

Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

Fiscal Year 2014 Capital Investment Grant Program

Report of the Secretary of Transportation
to the United States Congress
Pursuant to 49 USC 5309(o)(1)

2013

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 Grant Program Projects.....	2
The FY 2014 Funding Allocations and Recommendations.....	5

Tables and Maps

Table 1 FY 2014 Funding for Capital Investment Grant Program.....	4
Table 2A Summary of FY 2014 Project Ratings.....	8
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2014 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	9
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2014 Project Justification Ratings.....	10
Map of Projects with Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements and Small Starts Grant Agreements ...	11
Map of Projects in Project Development and Engineering.....	12

Introduction

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

The Capital Investment Grant Program

The Capital Investment Grant Program outlined in 49 USC 5309, most recently authorized in July 2012 by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act¹ (MAP-21), is the Federal Government's primary financial resource for supporting major transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. The majority of the projects are fixed-guideway transit projects, meaning they use or occupy a separate right-of-way such as rails, catenaries, or exclusive bus lanes. This includes rapid rail, light rail, commuter rail, and bus rapid transit (BRT). However, ferry projects and corridor-based BRT projects that do not use an exclusive bus lane but have other characteristics similar to rail transit service are also eligible. 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 of millions of Americans, provided alternatives to congested roadways, and fostered the development of safer, more livable communities.

Under the previous authorizing statute — the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) — the Capital Investment Grant Program included two categories of eligible projects referred to as New Starts and Small Starts. New Starts projects were required to complete an Alternatives Analysis and go through three steps called Preliminary Engineering, Final Design, and Construction. Small Starts projects were required to complete an Alternatives Analysis and go through two steps called Project Development and Construction.

MAP-21 changed the Capital Investment Grant Program to include three categories of eligible projects, referred to as New Starts, Core Capacity, and Small Starts. It also streamlined the number of steps in the project development and funding process. Lastly, MAP-21 eliminated the exemption from the evaluation and rating that existed for projects seeking less than \$25 million in Capital Investment Grant Program funding. Although SAFETEA-LU had eliminated the exemption, it did so only once a Final Rule implementing Small Starts was completed.

With regard to streamlining, MAP-21 eliminated Alternatives Analysis as a stand-alone requirement under the Capital Investment Grant Program and instead, it relies on the evaluation of alternatives that occurs during the planning and environmental review processes. New Starts and Core Capacity projects go through three steps - Project Development, Engineering, and Construction. Small Starts projects go through two steps - Project Development and Construction. New Starts projects are defined as those whose sponsors request \$75 million or

¹ The mandate for the *Annual Report* (49 USC 5309(o)(1)) is a continuation of the detailed reporting requirement established by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) in 1998, reauthorized by SAFETEA-LU in August 2005, and reauthorized by MAP-21 in July 2012. MAP-21 made changes to the Capital Investment Grant Program, including the creation of the Core Capacity program.

more in Capital Investment Grant Program funds or have an anticipated total capital cost of \$250 million or more (49 USC 5309(d)). Core Capacity projects are defined as substantial corridor based investments in an existing fixed-guideway system that will increase capacity in the corridor by not less than 10 percent (49 USC 5309(a)(2)). Small Starts projects are defined as those whose sponsors request less than \$75 million in Capital Investment Program funds and have an anticipated total capital cost of less than \$250 million (49 USC 5309(h)). All projects must be evaluated and rated on a set of statutorily defined project justification and local financial commitment criteria and receive and maintain at least a “Medium” overall rating to advance through the various steps to be eligible for funding.

This Report provides general information about the Capital Investment Grant Program, including the guidelines that the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) uses to make funding recommendations for proposed projects in the development pipeline and for projects currently in construction. Table 1 identifies the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 funding amount recommended for individual projects, with information on each project’s cost and funding history. Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C provide the results of the evaluation and rating of the projects.

Information Available on the FTA Web Site

More detailed profiles of each of the projects in the Capital Investment Grant program “pipeline” can be found on FTA’s website at <http://www.fta.dot.gov/12304.html> in the row labeled “Current Projects.” There you can find a project description, project map, notes on the project’s progress, and a discussion of any significant issues since FTA’s last evaluation of the project.

