

Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

Fiscal Year 2021

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

February 2020

Prepared by:
Federal Transit Administration

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

<https://www.transit.dot.gov/>

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
General Commitment Guidelines for Capital Investment Grants Program Projects	2
The FY 2021 Funding Allocations and Recommendations	5

Tables

Table 1 FY 2021 Funding Proposed for Capital Investment Grants Program.....	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grants Program FY 2021 Project Ratings	8
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2021 Local Financial Commitment Ratings	10
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2021 Project Justification Ratings	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 (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 Act¹ (FAST).

Since 1964, Congress has provided Federal funds to supplement certain local transit projects. In FY 2020, 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. Ordinarily, the CIG Program share is less than the maximums specified in law, and often by a considerable amount. This is because Section 5309(f)(2)(E) requires FTA's rating of the project to consider "the extent to which a project has a local financial commitment that exceeds the required non-Government share of the cost of the project."

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

¹ 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 Project 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 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 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 2021 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 <https://www.transit.dot.gov/CIG>. Also available on the website, in the section labeled "Current Projects," are profiles of each of the projects currently in the CIG Program pipeline.

General Funding Recommendation and Funding Commitment Guidelines for CIG Projects

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

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

- The construction grant agreement, called either a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for New Starts and Core Capacity projects or a Small Starts Grant Agreement (SSGA) for Small Starts projects, defines the project including its cost, scope, schedule, and level of service; commits to a maximum level of annual and total CIG financial assistance (subject to Congressional appropriation); establishes the terms and conditions of Federal financial participation; defines the period of time for completion of the project, and helps FTA oversee and the project sponsor manage the project in accordance with Federal law. Upon completion of the payment schedule outlined in an FFGA or SSGA, the CIG funding commitment has been fulfilled. Any additional costs are the responsibility of the project sponsor. 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.

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 2021 Funding Recommendations for the Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program and the 3005(b) Expedited Delivery Pilot Program

	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 CIG Request	Section 5309 CIG Share	CIG Funds Appropriated through FY20	FY21 President's Budget Recommendation	
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)							
						\$ 745,000,000	
Existing Core Capacity Full Funding Grant Agreements							
						\$ 200,000,000	
Other Projects That May Become Ready for Section 5309 Funding During FY21							
						\$ 774,803,100	
Other Projects That May Become Ready for Section 3005(b) Funding During FY21							
						\$ 150,000,000	
Oversight - 1% takedown by statute							
						\$ 18,886,900	
Total						\$ 1,888,690,000	
Existing New Starts FFGAs							
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 1	HR	\$ 2,821,957,153	\$ 1,250,000,000	44.3%	\$ 665,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	HR	\$ 2,499,239,536	\$ 1,187,000,000	47.5%	\$ 500,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA	San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	LRT	\$ 2,171,200,545	\$ 1,043,380,000	48.1%	\$ 530,024,740	\$ 100,000,000
MA	Boston Green Line Extension	LRT	\$ 2,297,618,856	\$ 996,121,000	43.4%	\$ 850,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
MD	Maryland National Capital Purple Line	LRT	\$ 2,407,030,286	\$ 900,000,000	37.4%	\$ 688,000,000	\$ 120,000,000
* TX	Fort Worth, TEX Rail	CR	\$ 1,034,411,932	\$ 499,390,221	48.3%	\$ 474,390,221	\$ 25,000,000
WA	Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension	LRT	\$ 3,160,704,706	\$ 790,000,000	25.0%	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
WA	Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	LRT	\$ 3,260,357,587	\$ 1,172,730,000	36.0%	\$ 400,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
Subtotal			\$ 19,652,520,601	\$ 7,838,621,221		\$ 4,307,414,961	\$ 745,000,000
Existing Core Capacity FFGAs							
CA	San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	CR	\$ 1,930,670,934	\$ 647,000,000	33.5%	\$ 472,956,593	\$ 100,000,000
IL	Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project Phase One	HR	\$ 2,066,702,783	\$ 956,607,772	46.3%	\$ 591,131,640	\$ 100,000,000
Subtotal			\$ 3,997,373,717	\$ 1,603,607,772		\$ 1,064,088,233	\$ 200,000,000
Other Projects That May Become Ready for Section 5309 Funding During FY21						\$ 774,803,100	
Other Projects That May Become Ready for Section 3005(b) Funding During FY21						\$ 150,000,000	

