

# Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

## Fiscal Year 2020

### Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program

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

**March 2019**

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 2020 Funding Allocations and Recommendations.....	5

## **Tables**

Table 1 FY 2020 Funding Proposed for Capital Investment Grants Program.....	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grants Program FY 2020 Project Ratings .....	7
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	9
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Project Justification Ratings.....	11



## **Introduction**

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

### ***The Capital Investment Grants Program***

The Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program outlined in 49 USC 5309, was most recently authorized in December 2015 by the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act<sup>1</sup> (FAST).

Since 1964, Congress has provided Federal funds to supplement certain local transit projects. In FY 2019, Congress provided \$10.2 billion in formula funds distributed to state and local governments for local transit projects. The CIG Program supplements those expenditures with additional financial resources for transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. It provides discretionary 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.

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

The FTA awards Section 5309 CIG funding for a portion of the total project cost, including design and construction. Federal public transportation law limits New Starts projects to a maximum Section 5309 CIG Program share of 60 percent of the total project cost, while Core Capacity and Small Starts projects are limited to a maximum Section 5309 CIG Program share of 80 percent of the total project cost. Often, annual appropriations laws also include provisions relating to the maximum Section 5309 CIG share allowed for projects funded with that year's appropriations. For example, the FY 2019 Consolidated Appropriations Act limits the CIG Program share for New Starts projects to a maximum of 51 percent. Ordinarily, the CIG Program share is less than the maximums specified in law, and often by a considerable amount.

The law requires all CIG projects to be evaluated and rated on a set of statutorily defined project justification and local financial commitment criteria. Projects must receive and maintain a "Medium" or better overall rating to advance through the various phases and be eligible for CIG

---

<sup>1</sup> This Annual Report is required by Federal public transportation law, 49 USC 5309(o)(1).

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.

Section 3005(b) of FAST established the Expedited Delivery 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 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 FAST requires FTA to submit to Congress an annual report on the proposed amount of funding for this pilot program.

This Report provides general information about the CIG Program, including the guidelines that the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) uses to make funding recommendations. Table 1 identifies the FY 2020 funding amount recommended for individual CIG projects, with information on each project's cost and funding history. Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C provide the results of FTA's evaluation and rating of the CIG projects at this juncture.

#### ***Information Available on the FTA Web Site***

More information on the CIG Program can be found on FTA's website at <http://www.fta.dot.gov/12304.html>. Also available on the website, in the section labeled "Current Projects," are profiles of each of the projects currently in the CIG Program pipeline.

## **General Funding Recommendation and Funding Commitment Guidelines for CIG Projects**

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

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

- The construction grant agreement, called either a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for New Starts and Core Capacity projects or a Small Starts Grant Agreement (SSGA) for Small Starts projects, defines the project including its cost, scope, schedule, and level of service; commits to a maximum level of annual and total CIG financial assistance (subject to Congressional appropriation); establishes the terms and conditions of Federal financial participation; defines the period of time for completion of the project, and helps FTA oversee and the project sponsor manage the project in accordance with Federal law. Upon completion of the payment schedule outlined in an FFGA or SSGA, the CIG funding commitment has been fulfilled. Any additional costs are the responsibility of the project sponsor. The 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. The 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."
- The FTA encourages project sponsors to provide an overmatch as a means of funding more projects and leveraging State, local and private financial resources including through the use of value capture. For large projects, the maximum Federal CIG Program share has been less than 38 percent in new FFGAs awarded since January 2017.

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 2020 Funding Recommendations for the Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program and the 3005(b) Expedited Delivery**

