NY	New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	HR	\$6,948,742,838	\$3,404,883,991	49.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,000,000	\$ 400,000,000
#+ TX	San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit North-South Corridor	BRT	\$320,000,000	\$158,080,000	49.4%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 158,080,000	\$ 158,080,000
Funding for Other New Starts Projects That May Become Ready and for Project Development and Engineering Grants						\$ -	\$ 183,318,948	\$ 183,318,948	\$ 421,200,000	\$ -	\$ 421,200,000
<b>Total for Proposed New Starts Projects</b>						<b>\$100,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 139,345,549</b>	<b>\$ 341,441,027</b>	<b>\$ 480,786,576</b>	<b>\$ 521,200,000</b>	<b>\$ 558,080,000</b>



**Table 1 - FY 2023 Funding Recommendations for the Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program**

	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 CIG Request	Section 5309 CIG Share	CIG/EPD Funds Allocated through FY 2021	FY 2022			FY 2023			
						FY22 Advance Appropriation \$1.600 B	FY22 Consolidated Appropriations Act \$2.248 B	Total FY22	FY23 Advance Appropriation \$1.600 B	FY23 Budget Proposal \$2.850 B	Total FY23 Funding \$4.450 B	
<b>Proposed Small Starts Projects</b>												
* MN	Rochester, Rapid Transit	\$114,541,900	\$56,085,700	49.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 56,085,700	\$ 56,085,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
* TX	Austin, Expo Center Bus Rapid Transit	\$48,516,357	\$30,855,528	63.6%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,855,528	\$ 30,855,528	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
* TX	Austin, Pleasant Valley Bus Rapid Transit	\$52,723,726	\$34,748,728	65.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,748,728	\$ 34,748,728	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
* WA	Seattle, RapidRide I Line	\$141,058,980	\$66,720,897	47.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,720,897	\$ 66,720,897	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
* WA	Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	\$169,997,716	\$75,202,455	44.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75,202,455	\$ 75,202,455	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
* WI	Madison, East-West BRT	\$186,000,000	\$103,000,000	55.4%	\$ -	\$ 45,113,308	\$ 57,886,692	\$ 103,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
* PA	Pittsburgh Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End BRT	\$290,795,000	\$150,000,000	51.6%	\$ 99,950,000	\$ 50,050,000	\$ -	\$ 50,050,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
#+	TN Memphis Innovation Corridor BRT	\$73,341,523	\$46,037,482	62.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46,037,482	\$ -	\$ 46,037,482	
#+	WA Seattle RapidRide J Line	\$120,546,340	\$60,128,514	49.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,128,514	\$ -	\$ 60,128,514	
Funding for Other Small Starts Projects That May Become Ready and for Project Development Grants					\$ -	\$ 142,436,692	\$ -	\$ 142,436,692	\$ 131,434,004	\$ 151,496,303	\$ 282,930,307	
<b>Total for Proposed Small Starts Projects</b>					\$ 99,950,000	\$ 237,600,000	\$ 321,500,000	\$ 559,100,000	\$ 237,600,000	\$ 151,496,303	\$ 389,096,303	
<b>Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program</b>												
+ CA	BART Silicon Valley Phase II Project	\$ 9,148,000,000	\$ 2,287,000,000	25.0%	\$ 225,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 200,000,000	
+ CA	Los Angeles East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Phase 1	\$ 2,811,929,373	\$ 702,000,000	25.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000,000	\$ 250,000,000	
Funding for Other EPD Projects That May Become Ready					\$ -	\$ 158,400,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 258,400,000	\$ 158,400,000	\$ -	\$ 158,400,000	
<b>Total for EPD Pilot Program</b>					\$ -	\$ 158,400,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 258,400,000	\$ 158,400,000	\$ 450,000,000	\$ 608,400,000	

\* This project would have its CIG funding completed with FY 2022 funding.

# This project would have its CIG funding completed with the proposed FY 2023 funding.

+ This project is recommended for funding in the President's Budget for the first time

^ The Phoenix NW project was a proposed FFGA in the FY 2022 President's Budget, but has now been awarded an FFGA. It is shown in the proposed FFGA category to better show FY 2022 allocations.

^ These funds will not be allocated to the Hudson Tunnel project until the project sponsor meets statutory requirements for receipt of Federal funds.

## The FY 2023 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

FTA is requesting in the President's FY 2023 Budget an appropriation of \$2.85 billion in funds for the Section 5309 CIG and EPD Programs, with the proposed distribution as follows:

- \$1.5224 billion for seven existing New Starts FFGAs;
- \$558.1 million for two New Starts projects not yet under construction grants;
- \$139.5 million for one existing Core Capacity FFGA;
- \$151.5 million for other Small Starts projects;
- \$450.0 million for two projects not yet under construction grants under the Section 3005(b) EPD Pilot Program; and
- \$28.5 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2023 funding level).