General Commitment Guidelines for Capital Investment Projects

- Any project recommended for a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) or Small Starts Grant Agreement (SSGA) should 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.
- To the extent that funds can be obligated in the coming fiscal year under existing FFGAs and SSGAs, these commitments should be honored before any new funding recommendations are made.
- The FFGA or SSGA defines the project including its cost, scope, schedule, and level of service; commits to a maximum level of annual and total Capital Investment Grant Program 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 and the project sponsor manage the project in accordance with Federal law. Upon completion of an FFGA or SSGA, the Section 5309 funding commitment has been fulfilled. Additional Section 5309 funding will not be recommended. Any additional costs beyond the scope of the commitment outlined in the FFGA or SSGA 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.

- Initial planning efforts conducted prior to entry into the first phase of the process are not eligible for Section 5309 funding under MAP-21, but funding may be provided through grants under the Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program, the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, or Title 23 “flexible funding.”
- Firm funding commitments, embodied in FFGAs or SSGAs, will not be made until the project sponsor has demonstrated that its project is ready for such an agreement, i.e., the project’s development and design have progressed to the point where its scope, costs, benefits, and impacts are considered firm and final.
- Funding should be provided to the most qualified projects to allow them to proceed through the process on a reasonable schedule, to the extent that funds can be obligated to such projects in the upcoming fiscal year.
- Funding recommendations will be based on the results of the project evaluation process and resulting project justification, local financial commitment, overall project ratings, and considerations such as project readiness and the availability of funds.
- FTA encourages project sponsors to provide an overmatch as a means of funding more projects and leveraging State and local financial resources, as well as other Federal financial resources.