	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 CIG Request	Section 5309 CIG Share	CIG Funds Appropriated through FY19	FY20 President's Budget Recommendation
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)						\$ 795,290,221
Existing Core Capacity Full Funding Grant Agreements						\$ 200,000,000
Other Projects That May Become Ready for Section 5309 or 3005(b) Funding During FY20						\$ 494,847,879
Oversight - 1% takedown by statute						\$ 15,051,900
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$ 1,505,190,000</b>
<b>Existing New Starts FFGAs</b>						
* CA Los Angeles, Regional Connector	LRT	\$ 1,402,932,490	\$ 669,900,000	47.7%	\$ 565,000,000	\$ 104,900,000
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 1	HR	\$ 2,821,957,153	\$ 1,250,000,000	44.3%	\$ 565,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	HR	\$ 2,499,239,536	\$ 1,187,000,000	47.5%	\$ 400,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	LRT	\$ 2,171,200,545	\$ 1,043,380,000	48.1%	\$ 430,024,740	\$ 100,000,000
MA Boston Green Line Extension	LRT	\$ 2,297,618,856	\$ 996,121,000	43.4%	\$ 700,000,000	\$ 150,000,000
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	LRT	\$ 2,407,030,286	\$ 900,000,000	37.4%	\$ 568,000,000	\$ 120,000,000
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	CR	\$ 1,034,411,932	\$ 499,390,221	48.3%	\$ 454,000,000	\$ 20,390,221
WA Lynnwood, Link Extension	LRT	\$ 3,260,357,587	\$ 1,172,730,000	36.0%	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 17,894,748,385</b>	<b>\$ 7,718,521,221</b>		<b>\$ 3,882,024,740</b>	<b>\$ 795,290,221</b>
<b>Existing Core Capacity FFGAs</b>						
CA San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	CR	\$ 1,930,670,934	\$ 647,000,000	33.5%	\$ 372,956,593	\$ 100,000,000
IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project Phase One	HR	\$ 2,066,702,783	\$ 956,607,772	46.3%	\$ 491,131,640	\$ 100,000,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 3,997,373,717</b>	<b>\$ 1,603,607,772</b>		<b>\$ 864,088,233</b>	<b>\$ 200,000,000</b>
<b>Other Projects That May Become Ready for Section 5309 or 3005(b) Funding During FY20</b>						<b>\$ 494,847,879</b>

\* CIG payout completed with receipt of proposed FY 2020 funding recommendation

LRT = light rail transit, HR = heavy rail, CR = commuter rail



## **The FY 2020 Funding Allocations and Recommendations**

The FTA is recommending a total appropriation of \$1.505 billion in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants Program funds in FY 2020, with the proposed distribution as follows:

- \$995.29 million for 10 existing FFGAs, including eight New Starts and two Core Capacity projects;
- \$494.85 million in funding for other projects that may become ready for Section 5309 CIG or 3005(b) Expedited Delivery Pilot Program funding during FY2020; and
- \$15.05 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2020 funding level.)

The funding proposed for the existing FFGAs shown above includes the negotiated payment outlined in each FFGA or the amount needed to complete the CIG commitment if the project is in the last year of its payment schedule.

The requested funds can also support projects in the Expedited Project Delivery for Capital Investment Grants Pilot Program. The FTA is administering the CIG Program consistent with the law, evaluating each project on its individual merits, and consistent with the discretion afforded by Section 5309. The Department's diligence in administering the CIG Program helps to ensure that Federal funds go to projects that will use the assistance effectively.

## **Project Evaluation and Ratings**

The CIG project evaluation and ratings included in this report are based on a process specified in statute. Federal public transportation law (49 USC 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. The FTA awards CIG Program funding only once the project sponsor can assure FTA that the proposed project scope, cost estimate, and budget are firm and reliable, all non-CIG funding commitments are in place, and all critical third-party agreements are completed. If a project receives a construction grant agreement from FTA, it is no longer required to be evaluated and rated.

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

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

Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C present the ratings for all projects currently in the Project Development or Engineering phase of the CIG Program. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2020 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Project Justification Ratings.

Between publication of the FY 2019 *Annual Report* in February 2018 and mid-February 2019, FTA awarded ten construction grant agreements. In addition, FTA approved one project into the New Starts Engineering phase and eight projects entered the Small Starts Project Development phase. These include the following:

New Starts Projects That Received Construction Grant Agreements

- CA Santa Ana and Garden Grove Streetcar
- WA Lynnwood Link Extension

Small Starts Projects That Received Construction Grant Agreements

- CA San Raphael SMART Larkspur Extension
- FL Jacksonville BRT East Corridor
- IN Indianapolis Red Line
- MI Grand Rapids Laker Line BRT
- MO Kansas City Prospect Max BRT
- NM Albuquerque Rapid Transit
- WA Everett Swift II BRT
- WA Tacoma Link Extension