This report also documents how FTA is proposing to allocate the \$1.6 billion in FY2023 advance appropriations pursuant to Division J of the IIJA<sup>1</sup>. The proposed distribution is as follows:

- \$871.2 million for New Starts (55 percent of the total per direction in IIJA) including:
  - \$350.0 million for seven existing FFGAs;
  - \$100.0 million for one project not yet under a construction grant; and
  - \$421.2 million for other projects that may become ready for construction funding during FY 2023 and/or for planning and design grants for projects in Project Development and Engineering as allowed by 5309(b)(1).
- \$316.8 million Core Capacity projects (20 percent of the total per direction in IIJA) including:
  - \$200.0 million for one existing FFGA; and
  - \$116.8 million for other projects that may become ready for construction funding during FY 2023.
- \$237.6 million for Small Starts (15 percent of the total per direction in IIJA) including:
  - \$106.2 million for two projects not yet under construction grants; and
  - \$131.4 million for other projects that may become ready for construction funding during FY 2023 and/or for planning and design grants for projects in Project Development as allowed by 5309(b)(1).
- \$158.4 million for Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program (10 percent of the total per direction in IIJA) for projects that may become ready during FY 2023.
- \$16.0 million for FTA oversight of these projects (one percent per direction in IIJA).

With the amount of CIG funding being requested in FY 2023, combined with the amount appropriated in advance in the IIJA, FTA is proposing funding the existing New Starts and Core Capacity FFGAs at levels greater than the annual negotiated payment outlined in each FFGA as accelerated payments. FTA believes accelerating FFGA payments would not only potentially lower financing costs incurred on these projects, but also allow FTA to better manage the overall program in the future given the increasing number of projects and demand for funds.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Division J of the IIJA, the potential projects that may receive either FY 2022 or FY 2023 advanced appropriations funding are those that have entered the CIG or EPD programs. As new projects enter the CIG or EPD programs, the Department updates the relevant congressional committees.

FTA intends to allocate some of the \$1.6 billion in advanced FY 2023 appropriations to New Starts and Small Starts projects that are not yet currently ready for a funding recommendation but might successfully advance and become ready for construction funding in FY 2023, and for planning and design grants to projects in the Project Development and Engineering phases as allowed by Section 5309(b)(1). In addition, a portion of the \$1.6 billion in advanced FY 2023 appropriations is to be made available for Core Capacity projects and for EPD Pilot Program projects that are not yet currently ready for a funding recommendation but might successfully advance and become ready for construction funding in FY 2023. 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 construction grant agreements 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. Once a project receives a construction grant agreement, FTA does not have to continue to evaluate and rate the project.

FTA does not require CIG project sponsors to submit information annually for evaluation and rating for the *Annual Report*. Rather, FTA only requires CIG project 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 information on CIG and EPD projects, including the ratings for projects currently in the Project Development or Engineering phase of the CIG Program. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2023 CIG and EPD Projects; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2023 Local Financial Commitment Ratings for CIG projects; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY 2023 Project Justification Ratings for CIG projects.

Between publication of the FY 2022 *Annual Report* in May 2021, and publication of this report in March 2022, FTA awarded eight construction grant agreements. In addition, FTA approved one project into the New Starts Engineering phase. Lastly, ten projects entered the New Starts

Project Development phase, one project entered the Core Capacity Project Development phase, and eight projects entered the Small Starts Project Development phase. Each of these approvals are shown below:

New Starts Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since May 2021

- AZ Phoenix Northwest Extension Phase II

Small Starts Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since May 2021

- IN Indianapolis IndyGo Purple Line BRT
- NY Albany Washington Western BRT
- OR Portland Max Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvements
- UT Ogden-Weber State BRT
- WA Everett Swift Orange Line BRT
- WA Seattle Madison Street BRT
- WA Vancouver Mill Plain BRT

New Starts Projects Approved into Engineering since May 2021

- NY New York Second Avenue Subway Phase 2

New Starts Projects That Entered Project Development since May 2021

- CA Inglewood Transit Connector
- CA Los Angeles West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor
- CA San Francisco Transbay Downtown Rail Extension
- FL Miami Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit
- MN Twin Cities Metro Purple Line BRT
- PA King of Prussia King of Prussia Rail Extension
- TX Austin Blue Line Light Rail Transit
- TX Austin Orange Line Light Rail Transit
- TX Houston University Corridor BRT
- TX San Antonio ART North/South Corridor