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

Table 1 - FY 2014 Funding for Capital Investment Program

Project	Rating	Total Project Cost	5309 Request	Funds Appropriated/ Allocated Through FY12 (including ARRA and FY12 Bus & Bus Facilities)	FY13 Appropriations	FY14 Budget Recommendations
Totals by Phase						
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements						\$ 1,684,756,393
Recommended New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements						\$ 195,000,000
Other New Starts Projects						\$ -
Core Capacity Projects						\$ 120,000,000
Existing Small Starts Project Construction Grant Agreements						\$ 25,085,791
Recommended Small Starts Construction Grant Agreements and Small Starts Grants						\$ 87,836,137
Oversight Activities						\$ 19,814,720
GRAND TOTAL						\$ 2,132,493,041
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements - Projects Under Construction or Open for Service						
CA Sacramento, South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2	FFGA	\$ 270,000,000	\$ 135,000,000	\$ 89,340,000	\$ 43,153,697	\$ 2,506,303
CA San Francisco, Third Street Light Rail Phase 2 - Central Subway	FFGA	\$ 1,578,300,000	\$ 942,200,000	\$ 177,415,484	\$ 141,766,415	\$ 150,000,000
CA San Jose, Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project	FFGA	\$ 2,230,021,971	\$ 900,000,000	\$ 110,819,008	\$ 141,766,415	\$ 150,000,000
CO Denver, Eagle Commuter Rail	FFGA	\$ 2,043,143,000	\$ 1,030,449,000	\$ 225,420,000	\$ 141,766,415	\$ 150,000,000
CT Hartford, New Britain - Hartford Busway	FFGA	\$ 567,053,000	\$ 275,300,000	\$ 99,152,232	\$ 55,492,972	\$ 58,715,923
FL Orlando, Central Florida Commuter Rail Transit -- Initial Op Segment	FFGA	\$ 357,225,011	\$ 178,612,505	\$ 148,531,855	\$ 25,885,271	\$ 4,195,379
HI Honolulu, High Capacity Transit Corridor Project	FFGA	\$ 5,121,693,163	\$ 1,550,000,000	\$ 319,990,000	\$ 236,277,358	\$ 250,000,000
MN St. Paul-Minneapolis, Central Corridor LRT	FFGA	\$ 956,900,000	\$ 473,950,000	\$ 173,319,225	\$ 93,040,064	\$ 98,443,694
NC Charlotte, LYNX Blue Line Extension - Northeast Corridor	FFGA	\$ 1,160,084,496	\$ 580,042,248	\$ 39,650,000	\$ 66,157,660	\$ 100,000,000
NY New York, Long Island Rail Road East Side Access	FFGA	\$ 7,386,003,583	\$ 2,632,113,826	\$ 2,166,692,338	\$ 203,198,528	\$ 215,000,000
NY New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase I	FFGA	\$ 4,866,614,468	\$ 1,300,000,000	\$ 1,176,615,379	\$ 106,578,687	\$ 14,640,127
OR Portland, Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project	FFGA	\$ 1,490,350,173	\$ 745,175,087	\$ 85,000,000	\$ 94,510,943	\$ 100,000,000
TX Dallas, Northwest/Southeast LRT MOS	FFGA	\$ 1,406,215,977	\$ 700,000,000	\$ 620,969,431	\$ 70,303,715	\$ 8,726,854
TX Houston, North Corridor LRT	FFGA	\$ 756,008,000	\$ 450,000,000	\$ 261,841,000	\$ 94,510,943	\$ 88,264,057
TX Houston, Southeast Corridor LRT	FFGA	\$ 822,919,000	\$ 450,000,000	\$ 261,841,000	\$ 94,510,943	\$ 88,264,057
VA Northern VA, Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project Extension to Wiehle Ave.	FFGA	\$ 3,142,471,634	\$ 900,000,000	\$ 611,114,364	\$ 90,730,505	\$ 96,000,000
WA Seattle, University Link LRT Extension	FFGA	\$ 1,947,682,000	\$ 813,000,000	\$ 509,364,000	\$ 103,962,037	\$ 110,000,000
Total Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements		\$ 36,296,326,476	\$ 14,172,027,266	\$ 7,187,543,316	\$ 1,803,612,569	\$ 1,684,756,393
Existing Small Starts Construction Grant Agreements - Projects Under Construction						
AZ Mesa, Central Mesa LRT Extension	SSGA	\$ 199,010,443	\$ 74,999,999	\$ 35,481,000	\$ 18,902,189	\$ 20,616,810
MI Grand Rapids, Silver Line BRT	SSGA	\$ 39,857,022	\$ 18,997,674	\$ 13,481,943	\$ 13,934,693	\$ 4,468,981
Existing Small Starts Construction Grants		\$ 238,867,465	\$ 93,997,673	\$ 48,962,943	\$ 32,836,882	\$ 25,085,791
Recommended New Starts Projects for FFGAs						
CA Los Angeles, Regional Connector Transit Corridor	Medium-High	\$ 1,366,293,948	\$ 669,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65,000,000
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension	Medium-High	\$ 2,839,716,323	\$ 1,250,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65,000,000
WA Vancouver, Columbia River Crossing Project	Medium-High	\$ 2,796,908,975	\$ 850,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65,000,000
Total Recommended New Starts Projects for FFGAs		\$ 7,002,919,246	\$ 2,769,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 195,000,000
Core Capacity Projects						
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000,000
Recommended Small Starts Projects for SSGAs						
CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	Medium	\$ 47,236,281	\$ 37,789,025	\$ 17,800,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000
FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor	Medium	\$ 33,481,576	\$ 26,785,261	\$ 7,710,400	\$ -	\$ 19,074,600
FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT Southeast Corridor	Medium	\$ 23,877,039	\$ 19,100,923	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,101,000
OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	Medium	\$ 95,567,321	\$ 74,999,999	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,423,479
TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	Medium	\$ 35,901,050	\$ 20,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,237,058
Total Small Starts		\$ 236,063,268	\$ 179,075,208	\$ 25,510,400	\$ -	\$ 87,836,137

The FY 2014 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

FTA is recommending a total appropriation of \$1,981.47 million in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grant Program funds in FY 2014. Additionally, FTA anticipates using \$151.02 million in prior years' unallocated and unobligated funds from the Bus and Bus Discretionary Program, the Alternatives Analysis Program, and the Capital Investment Grant Program to help fund the program needs in FY 2014. This would bring the total FY 2014 Capital Investment Grant Program funding level to \$2,132.49 million.