New Starts Project Entered into Engineering

- CA Los Angeles Westside Section 3

Small Starts Projects Entered into Project Development

- FL Miami-Dade County South Corridor Rapid Transit
- FL Tampa Streetcar Extension
- IN Indianapolis Blue Line Rapid Transit
- LA New Orleans St. Claude and Elysian Fields Streetcar Extensions
- OR Portland Southwest Corridor LRT
- UT Ogden/Weber State University Bus Rapid Transit
- WA Tacoma Pacific Avenue/SR7 Corridor BRT
- WA Vancouver Mill Plain BRT

In the project evaluations in the tables below, there are four projects that earned an overall project rating below Medium, making them currently ineligible for CIG funding.

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2020 Project Ratings

<b>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</b>								
Phase	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
State, City, Project								
<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
TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	\$128.7	\$0.0	\$128.7	\$60.8	47.2%	High	Medium	Medium-High
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b>								
CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program	\$2,689.7	\$81.5	\$2,771.2	\$1,250.0	45.1%	High	Medium-High	High
NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	\$1,409.0	\$233.0	\$1,642.0	\$811.1	49.4%	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low
<b>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</b>								
Phase	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
State, City, Project								
<b>New Starts Engineering</b>								
CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3	\$3,211.9	\$451.1	\$3,663.0	\$1,300.0	35.5%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	\$1,496.2	\$40.0	\$1,536.2	\$752.7	49.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	\$1,948.2	\$55.0	\$2,003.2	\$928.8	46.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
NC Durham, Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit	\$2,343.8	\$132.5	\$2,476.3	\$1,238.2	50.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
<b>New Starts Project Development</b>								
AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II Light Rail	\$326.6	\$14.2	\$340.8	\$168.7	49.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension (Downtown Hub)	\$1,275.3	\$69.8	\$1,345.2	\$665.9	49.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara	\$4,693.0	---	\$4,693.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor	\$764.3	\$126.6	\$890.9	\$440.1	49.4%	High	Medium	Medium-High
MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$420.0	---	\$420.0	\$189.0	45.0%	---	---	---
MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extension	\$316.6	\$0.0	\$316.6	\$151.6	47.9%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	\$11,429.1	\$2,273.3	\$13,702.4	\$6,769.0	49.4%	Low	Medium	Medium-Low
^ NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	\$6,000.0	---	\$6,000.0	\$2,000.0	33.3%	---	---	---
OR Portland, Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit	\$2,600 - \$2,800	---	\$2,600 - \$2,800	\$1,300 - \$1,400	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension - Sound Transit	\$2,976.8	\$183.9	\$3,160.7	\$790.0	25.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High

