

# Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

## Fiscal Year 2024

### 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 2023**

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 2024 Funding Allocations and Recommendations .....	6

## **Tables**

Table 1 FY 2024 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 2024 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	12
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2024 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 (LRT), streetcars, bus rapid transit (BRT), 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 2024 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 2024 Funding Recommendations for the Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program and the Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) Pilot Program**

FTA is requesting in the President's FY 2024 Budget an appropriation of \$2.85 billion in funds for the Section 5309 CIG and EPD Programs, that when combined with the \$1.6 billion in advanced appropriation, totals \$4.45 billion.

Project Name	State	Total Project Cost	CIG/EPD Amount Agreed Upon in FFGA and Engineering Approval	CIG/EPD Request +	CIG/EPD Share	Total CIG/EPD Funding Appropriated/Allocated From FY 2023 and Prior Years	Remaining CIG/EPD Funds Needed After FY 2023	FY 2024 President's Budget Proposal \$4.45 B
<b>Existing New Starts FFGAs</b>								
* Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	CA	\$ 2,499,239,536	\$ 1,187,000,000		47.5%	\$ 1,021,983,701	\$ 165,016,299	\$ 165,016,299
#* Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 3	CA	\$ 3,599,267,008	\$ 1,300,000,000		36.1%	\$ 821,983,701	\$ 478,016,299	\$ 478,016,299
#* Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	MN	\$ 2,003,152,549	\$ 928,840,370		46.4%	\$ 636,983,701	\$ 291,856,669	\$ 291,856,669
#* Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	WA	\$ 3,260,357,587	\$ 1,172,730,000		36.0%	\$ 921,983,701	\$ 250,746,299	\$ 250,746,299
<b>Total for Existing New Starts FFGAs</b>						<b>\$ 3,402,934,804</b>	<b>\$ 1,185,635,566</b>	<b>\$ 1,185,635,566</b>
<b>Proposed New Starts Projects</b>								
^ Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	SC	\$ 625,100,843	\$ 375,060,506		60.0%	\$ -	\$ 375,060,506	\$ 100,000,000
^ Chicago, Red Line Extension	IL	\$ 3,730,347,425		\$ 2,238,208,455	60.0%	\$ -	\$ 2,238,208,455	\$ 350,000,000
^ Houston, University Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project	TX	\$ 1,565,647,772		\$ 939,388,663	60.0%	\$ -	\$ 939,388,663	\$ 150,000,000
New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	NY	\$ 7,699,030,840	\$ 3,404,883,991		44.2%	\$ 450,000,000	\$ 2,954,883,991	\$ 496,784,764
San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II	CA	\$ 9,317,609,695		\$ 4,602,898,999	49.4%	\$ -	\$ 4,602,898,999	\$ 500,000,000
& Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	NJ-NY	\$ 14,652,648,168		\$ 6,652,903,085	45.4%	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 6,552,903,085	\$ 700,000,000
Funding for Other New Starts Projects That May Become Ready and for Planning and Design grants as allowed by 5309(b)(1);						\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000,000
<b>Total for Proposed New Starts Projects</b>						<b>\$ 550,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 17,663,343,699</b>	<b>\$ 2,396,784,764</b>
<b>Proposed Core Capacity Projects</b>								
^ Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	UT	\$ 966,165,802		\$ 671,090,673	69.5%	\$ 177,280,461	\$ 493,810,212	\$ 316,800,000
<b>Total for Proposed Core Capacity Projects</b>						<b>\$ 177,280,461</b>	<b>\$ 493,810,212</b>	<b>\$ 316,800,000</b>
<b>Proposed Small Starts Projects</b>								
*^ Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	CO	\$ 255,308,919	Not Applicable	\$ 126,888,532	49.7%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 118,753,932	\$ 118,753,932
*^ Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	MN	\$ 97,999,501	Not Applicable	\$ 53,400,000	54.5%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 45,265,400	\$ 45,265,400
*^ Monterey SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	CA	\$ 66,039,420	Not Applicable	\$ 22,170,621	33.6%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 14,036,021	\$ 14,036,021
*^ Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor	NC	\$ 173,916,583	Not Applicable	\$ 85,914,792	49.4%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 77,780,192	\$ 77,780,192
* Rochester, Link Rapid Transit Project	MN	\$ 143,373,368	Not Applicable	\$ 84,917,168	59.2%	\$ 56,085,700	\$ 28,831,468	\$ 28,831,468
*^ Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	UT	\$ 103,417,257	Not Applicable	\$ 62,797,257	60.7%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 54,662,657	\$ 54,662,657
<b>Total for Proposed Small Starts Projects</b>						<b>\$ 96,758,700</b>	<b>\$ 339,329,670</b>	<b>\$ 339,329,670</b>
<b>Proposed Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program</b>								
* Los Angeles East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Phase 1	CA	\$ 3,635,449,261		\$ 908,750,000	25.0%	\$ 741,800,000	\$ 166,950,000	\$ 166,950,000
<b>Total for EPD Pilot Program</b>						<b>\$ 741,800,000</b>	<b>\$ 166,950,000</b>	<b>\$ 166,950,000</b>
<b>FTA Oversight (1%)</b>								<b>\$ 44,500,000</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>								<b>\$ 4,450,000,000</b>