FTA recommends the \$2,132.49 million be distributed as follows:

- \$ 1,684.76 million for existing FFGAs
- \$ 25.09 million to existing SSGAs
- \$ 195.00 million to proposed FFGAs
- \$ 120.00 million for Core Capacity projects
- \$ 87.84 million to proposed SSGAs
- \$ 19.81 million for management and oversight (1% of the FY14 5309 funding level.)

Project Evaluation and Ratings

The projects included in this report are the culmination of an evaluation and rating process specified in statute. Similar to SAFETEA-LU, MAP-21 establishes a five-point rating scale for candidate Capital Investment projects: *High*, *Medium-High*, *Medium*, *Medium-Low*, and *Low*. To advance in the process toward a funding recommendation, a project must be rated *Medium* or higher overall and must continue to be rated *Medium* or higher to be eligible for consideration for a funding recommendation in the President's Budget. Project funding is subject to Congressional appropriation, and is obligated when the grantee can satisfy FTA that the proposed project scope, cost estimate, and budget are firm and reliable; and local funding commitments are in place or are expected to be in place at the time of a construction grant agreement.

MAP-21 made significant changes to the Capital Investment Grant Program evaluation and rating criteria. Projects are still rated against a number of measures for project justification and local financial commitment. For New Starts projects, MAP-21 eliminated the operating efficiencies criterion under project justification and replaced it with a congestion relief criterion. Additionally, MAP-21 specified that the cost effectiveness criterion under project justification should be measured as cost per trip. For Small Starts projects, MAP-21 increased the number of project justification criteria from three to six (the same six as under New Starts). However, MAP-21 also specified that for Small Starts projects the project justification criteria shall be considered in relation to a no-action alternative and that the rating shall be based on an evaluation of the benefits of the project as compared to the Federal assistance to be provided. Federal assistance includes not only the funding from the Capital Investment Grant Program assumed but from any other Federal source as well.

FTA no longer requires project sponsors to submit annual information for evaluation and rating in the *Annual Report*, unless significant issues were raised in prior year evaluations that warranted a rerating or there was a significant change to the project.

Projects can be expected to continue to change as they progress through the development process. Hence, the ratings for projects that have not yet been recommended for FFGAs or SSGAs should not be construed as statements about the ultimate ratings of those projects. Rather, the ratings provide assessments of the projects' strengths and weaknesses at the time they were rated.

Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C present the ratings for all projects currently advancing through the process. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2014 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2014 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY2014 Project Justification Ratings.

Since publication of the FY 2013 *Annual Report* in February 2012, several New and Small Starts projects received construction grant agreements. In addition, several projects have been approved into preliminary engineering, final design, or Small Starts project development (prior to passage of MAP-21) or project development (after passage of MAP-21). These include the following:

New Starts Projects that Received Full Funding Grant Agreements

- Charlotte, NC –LYNX Blue Line Extension - Northeast Corridor
- Honolulu, HI – High Capacity Transit Corridor Project
- Portland, OR – Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
- San Jose, CA – Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project
- Sacramento, CA – South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2
- San Francisco, CA – Third Street Light Rail Phase 2 – Central Subway

Small Starts Projects that Received Small Starts Grant Agreements

- Fort Collins, CO – Mason Street BRT
- Grand Rapids, MI – Silver Line BRT
- Mesa, AZ – Central Mesa Light Rail Extension
- New York, NY – Nostrand Avenue BRT

New Starts Projects Approved into Final Design under SAFETEA-LU

- Charlotte, NC –LYNX Blue Line Extension - Northeast Corridor
- Sacramento, CA – South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2