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

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

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2020 Project Ratings

<b>SMALL STARTS PROJECTS</b>								
Phase	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
State, City, Project								
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>								
^ AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	\$32.9	---	\$32.9	---	---	---	---	---
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	\$192.4	\$9.5	\$201.8	\$75.0	37.2%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
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 Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	\$209.8	\$0.0	\$209.8	\$100.0	47.7%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT	\$219.0	---	\$219.0	---	---	---	---	---
FL Jacksonville, First Coast Flyer Bus Rapid Transit Southwest Corridor	\$33.2	\$0.0	\$33.2	\$23.2	70.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
FL Miami-Dade County, South Corridor Rapid Transit Project	\$291.0	---	\$291.0	\$97.0	33.3%	---	---	---
^ FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	\$175 - \$225	---	\$175 - \$225	---	---	---	---	---
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North	\$68.2	\$0.5	\$68.7	\$34.3	50.0%	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated
FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$41.4	\$0.0	\$41.4	\$20.4	49.3%	High	Medium	Medium-High
FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension	\$99.6 - \$102.6	---	\$99.6 - \$102.6	\$51.3	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	\$200.0	\$0.0	\$200.0	\$100.0	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	\$140.0	\$0.0	\$140.0	\$70.0	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	\$169.8	---	\$169.8	\$84.0	49.5%	---	---	---
^ LA New Orleans, St. Claude and Elysian Fields Streetcar Extensions	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MI Lansing, Capital Area Transportation Authority Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$141.8	\$0.0	\$141.8	\$97.8	69.0%	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$150.7	\$0.0	\$150.7	\$74.1	49.2%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	\$96.8 - \$105.9	---	\$96.8 - \$105.9	\$77.4 - \$84.7	---	---	---	---
NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	\$98.5	\$0.0	\$98.5	\$40.4	41.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	\$41.4	\$0.0	\$41.4	\$26.9	65.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	\$80.6	\$0.0	\$80.6	\$60.5	75.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$231.9	\$0.0	\$231.9	\$97.1	41.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
OR Portland, Division Transit Project	\$168.6	\$6.3	\$174.8	\$87.4	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	\$195.5	\$0.0	\$195.5	\$97.8	50.0%	High	Medium-High	High
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	\$47.0	\$0.0	\$47.0	\$28.2	60.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	\$78.2	\$0.8	\$79.0	\$49.8	63.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	\$119 - \$140	---	\$119 - \$140	---	---	---	---	---
^ WA Everett, Swift Bus Rapid Transit Orange Line	\$67 - \$77	---	\$67 - \$77	\$35 - \$40	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Center City Connector	\$252.2	\$0.0	\$252.2	\$75.0	29.7%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	\$121.3	\$0.0	\$121.3	\$59.9	49.4%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide Roosevelt Project	\$90.2	\$0.0	\$90.2	\$45.0	49.9%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Spokane, Central City Line	\$72.0	\$0.0	\$72.0	\$53.4	74.2%	Medium	Medium	Medium
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 Corridor BRT	\$149.9	\$0.0	\$149.9	\$59.7	39.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WA Vancouver, Mill Plain Bus Rapid Transit	\$50.0	\$0.0	\$50.0	\$24.9	49.8%	---	---	---
WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	\$54.7	\$0.0	\$54.7	\$38.7	70.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium

+++ Questions remain on the capital and operating costs submitted by the project sponsor. Therefore, FTA was unable to develop ratings for the project.

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

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

**Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Local Financial Commitment Ratings**

<b>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</b> <b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<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>Core Capacity Engineering</b> NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	Medium N/A	High N/A	Medium-Low N/A	26.8% 47.2%	<b>Medium-High</b> <b>High</b>
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b> CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	High Medium-Low	High Medium	Medium-Low Medium-Low	45.1% 49.4%	<b>High</b> <b>Medium-Low</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.

"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.

<b>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</b> <b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<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>New Starts Engineering</b> CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3 MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit NC Durham, Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit	Medium-Low Medium-High Medium-High Medium-High	High High High Medium	Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low	35.5% 49.0% 46.4% 50.0%	<b>Medium-High</b> <b>Medium-High</b> <b>Medium-High</b> <b>Medium</b>
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II Light Rail AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension (Downtown Hub) CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extension NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2 OR Portland, Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension - Sound Transit	Medium Medium --- High --- High Medium-Low --- --- Medium-High	High Medium-High --- High --- Low Low --- --- Medium-High	Medium-Low Medium-Low --- Medium-Low --- Medium-Low Low Low --- Medium	49.5% 49.5% --- 49.4% 45.0% 47.9% 49.4% 33.3% --- 25.0%	<b>Medium</b> <b>Medium</b> --- <b>High</b> --- <b>Medium-High</b> <b>Low</b> --- --- <b>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.