Core Capacity Projects That Entered Project Development since May 2021

- VA Northern Virginia Core Capacity Project

Small Starts Projects That Entered Project Development since May 2021

- CO Denver Colfax Avenue BRT
- CO Fort Collins West Elizabeth Corridor
- FL Miami East-West Rapid Transit Phase I
- GA Atlanta Clayton Southlake BRT
- NC Raleigh Wake BRT – Southern Corridor
- OH Cleveland MetroHealth Line BRT
- OH Columbus East Main Street BRT
- OH Columbus West Broad Street BRT

**Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2023 Project Ratings**

<b>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</b>								
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<b>Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Financing Costs (millions)</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Total CIG Funding Request (millions)</b>	<b>CIG Share of Capital Costs</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Rating</b>	<b>Project Justification Rating</b>	<b>Overall Project Rating</b>
<b>Core Capacity Engineering</b> 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
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b> ^ VA Northern Virginia, Northern Virginia Core Capacity Project	\$2,415.0	---	\$2,415.0	---	---	---	---	---

^ Project Development 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.  
 --- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

<b>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</b>								
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<b>Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Financing Costs (millions)</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Total CIG Funding Request (millions)</b>	<b>CIG Share of Capital Costs</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Rating</b>	<b>Project Justification Rating</b>	<b>Overall Project Rating</b>
<b>New Starts Engineering</b> # 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
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	\$6,289.4	\$659.3	\$6,948.7	\$3,404.9	49.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> ^ CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector	\$1,150.0	---	\$1,150.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA Los Angeles, West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project	\$4,900 - \$5,100	---	\$4,900 - \$5,100	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension Project	\$4,400 - \$5,000	---	\$4,400 - \$5,000	---	---	---	---	---
^ FL Miami, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit	\$414.0	---	\$414.0	\$207.0	50.0%	---	---	---
^ IL Chicago, Red Line Extension	\$2,507.0	---	\$2,507.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT	\$445.0	---	\$445.0	\$218.0	49.0%	---	---	---
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	\$11,045.9	\$1,639.6	\$12,685.5	\$5,582.6	44.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT	\$2,600 - \$2,800	---	\$2,600 - \$2,800	\$1,300 - \$1,400	---	---	---	---
^ PA King of Prussia, King of Prussia Rail Project	\$2,082.0	---	\$2,082.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	\$387.5	---	\$387.5	---	---	---	---	---
^ TX Austin, Blue Line Light Rail Transit Project	\$2,000.0	---	\$2,000.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ TX Austin, Initial Investment of the Orange Line Light Rail Transit	\$3,800.0	---	\$3,800.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ TX Houston, University Corridor BRT	\$1,560.0	---	\$1,560.0	\$936.0	60.0%	---	---	---
TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) North-South Corridor	\$320.0	\$0.0	\$320.0	\$158.1	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
^ 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.  
 ^ Project Development 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.  
 --- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2023 Project Ratings

<b>SMALL STARTS PROJECTS</b>								
<b>Phase</b>	<b>Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Financing Costs (millions)</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Total CIG Funding Request (millions)</b>	<b>CIG Share of Capital Costs</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Rating</b>	<b>Project Justification Rating</b>	<b>Overall Project Rating</b>
State, City, Project								
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>								
^ 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
^ CO Denver, Colfax Avenue BRT	\$200 - \$300	---	\$200 - \$300	---	---	---	---	---
^ CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth Corridor	\$74.3	---	\$74.3	---	---	---	---	---
^ FL Miami, East-West Corridor Rapid Transit Phase 1 Project	\$281.0	---	\$281.0	\$92.7	33.0%	---	---	---
^ 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
^ GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	\$338.1	---	\$338.1	\$150.0	44.4%	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	\$209.7	\$10.3	\$220.0	\$100.0	45.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
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: Southern Corridor Project	\$93 - \$126	---	\$93 - \$126	---	---	---	---	---
^ NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor Project	\$180.0	---	\$180.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project	\$287.0	---	\$287.0	\$100.0	34.8%	---	---	---
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$258.8	\$0.0	\$258.8	\$97.2	37.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	\$50.0	---	\$50.0	\$20.0	40.0%	---	---	---
^ OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	\$220 - \$230	---	\$220 - \$230	---	---	---	---	---
^ OH Columbus, West Broad Street BRT	\$180 - \$190	---	\$180 - \$190	---	---	---	---	---
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	\$71.7	\$1.7	\$73.3	\$46.0	62.8%	Medium	Medium	Medium
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 Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	\$18.3 - \$19.4	---	\$18.3 - \$19.4	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector Project	\$105.5	\$0.0	\$105.5	\$50.9	48.2%	High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low
^ 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, RapidRide I Line	\$141.1	\$0.0	\$141.1	\$66.7	47.3%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WA Seattle, RapidRide J Line	\$120.5	\$0.0	\$120.5	\$60.1	49.9%	High	Medium-High	High
^ WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	\$89.8	---	\$89.8	---	---	---	---	---
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
WI Madison, Madison East-West BRT	\$157.2	\$2.8	\$160.0	\$80.0	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High