The cost and CIG request shown on this table may differ from what is reflected in Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C of this report. This is because those tables reflect only information for which FTA has received a formal submittal and completed its review. This table, by contrast, is based on the latest information submitted to FTA with a request from the project sponsor to advance to the next stage of the CIG process. FTA's review of the updated information may not yet be complete.

+ The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amounts shown here reflect the project sponsors latest information, but may change.

\* CIG/EPD Funding for the project would be completed with the FY24 request.

# The FY2023 Consolidated Appropriations Act provided \$425 M for existing New Starts and Core Capacity FFGAs to supplement their CIG funding. The law directed that this funding is not to count toward the CIG funding specified in the FFGA. Allocations of this special funding are not included in the column on this table showing total funding appropriated/allocated in FY23 and prior years.

^ FY24 proposal would be the first time the project has been recommended for funding in the President's budget

& The Hudson Tunnels project is a joint intercity rail and public transportation project. The latest overall project cost submitted to FTA is \$16.1 billion, but the public transportation component of that is \$14.7 billion. Per 49 U.S.C § 5309(q) CIG funding may only be used on the public transportation component of the project.





## The FY 2024 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

FTA is requesting in the President’s FY 2024 Budget an appropriation of \$2.85 billion in funds for the Section 5309 CIG and EPD Programs, that when combined with the \$1.6 billion in advanced appropriations totals \$4.45 billion<sup>1</sup>. The proposed distribution of this funding is as follows:

- \$1.1856 billion for four existing New Starts FFGAs;
- \$2.2968 billion for six New Starts projects not yet under construction grants;
- \$100 million for other New Starts projects that may become ready for construction funding during FY2024 and/or planning and design grants as allowed for by 5309(b)(1);
- \$316.8 million for one Core Capacity project not yet under a construction grant;
- \$339.3 million for six Small Starts projects not yet under construction grants;
- \$167.0 million for one project not yet under a construction grant under the Section 3005(b) EPD Pilot Program; and
- \$44.5 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2024 funding level).

With the amount of CIG funding being requested in FY 2024, FTA is proposing funding the existing New Starts 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.

FTA is proposing \$100.0 million for New Starts projects that are not yet currently ready for a funding recommendation but might successfully advance and become ready for construction funding in FY 2024, and for planning and design grants to projects in the Project Development and Engineering phases as allowed by Section 5309(b)(1). 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Division J of the IJJA, the potential projects that may receive FY 2024 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.

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 2024 CIG and EPD Projects; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2024 Local Financial Commitment Ratings for CIG projects; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY 2024 Project Justification Ratings for CIG projects.