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

**Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Local Financial Commitment Ratings**

<b>SMALL STARTS PROJECTS</b> <b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<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>	
AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	---	---	---	---	---
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	Medium	High	Medium-Low	37.2%	<b>Medium-High</b>
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	Medium-High	Low	Low	33.7%	<b>Medium-Low</b>
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.7%	<b>High</b>
CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT	---	---	---	---	---
FL Jacksonville, First Coast Flyer Bus Rapid Transit Southwest Corridor	N/A	N/A	N/A	70.0%	<b>Medium</b>
FL Miami-Dade County, South Corridor Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	33.3%	---
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	50.0%	<b>Not Rated</b>
FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.3%	<b>High</b>
FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension	---	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	<b>High</b>
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	<b>High</b>
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	49.5%	---
LA New Orleans, St. Claude and Elysian Fields Streetcar Extensions	---	---	---	---	---
MI Lansing, Capital Area Transportation Authority Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Low	69.0%	<b>Medium-Low</b>
MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.2%	<b>High</b>
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---
NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	N/A	N/A	N/A	41.0%	<b>High</b>
NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	65.0%	<b>Medium</b>
NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	75.0%	<b>Medium</b>
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	41.9%	<b>High</b>
OR Portland, Division Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	<b>High</b>
PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	<b>High</b>
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	N/A	N/A	N/A	60.0%	<b>Medium</b>
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	63.0%	<b>Medium</b>
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Bus Rapid Transit Orange Line	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Center City Connector	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.7%	<b>High</b>
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.4%	<b>High</b>
WA Seattle, RapidRide Roosevelt Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	<b>High</b>
WA Spokane, Central City Line	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-Low	74.2%	<b>Medium</b>
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 Corridor BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	39.9%	<b>High</b>
WA Vancouver, Mill Plain Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	49.8%	---
WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	70.7%	<b>Medium</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.

+++ Questions remain on the capital and operating costs submitted by the project sponsor. Therefore, FTA was unable to develop ratings for the project.

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

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

**Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Project Justification Ratings**

<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>
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project							
<b>Core Capacity Engineering</b> NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	Medium Medium	High Medium	Medium Medium	High High	Medium Medium	Medium-High Medium	<b>Medium-High</b> <b>Medium</b>
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b> CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	Medium Medium	High High	High Medium	High High	Medium Medium	Medium-High Medium	<b>Medium-High</b> <b>Medium-High</b>

<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>
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project							
<b>New Starts Engineering</b> CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3 MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit NC Durham, Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit	High Medium-High Medium Medium-High	Medium-High Medium Medium Medium	Medium Medium-High Medium Medium-High	Medium Medium-Low Medium-Low Low	Medium-High Medium Medium-High Medium	Medium Medium-High Medium Medium	<b>Medium-High</b> <b>Medium</b> <b>Medium</b> <b>Medium</b>
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II Light Rail AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension (Downtown Hub) CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extension NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2 OR Portland, Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension - Sound Transit	High Medium --- High --- Medium-Low Not Rated --- --- High	Medium-Low Medium --- Medium-Low --- Medium-Low High --- --- Medium	Medium Medium --- Medium --- Medium Not Rated --- --- Medium	Medium-High Low --- Medium-Low --- Medium High --- --- Medium	Medium Medium --- Medium-Low --- Medium Medium-High --- --- Medium	Medium-Low Medium-High --- Medium --- Medium-Low Medium-High --- --- Medium	<b>Medium</b> <b>Medium</b> --- <b>Medium</b> --- <b>Medium</b> <b>Medium</b> --- --- <b>Medium</b>

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

Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2020 Project Justification Ratings

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
State, City, Project							
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>							
AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	Medium-Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	<b>Medium</b>
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	High	<b>Medium</b>
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Jacksonville, First Coast Flyer Bus Rapid Transit Southwest Corridor	High	Low	Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
FL Miami-Dade County, South Corridor Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	<b>Not Rated</b>
■ FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
LA New Orleans, St. Claude and Elysian Fields Streetcar Extensions	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MI Lansing, Capital Area Transportation Authority Bus Rapid Transit Project	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	<b>Medium</b>
■ MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	<b>Medium</b>
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
■ NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
■ NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
■ NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	<b>Medium</b>
■ NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
■ OR Portland, Division Transit Project	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
■ PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	<b>Medium-High</b>
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	High	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Low	<b>Medium</b>
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Bus Rapid Transit Orange Line	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Center City Connector	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	<b>Medium-High</b>
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium-High	<b>Medium-High</b>
WA Seattle, RapidRide Roosevelt Project	High	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium-High	Medium-High	<b>Medium-High</b>
WA Spokane, Central City Line	Medium	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
WA Tacoma, Pacific Avenue/SR 7 Corridor BRT	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>
WA Vancouver, Mill Plain Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
■ WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	<b>Medium</b>

+++ Questions remain on the capital and operating costs submitted by the project sponsor. Therefore, FTA was unable to develop ratings for the project.

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

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