^ Project Development 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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

**Table 2A-EPD -- Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program Summary for FY 2023**

<b><u>EXPEDITED PROJECT DELIVERY (EPD) PROJECTS</u></b>	<b>Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Financing Costs (millions)</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Total EPD Funding Request (millions)</b>	<b>EPD Share of Capital Costs</b>	<b>Project Selection</b>
State, City, Project						
<b>New Starts EPD</b>						
CA Los Angeles, East San Fernando Valley (ESFV) Transit Corridor Phase 1 Project	\$2,752.0	\$60.0	\$2,812.0	\$702.0	25.0%	Under Review
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension	\$8,758.0	\$390.0	\$9,148.0	\$2,287.0	25.0%	Letter of Intent

**Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2023 Local Financial Commitment Ratings**

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

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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

<b>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Factors</b>				<b>Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating</b>
	<b>Current Financial Condition Rating</b>	<b>Commitment of Funds Rating</b>	<b>Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating</b>	<b>CIG Share of Capital Costs</b>	
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project					
<b>New Starts Engineering</b> # MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	Under Review High Medium	Under Review High Medium	Under Review Medium-Low Medium-Low	TBD 45.0% 49.0%	<b>Under Review</b> <b>High</b> <b>Medium-High</b>
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector CA Los Angeles, West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension Project FL Miami, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit IL Chicago, Red Line Extension MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT PA King of Prussia, King of Prussia Rail Project SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit TX Austin, Blue Line Light Rail Transit Project TX Austin, Initial Investment of the Orange Line Light Rail Transit TX Houston, University Corridor BRT TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) North-South Corridor VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	--- --- --- --- --- --- Medium --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- Medium --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- High ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium-Low --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium-Low ---	--- --- --- 50.0% --- 49.0% 44.0% --- --- --- --- --- 60.0% 49.4% 39.0%	--- --- --- --- --- --- <b>Medium-High</b> --- --- --- --- --- --- <b>Medium-High</b> ---

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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.



Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2023 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

<b>SMALL STARTS PROJECTS</b>	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	
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project					
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>					
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
CO Denver, Colfax Avenue BRT	---	---	---	---	---
CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
FL Miami, East-West Corridor Rapid Transit Phase 1 Project	---	---	---	33.0%	---
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
GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	---	---	---	44.4%	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.5%	High
MN Rochester, Rochester Rapid Transit	Medium-High	Low	Medium-High	49.0%	Medium-High
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: Southern Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project	---	---	---	34.8%	---
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	37.5%	High
OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	---	---	---	40.0%	---
OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, West Broad Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	62.8%	Medium
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 Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	48.2%	High
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.9%	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.3%	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide J Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---
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
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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

"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 2023 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
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project							
<b>Core Capacity Engineering</b> NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium-High	<b>Medium-High</b>
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b> VA Northern Virginia, Northern Virginia Core Capacity Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

<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
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project							
<b>New Starts Engineering</b> # MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	Under Review Medium Medium-Low	Under Review Low High	Under Review Medium Medium	Under Review Medium-Low Medium-High	Under Review Medium High	Under Review Medium-High High	<b>Under Review</b> <b>Medium</b> <b>Medium-High</b>
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector CA Los Angeles, West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension Project FL Miami, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit IL Chicago, Red Line Extension MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT PA King of Prussia, King of Prussia Rail Project SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit TX Austin, Blue Line Light Rail Transit Project TX Austin, Initial Investment of the Orange Line Light Rail Transit TX Houston, University Corridor BRT TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) North-South Corridor VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	--- --- --- --- --- --- Medium --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium-High ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- High --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium-Low ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- Low --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium-Low ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- High --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- High ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- Medium-High --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium-Low ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- High --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- Medium ---	

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

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2023 Project Justification Ratings

<b>SMALL STARTS PROJECTS</b>	<b>Environmental Benefits Rating</b>	<b>Mobility Improvements Rating</b>	<b>Congestion Relief Rating</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness Rating</b>	<b>Economic Development Rating</b>	<b>Land Use Rating</b>	<b>Project Justification Summary Rating</b>
Phase State, City, Project							
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>							
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
CO Denver, Colfax Avenue BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Miami, East-West Corridor Rapid Transit Phase 1 Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
& FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension and Modernization	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
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: Southern Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
■ NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, West Broad Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
■ 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	Medium	Medium-Low	Low	High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
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 Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector Project	High	Low	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	Medium	Low	Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
WA Seattle, RapidRide J Line	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium-High	High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
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
■ 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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

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