* CIG Payout Completed with Receipt of Proposed FY 2021 Funding Recommendation

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

The FY 2021 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

The FTA is requesting in the President's Budget a total appropriation of \$1.889 billion in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants Program funds in FY 2021, with the proposed distribution as follows:

- \$945.00 million for 10 existing FFGAs, including eight New Starts and two Core Capacity projects;
- \$774.80 million in funding for other projects that may become ready for Section 5309 CIG funding during FY2021;
- \$150.00 million in funding for projects that may become ready for Section 3005(b) Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program funding during FY 2021; and
- \$18.89 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2021 funding level.)

The funding proposed for the existing FFGAs includes the negotiated payment outlined in each FFGA or the amount needed to complete the CIG commitment if the project is in the last year of its payment schedule. The requested funds also support projects in the Expedited Project Delivery 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 2021 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2021 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY 2021 Project Justification Ratings.

Between publication of the FY 2020 *Annual Report* in March 2019 and January 2020, FTA awarded nine construction grant agreements. In addition, FTA approved four projects into the New Starts Engineering phase and one project into the Core Capacity Engineering phase. Lastly, two projects entered the New Starts Project Development phase and five projects entered the Small Starts Project Development phase. These include the following:

New Starts Projects That Received Construction Grant Agreements

- WA Federal Way Link Extension

Core Capacity Projects That Received Construction Grant Agreements

- TX Dallas Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions Project

Small Starts Projects That Received Construction Grant Agreements

- AZ Tempe Streetcar Project
- FL Jacksonville First Coast Flyer Bus Rapid Transit Southwest Corridor
- MN Minneapolis Orange Line BRT
- NV Reno Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension
- NY Albany River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit
- OR Portland Division Transit Project
- WA Spokane Central City Line

New Starts Projects That Entered into Engineering

- AZ Phoenix South Central Light Rail Extension (Downtown Hub)
- IN Gary to Michigan City NICTD Double Track Northwest Indiana
- IN Lake County West Lake Corridor
- WA Federal Way Link Extension

Core Capacity Projects That Entered into Engineering

- CA San Francisco Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program

New Starts Projects That Entered into Project Development

- NV Las Vegas Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project
- SC Charleston Lowcountry Rapid Transit

Small Starts Projects That Entered into Project Development

- NC Raleigh Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue BRT
- OR Portland MAX Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvements
- TX Waco Rapid Transit Corridor
- WA Seattle RapidRide I Line BRT
- WA Seattle RapidRide K Line BRT

In the project evaluations in the tables below, there are five 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 2021 Project Ratings