The latest information FTA has on CIG projects in the Project Development and Engineering phases can be found on the FTA public website at <https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/grant-programs/capital-investments/capital-investment-grant-cig-dashboard>. In some cases, the cost and CIG request for each project listed in Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C may not match the data contained on the public dashboard. This is because the information contained in these tables is based on FTA's completed review of formal submittals from project sponsors. As projects progress through planning and design, project costs can and often do change before project sponsors formally submit updated information to FTA and such information is included on the public dashboard.

Between publication of the FY 2023 *Annual Report* in March 2022, and publication of this report in March 2023, FTA awarded one construction grant agreement. At the time of publication of this *Annual Report*, there are an additional five grant awards pending. In addition, FTA approved one project into the New Starts Engineering phase. Lastly, three projects entered the New Starts Project Development phase, two projects entered the Core Capacity Project Development phase, and six projects entered the Small Starts Project Development phase. Each of these approvals are shown below:

New Starts Project Construction Grant Agreement pending as of March 2023

- MN St. Paul Gold Line BRT

Small Starts Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since March 2022

- NC Raleigh Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue Project

Small Starts Project Construction Grant Agreement pending as of March 2023

- CA San Bernardino West Valley Connector BRT
- PA Pittsburgh Downtown-Uptown-Oakland BRT
- TX Austin Expo Center BRT
- TX Austin Pleasant Valley BRT

New Starts Projects Approved into Engineering since March 2022

- SC Charleston Lowcountry Rapid Transit Project

New Starts Projects That Entered Project Development since March 2022

- CA Livermore Valley Link Rail Project Phase 1
- WA Seattle West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: SODO to Ballard
- WA Seattle West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: West Seattle to SODO

Core Capacity Projects That Entered Project Development since March 2022

- MA Boston Green Line Transformation Program
- UT Salt Lake FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project

Small Starts Projects That Entered Project Development since March 2022

- FL Broward County Broward Commuter Rail South
- GA Atlanta Campbellton Community Investment Corridor BRT
- MD Montgomery County Veirs Mill Road BRT
- MN Minneapolis METRO F Line BRT
- TX San Antonio Advanced Rapid Transit East/West Corridor Project
- WI Milwaukee North-South BRT

**Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grants Program Summary of FY 2024 Project Ratings**

The latest information FTA has on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard. This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

<b>CORE CAPACITY 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>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>								
^ MA Boston, Green Line Transformation Program	\$2,100.0	---	\$2,100.0	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	\$966.2	---	\$966.2	\$671.1	69.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ VA Northern Virginia, Northern Virginia Core Capacity Project	\$2,415.0	---	\$2,415.0	---	---	---	---	---

\* The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amount shown here may change.

^ 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>	<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>New Starts Engineering</b>								
# MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
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
SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	\$593.5	\$31.6	\$625.1	\$375.1	60.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
<b>New Starts Project Development *</b>								
^ CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector	\$1,150.0	---	\$1,150.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA Livermore, Valley Link Rail Project Phase 1	\$1,800.0	---	\$1,800.0	\$450.0	25.0%	---	---	---
^ 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	\$4,400 - \$5,000	---	\$4,400 - \$5,000	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension	\$8,752.7	\$565.0	\$9,317.6	\$4,602.9	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
^ FL Miami, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit Project	\$414.0	---	\$414.0	\$207.0	50.0%	---	---	---
IL Chicago, Red Line Extension	\$3,574.4	\$155.9	\$3,730.3	\$2,238.2	60.0%	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ 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
^ PA King of Prussia, King of Prussia Rail Project	\$2,082.0	---	\$2,082.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ 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 Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$1,559.6	\$6.0	\$1,565.6	\$939.4	60.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) North-South Corridor	\$320.0	---	\$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%	---	---	---
^ WA Seattle, West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: SODO to Ballard	\$9,000.0	---	\$9,000.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ WA Seattle, West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: West Seattle to SODO	\$3,200.0	---	\$3,200.0	---	---	---	---	---

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

\* The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amount shown here may change.