New Starts Projects Approved into Preliminary Engineering under SAFETEA-LU

- Cambridge to Medford, MA – Green Line Extension
- Fort Worth, TX – TEX Rail

New Starts Projects Approved into Project Development under MAP-21

- Denver, CO – Southeast Corridor

Small Starts Projects Approved into Project Development under MAP-21

- Columbus, OH – Northeast Corridor BRT
- El Paso, TX – Montana Corridor BRT
- Fort Lauderdale, FL – Wave Streetcar
- Lansing, MI – Michigan/Grand River BRT
- Provo, UT – Provo-Orem
- Tempe, AZ – Tempe Streetcar
- Vancouver, WA – Fourth Plain BRT

Table 2A -- Summary of FY 2014 Project Ratings

Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total New or Small Starts Funding Request (millions)	New or Small Starts Funds Share of Capital Costs	Overall Project Rating	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating
New Starts Engineering								
CA Los Angeles, Regional Connector Transit Corridor	\$1,342.5	\$23.8	\$1,366.3	\$669.9	49.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	\$2,310.0	\$529.7	\$2,839.7	\$1,250.0	44.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
FL Orlando, SunRail Phase 2 South	\$184.8	\$0.2	\$185.0	\$92.5	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	\$1,115.8	\$218.8	\$1,334.6	\$557.1	41.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium
TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	\$1,461.6	\$101.5	\$1,563.1	\$781.5	50.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
WA Vancouver, Columbia River Crossing Project	\$2,730.0	\$66.9	\$2,796.9	\$850.0	30.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
New Starts Project Development								
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	\$1,641.2	\$343.5	\$1,984.7	\$980.4	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	\$210.7	\$0.0	\$210.7	\$92.0	43.7%	†	†	†
MD Baltimore, Red Line	\$2,574.8	\$0.0	\$2,574.8	\$1,250.0	48.5%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	\$2,151.7	\$0.0	\$2,151.7	\$1,053.0	48.9%	Medium	Medium	Medium
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	\$1,220.5	\$30.0	\$1,250.5	\$625.2	50.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	\$840.9	\$118.3	\$959.1	\$479.6	50.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
Small Starts Project Development								
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	\$124.7	\$4.7	\$129.3	\$56.0	43.3%	†	†	†
CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	\$47.2	\$0.0	\$47.2	\$37.8	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
CA Oakland, East Bay BRT	\$173.1	\$4.8	\$177.9	\$75.0	42.2%	Medium-High	High	Medium
CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	\$125.6	\$0.0	\$125.6	\$75.0	59.7%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	\$140.2	\$2.4	\$142.6	\$49.7	34.8%	†	†	†
FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor	\$33.5	\$0.0	\$33.5	\$26.8	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	\$23.9	\$0.0	\$23.9	\$19.1	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	\$215.4	\$0.0	\$215.4	\$75.0	34.8%	†	†	†
OH Columbus, COTA Northeast Corridor BRT Project	\$39.4	\$0.0	\$39.4	\$31.5	80.0%	†	†	†
OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	\$95.6	\$0.0	\$95.6	\$75.0	78.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	\$35.9	\$0.0	\$35.9	\$20.4	56.8%	Medium	Medium	Medium
TX El Paso, Montana Corridor BRT	\$43.4	\$0.0	\$43.4	\$25.7	59.4%	†	†	†
UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	\$146.4	\$13.0	\$159.4	\$75.0	47.1%	†	†	†
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	\$49.3	\$0.0	\$49.3	\$39.4	80.0%	†	†	†

† This project was not rated because it entered Project Development (PD) under MAP-21 procedures, which do not require a rating to be assigned upon entry into PD.

Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2014 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