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS								
Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
Core Capacity Engineering								
CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program	\$2,705.7	\$0.0	\$2,705.7	\$1,169.0	43.2%	High	Medium-High	High
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
Core Capacity Project Development								
NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	\$1,479.3	\$236.9	\$1,716.2	\$811.1	47.3%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
NEW STARTS PROJECTS								
Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
New Starts Engineering								
AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension (Downtown Hub)	\$1,260.7	\$84.5	\$1,345.2	\$529.9	39.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3	\$3,211.9	\$387.4	\$3,599.3	\$1,300.0	36.1%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
IN Gary to Michigan City, NICTD Double Track - Northwest Indiana	\$416.0	\$40.1	\$456.0	\$173.0	37.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor	\$816.3	\$116.8	\$933.1	\$354.6	38.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	\$1,496.2	\$40.0	\$1,536.2	\$752.7	49.0%	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
New Starts Project Development								
AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II	\$376.8	\$24.6	\$401.3	\$158.1	39.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
^ CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara	\$5,581.0	---	\$5,581.0	\$1,395.0	25.0%	---	---	---
MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$451.8	\$9.1	\$460.9	\$207.4	45.0%	High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low
MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extension	\$329.9	\$21.8	\$351.6	\$174.1	49.5%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	\$10,157.3	\$1,969.9	\$12,127.2	\$5,338.7	44.0%	Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low
^ NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project	\$345.0	---	\$345.0	\$170.8	49.5%	---	---	---
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	\$5,731.0	\$659.3	\$6,390.3	\$2,000.0	31.3%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT	\$2,600 - \$2,800	---	\$2,600 - \$2,800	\$1,395.0	---	---	---	---
^ SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	\$387.5	---	\$387.5	---	---	---	---	---

^ 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 2021 Project Ratings

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS								
Phase	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
State, City, Project								
Small Starts Project Development								
^ AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	\$32.9	---	\$32.9	---	---	---	---	---
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	\$282.2	\$14.2	\$296.4	\$100.0	33.7%	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
CA 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 Miami-Dade County, South Corridor Rapid Transit Project	\$299.8	\$0.0	\$299.8	\$100.0	33.4%	High	Medium-High	High
^ 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	\$43.9	\$0.0	\$43.9	\$21.8	49.7%	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	\$209.7	\$10.3	\$220.0	\$100.0	45.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Line Rapid Transit	\$155.0	\$0.0	\$155.0	\$77.5	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
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit	\$141.3	\$0.0	\$141.3	\$100.0	70.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue Project	\$71.5	\$0.0	\$71.5	\$35.1	49.1%	High	Medium	Medium-High
NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	\$81.2	\$0.0	\$81.2	\$60.9	75.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$258.8	\$0.0	\$258.8	\$97.2	37.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
OR Portland, MAX Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvements	\$206.0	\$0.0	\$206.0	\$100.0	48.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	\$249.9	\$0.0	\$249.9	\$100.0	40.0%	High	Medium-High	High
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	\$49.2	\$0.0	\$49.2	\$28.2	57.4%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TX Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	\$18.3 - \$19.4	---	\$18.3 - \$19.4	---	---	---	---	---
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	\$99.7	\$0.0	\$99.7	\$64.5	64.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	\$119 - \$140	---	\$119 - \$140	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	\$84.2	\$0.0	\$84.2	\$41.7	49.5%	High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	\$285.5	\$0.0	\$285.5	\$75.0	26.3%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	\$121.2	\$0.0	\$121.2	\$59.9	49.4%	High	Medium-High	High
^ WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line BRT	\$117 - \$140	---	\$117 - \$140	---	---	---	---	---
^ WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	\$89.8	---	\$89.8	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	\$90.2	\$0.0	\$90.2	\$45.0	49.9%	High	Medium-High	High
WA Tacoma, Pierce Transit Pacific Avenue/SR 7 Corridor BRT	\$150.0	\$0.0	\$150.0	\$59.9	39.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Mill Plain BRT	\$49.9	\$0.0	\$49.9	\$24.9	49.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	\$54.8	\$0.0	\$54.8	\$40.9	74.7%	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 2021 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS Phase State, City, Project	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
Core Capacity Engineering CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	High Medium	High High	Medium-Low Medium-Low	43.2% 26.8%	High Medium-High
Core Capacity Project Development NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	47.3%	Medium-High

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

--- 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.