^ 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 Grants Program Summary of FY 2024 Project Ratings**

The latest information FTA has on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard. This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

<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! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$66.0	---	\$66.0	\$22.2	33.6%	High	Medium	Medium-High
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	\$117.0	---	\$117.0	\$50.0	42.7%	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
CO Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	\$255.3	---	\$255.3	\$126.9	49.7%	High	Medium-High	High
^ CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth Corridor	\$74.3	---	\$74.3	---	---	---	---	---
^ FL Broward County, Broward Commuter Rail South	\$297.0	---	\$297.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ 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, Campbellton CIC BRT	\$274.7	---	\$274.7	---	---	---	---	---
^ GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	\$338.1	---	\$338.1	\$150.0	44.4%	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$209.7	\$10.3	\$220.0	\$100.0	45.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ MD Montgomery County, Veirs Mill Road Flash BRT	\$102.0	---	\$102.0	---	---	---	---	---
MN Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$98.0	---	\$98.0	\$53.4	54.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
MN Rochester, Link Rapid Transit	\$143.4	---	\$143.4	\$84.9	59.2%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	\$141.3	---	\$141.3	\$100.0	70.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor Project	\$173.9	---	\$173.9	\$85.9	49.4%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor	\$180.0	---	\$180.0	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$305.0	---	\$305.0	\$150.0	49.2%	High	Medium	Medium-High
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$258.8	---	\$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	---	---	---	---	---
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	\$71.7	\$1.7	\$73.3	\$46.0	62.8%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) East-West Corridor	\$293.0	---	\$293.0	\$144.7	49.4%	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	\$103.4	---	\$103.4	\$62.8	60.7%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
^ VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	\$119 - \$140	---	\$119 - \$140	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	\$141.1	---	\$141.1	\$66.7	47.3%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WA Seattle, RapidRide J Line	\$120.5	---	\$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	---	\$285.5	\$75.0	26.3%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	\$170.0	---	\$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
^ WI Milwaukee, North-South BRT	\$148.2	---	\$148.2	---	---	---	---	---

^ 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.

+++ 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.

**Table 2A-EPD -- Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program Summary for FY 2024**

<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	\$3,575.5	\$60.0	\$3,635.4	\$908.8	25.0%	Letter of Intent

**Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2024 Local Financial Commitment Ratings**

The latest information FTA has on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard.

This is because the information below is based on FTA’s completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

<b>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Factors</b>				<b>Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating</b>
	<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<b>Current Financial Condition Rating</b>	<b>Commitment of Funds Rating</b>	<b>Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating</b>	
<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> MA Boston, Green Line Transformation Program	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	69.5%	<b>Medium</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 CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amount shown here may change.

--- 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>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<b>Current Financial Condition Rating</b>	<b>Commitment of Funds Rating</b>	<b>Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating</b>	
<b>New Starts Engineering</b> # MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	TBD	<b>Under Review</b>
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	49.0%	<b>Medium-High</b>
SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	High	High	Medium-Low	60.0%	<b>Medium-High</b>
<b>New Starts Project Development *</b> CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector	---	---	---	---	---
CA Livermore, Valley Link Rail Project Phase 1	---	---	---	25.0%	---
CA Los Angeles, West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension	Medium-High	Medium-High	Low	49.4%	<b>Medium-High</b>
FL Miami, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	50.0%	---
IL Chicago, Red Line Extension	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	60.0%	<b>Medium</b>
MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT	---	---	---	49.0%	---
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	44.0%	<b>Medium-High</b>
PA King of Prussia, King of Prussia Rail Project	---	---	---	---	---
TX Austin, Blue Line Light Rail Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---
TX Austin, Initial Investment of the Orange Line Light Rail Transit	---	---	---	---	---
TX Houston, University Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	60.0%	<b>Medium</b>
TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) North-South Corridor	Medium	High	Medium-Low	49.4%	<b>Medium-High</b>
VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	---	---	---	39.0%	---
WA Seattle, West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: SODO to Ballard	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: West Seattle to SODO	---	---	---	---	---

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 CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amount shown here may change.