Phase State, City, Project	Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating	Local Financial Commitment Factors									
		New or Small Starts Share		Capital Plan				Operating Plan			
		Rating	Section 5309 Funding Request (millions \$)	Summary Rating	Current Capital Condition Rating	Commitment of Capital Funds Rating	Reasonableness of Estimates and Financial Capacity Rating	Summary Rating	Current Operating Condition Rating	Commitment of Operating Funds Rating	Reasonableness of Estimates and Financial Capacity Rating
New Starts Engineering											
CA Los Angeles, Regional Connector Transit Corridor	Medium	Medium-High	\$669.9	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium-High	High	High	Medium-Low
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	Medium	Medium-High	\$1,250.0	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium-High	High	High	Medium-Low
FL Orlando, SunRail Phase 2 South	Medium-High	Medium	\$92.5	Medium-High	High	High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	High	Medium
MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	Medium	Medium-High	\$557.1	Medium	Medium	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium
TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	Medium	Medium	\$781.5	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low
WA Vancouver, Columbia River Crossing Project	Medium	High	\$850.0	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-High	High	Medium-High	Medium-High
New Starts Project Development											
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	Medium-High	Medium-High	\$980.4	Medium-High	High	High	Medium	Medium-High	High	High	Medium
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	†	†	\$92.0	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
MD Baltimore, Red Line	Medium	Medium-High	\$1,250.0	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	Medium	Medium-High	\$1,053.0	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	High	Medium-Low
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	Medium	Medium	\$625.2	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	High	High	Medium
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	Medium	Medium	\$479.6	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium	Medium-High	High	High	Medium
Small Starts Project Development											
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	†	†	\$56.0	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	Medium	N/A	\$37.8	N/A				N/A			
CA Oakland, East Bay BRT	High	N/A	\$75.0	N/A				N/A			
CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	Medium	N/A	\$75.0	N/A				N/A			
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	†	†	\$49.7	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor	Medium	N/A	\$26.8	N/A				N/A			
FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	Medium	N/A	\$19.1	N/A				N/A			
MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	†	†	\$75.0	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
OH Columbus, COTA Northeast Corridor BRT Project	†	†	\$31.5	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	Medium	N/A	\$75.0	N/A				N/A			
TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	Medium	N/A	\$20.4	N/A				N/A			
TX El Paso, Montana Corridor BRT	†	†	\$25.7	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	†	†	\$75.0	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	†	†	\$39.4	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† This project was not rated because it entered Project Development (PD) under MAP-21 procedures, which do not require a rating to be assigned upon entry into PD.

"N/A" signifies that this criterion does not apply to qualifying Small Starts projects per the simplified financial evaluation process specified in FTA's Small Starts Interim guidance.

Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2014 Project Justification Ratings

Phase	Project Justification Summary Rating	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating *	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating
New Starts Engineering							
CA Los Angeles, Regional Connector Transit Corridor	Medium-High	High	High	+++	High	Medium-High	Medium-High
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	Medium-High	High	Medium-High	+++	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase 2 South	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low
^ MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	Medium	High	Medium	N/A	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	Medium	High	Medium-High	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low
WA Vancouver, Columbia River Crossing Project	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	+++	Medium	High	Medium
New Starts Project Development							
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	Medium	High	Medium	+++	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
MD Baltimore, Red Line	Medium-High	High	Medium-High	+++	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	Medium	High	Medium-High	+++	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium
^ MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	Medium	Medium	Medium	N/A	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	Medium	High	Medium-Low	+++	Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low
Small Starts Project Development							
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	Medium	+++	+++	+++	Medium	Medium	Medium
CA Oakland, East Bay BRT	Medium	+++	+++	+++	High	Medium	Medium
CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	Medium-High	+++	+++	+++	High	High	High
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
^ FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
OH Columbus, COTA Northeast Corridor BRT Project	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
^ OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	High	Medium	Low
TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	Medium	+++	+++	+++	Medium	Medium	Medium
TX El Paso, Montana Corridor BRT	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

* For New Starts projects, ratings are based on the project cost per trip, per § 5309(d)(2)(A)(iii). For Small Starts projects, ratings are based on the Federal share of the project cost per trip, per § 5309(h)(6).

† This project was not rated because it entered Project Development (PD) under MAP-21 procedures, which do not require a rating to be assigned upon entry into PD.

+++ MAP-21 requires that projects be evaluated on this criterion, but the measure has not been finalized as of the release date of this report. A Medium rating has been assigned.

^ This project was not re-rated for the FY 2014 Annual Report; its prior rating is shown. If the project is a New Start, the summary rating also reflects a Medium rating for Operating Efficiencies (not shown).

Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements and Small Starts Construction Grant Agreements - FY2014



Project Development and Engineering FY 2014