NEW STARTS PROJECTS Phase State, City, Project	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
New Starts Engineering AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension (Downtown Hub) CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 2 IN Gary to Michigan City, NICTD Double Track - Northwest Indiana IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	Medium Medium High High High Medium-High	High High High High High High	Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low	39.4% 36.1% 37.9% 38.0% 49.0% 46.4%	Medium-High Medium-High High High High Medium-High
New Starts Project Development AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extensior NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2 OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	Medium --- High High Medium-Low --- Medium --- ---	High --- High High Low --- Medium --- ---	Medium-Low --- Medium-Low Medium-Low Low --- Medium-Low --- ---	39.4% 25.0% 45.0% 49.5% 44.0% 49.5% 31.3% --- ---	Medium-High --- High Medium-High Low --- Medium-High --- ---

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

--- 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 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2021 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS Phase State, City, Project	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	---	---	---	---	---
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	Medium-High	Low	Low	33.7%	Medium-Low
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.7%	High
CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT	---	---	---	---	---
FL Miami-Dade County, South Corridor Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.4%	High
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airpor	---	---	---	---	---
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	50.0%	Not Rated
FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.7%	High
FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension	---	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transi	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.5%	High
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Line Rapid Transi	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	49.5%	---
LA New Orleans, St. Claude and Elysian Fields Streetcar Extension	---	---	---	---	---
MI Lansing, Capital Area Transportation Authority Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Low	69.0%	Medium-Low
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	70.7%	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.1%	High
NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	75.0%	Medium
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	37.5%	High
OR Portland, MAX Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	48.5%	High
PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	40.0%	High
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	N/A	N/A	N/A	57.4%	Medium
TX Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	64.7%	Medium
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.5%	High
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	N/A	N/A	N/A	26.3%	High
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.4%	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	High
WA Tacoma, Pierce Transit Pacific Avenue/SR 7 Corridor BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	39.9%	High
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Mill Plain BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	High
WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	74.7%	Medium

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 2021 Project Justification Ratings

<u>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</u>	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Capacity Needs Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Phase State, City, Project							
Core Capacity Engineering CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	Medium Medium	High High	High Medium	High High	Medium Medium	Medium-High Medium-High	Medium-High Medium-High
Core Capacity Project Development NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High

--- 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.

<u>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</u>	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Phase State, City, Project							
New Starts Engineering AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension (Downtown Hub) CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3 IN Gary to Michigan City, NICTD Double Track - Northwest Indiana IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	Medium High High High Medium-High Medium	Medium Medium-High Low Medium-Low Medium Medium	Medium Medium Medium Medium Medium-High Medium	Low Medium Medium Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low	Medium Medium Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium Medium-High	Medium Medium Medium-High Medium Medium-High Medium	Medium Medium-High Medium Medium Medium Medium
New Starts Project Development AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Main Street Extension NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2 OR Portland, Southwest Corridor LRT SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	High --- Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium --- Medium-Low --- ---	Medium-Low --- Low Medium-Low High --- High --- ---	Medium --- Medium-Low Medium Low --- Medium --- ---	Medium-High --- Medium-Low Medium High --- Medium-High --- ---	Medium --- Medium Medium Medium-High --- High --- ---	Medium-Low --- Medium Medium-Low High --- High --- ---	Medium --- Medium-Low Medium Medium-High --- Medium-High --- ---

--- 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 2021 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							
Small Starts Project Development							
AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA Los Angeles, Restoration of Historic Streetcar in Downtown Los Angeles	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	High	Medium
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
CA San Bernardino, West Valley Connector BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Miami-Dade County, South Corridor Rapid Transit Project	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High
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	Not Rated
■ FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Rapid Transit	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Line Rapid Transit	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
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	Medium
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: New Bern Avenue Project	Medium-High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
■ NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ OR Portland, MAX Red Line Extension and Reliability Improvements	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	Medium-High	Medium
■ PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End Bus Rapid Transit	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	High	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Low	Medium
TX Waco, Rapid Transit Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Ogden, Ogden/Weber State University BRT	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift Orange Line BRT	Low	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium-High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	High	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
WA Tacoma, Pierce Transit Pacific Avenue/SR 7 Corridor BRT	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium
■ WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Mill Plain BRT	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	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, 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.