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



**Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2024 Local Financial Commitment Ratings**

The latest information FTA has on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard.

This is because the information below is based on FTA’s completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

<b>SMALL 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>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%	<b>Medium-Low</b>
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.6%	<b>High</b>
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	42.7%	<b>Under Review</b>
CO Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.7%	<b>High</b>
CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
FL Broward County, Broward Commuter Rail South	---	---	---	---	---
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%	<b>Under Review</b>
GA Atlanta, Campbellton CIC BRT	---	---	---	---	---
GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	---	---	---	44.4%	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.5%	<b>High</b>
MD Montgomery County, Veirs Mill Road Flash BRT	---	---	---	---	---
MN Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	54.5%	<b>Medium</b>
MN Rochester, Link Rapid Transit	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	59.2%	<b>Medium-High</b>
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	70.7%	<b>Medium</b>
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor Project	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	49.4%	<b>High</b>
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.2%	<b>High</b>
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	37.5%	<b>High</b>
OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	---	---	---	40.0%	---
OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, West Broad Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	62.8%	<b>Medium</b>
TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) East-West Corridor	---	---	---	49.4%	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	Medium-High	High	Medium	60.7%	<b>Medium-High</b>
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.3%	<b>High</b>
WA Seattle, RapidRide J Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	<b>High</b>
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	N/A	N/A	N/A	26.3%	<b>High</b>
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	44.2%	<b>High</b>
WI Madison, Madison East-West BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	<b>High</b>
WI Milwaukee, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---

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.

+++ 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.

"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 2024 Project Justification Ratings**

The latest information FTA has on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard. This is because the information below is based on FTA’s completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

<b>CORE CAPACITY 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>Capacity Needs Rating</b>	<b>Project Justification Summary Rating</b>
Phase 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> MA Boston, Green Line Transformation Program	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Not Rated	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
VA Northern Virginia, Northern Virginia Core Capacity Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

<b>NEW 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>New Starts Engineering</b> # MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	<b>Under Review</b>
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	Medium-Low	High	Medium	Medium-High	High	High	<b>Medium-High</b>
SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA Livermore, Valley Link Rail Project Phase 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA Los Angeles, West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	High	Medium-High	<b>Medium</b>
FL Miami, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IL Chicago, Red Line Extension	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	<b>Medium-High</b>
MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	Medium	High	Low	High	Medium-High	High	<b>Medium-High</b>
PA King of Prussia, King of Prussia Rail Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Austin, Blue Line Light Rail Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Austin, Initial Investment of the Orange Line Light Rail Transit	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Houston, University Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) North-South Corridor	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: SODO to Ballard	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, West Seattle to Ballard Link Extension: West Seattle to SODO	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

# 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 2024 Project Justification Ratings**

The latest information FTA has on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard. This is because the information below is based on FTA’s completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

<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	<b>Medium</b>
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium	Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	<b>Medium</b>
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	<b>Under Review</b>
CO Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	Medium-High	<b>Medium-High</b>
CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Broward County, Broward Commuter Rail South	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
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	<b>Under Review</b>
GA Atlanta, Campbellton CIC BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Bus Rapid Transit	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
MD Montgomery County, Veirs Mill Road Flash BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
■ MN Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	<b>Medium</b>
MN Rochester, Link Rapid Transit	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	<b>Medium</b>
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor Project	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
■ NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, West Broad Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	Medium	Medium-Low	Low	High	Medium	Medium-Low	<b>Medium</b>
TX San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit (ART) East-West Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	<b>Medium</b>
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium	Medium-Low	<b>Medium</b>
WA Seattle, RapidRide J Line	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium-High	High	<b>Medium-High</b>
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	<b>Medium-High</b>
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 BRT	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
■ WI Madison, Madison East-West BRT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
WI Milwaukee, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

+++ 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.

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