

Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Investment Grants 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 2018

Prepared by:
Federal Transit Administration

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

www.transit.dot.gov

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
General Commitment Guidelines for Capital Investment Grants Program Projects	2
The FY 2019 Funding Allocations and Recommendations	7

Tables

Table 1 FY 2019 Funding Proposed for Capital Investment Grants Program.....	5
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grants Program FY 2019 Project Ratings	9
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2019 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	11
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2019 Project Justification Ratings	13

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 Grant 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 2017, Congress provided \$9.1 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.

Section 5309 CIG funding is provided for a portion of the total project cost, including design and construction. By law, New Starts projects are limited to a maximum Section 5309 CIG program share of 60 percent, and Core Capacity and Small Starts projects are limited to a maximum Section 5309 CIG program share of 80 percent. Ordinarily, the Federal program share is less than those maximums, and often by a considerable amount.

All CIG projects must be evaluated and rated on a set of statutorily defined project justification and local financial commitment criteria and receive and maintain a "Medium" or better overall rating to advance through the various phases and be eligible for funding. Ratings are point in time evaluations by FTA and may change as the proposed project proceeds through planning and design when information concerning costs, benefits, financial plans, and impacts is refined. Once a construction grant agreement is awarded, the project is no longer evaluated and rated.

¹ This Annual Report is required by Federal Public Transportation Law, 49 USC 5309(o)(1).

Section 3005(b) of FAST newly 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 2019 funding amount recommended for individual CIG projects, with information on each project's cost and funding history. No other funding of projects is recommended at this time, but 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 www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grant-programs/capital-investments/about-program. Also available on the website are profiles of each of the projects in the program pipeline in the section labeled "Current Projects."

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 Capital Investment Grants 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 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. Additional CIG funding will not be recommended for the project. Any additional costs are the responsibility of the project sponsor. FTA works closely with project sponsors to identify and implement strategies for containing capital costs at the level indicated in the FFGA or SSGA at the time it was signed.
- When preparing funding recommendations for the upcoming fiscal year, FTA's priority is to honor the commitments made in existing construction grant agreements. New projects not yet under construction grant agreements are recommended for funding only if proposed CIG funding levels are sufficient.
- Initial planning efforts conducted prior to entry into the first phase of the CIG process are not eligible for CIG funding, but funding may be provided for that work through grants under the Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program, the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, or Title 23 "flexible funding."
- FTA encourages project sponsors to provide an overmatch as a means of funding more projects and leveraging State and local financial resources as well as other Federal financial resources. For large projects, a Federal CIG program share of 37 percent was the maximum in new FFGAs awarded since January 2017.

FTA emphasizes that the process of 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 2019 Funding Recommendations for the Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program

	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 CIG Request	Section 5309 CIG Share	Section 5309 CIG Funds Appropriated/Allocated Through FY 2017	Remaining Section 5309 CIG Funding Needs After FY 2017	President's FY 2018 CIG Budget Proposal	FY 2019 Section 5309 CIG Funding Recommendations	
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)									
								\$ 835,664,144	
Existing Core Capacity Full Funding Grant Agreements									
								\$ 200,000,000	
Oversight - 1% takedown by statute									
								\$ 10,461,254	
Total								\$ 1,046,125,398	
Existing New Starts FFGAs									
CA	Los Angeles, Regional Connector	LRT	\$ 1,402,932,490	\$ 669,900,000	47.7%	\$ 365,000,000	\$ 304,900,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 1	HR	\$ 2,821,957,153	\$ 1,250,000,000	44.3%	\$ 365,000,000	\$ 885,000,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	HR	\$ 2,499,239,536	\$ 1,187,000,000	47.5%	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 987,000,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA	San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	LRT	\$ 2,171,200,545	\$ 1,043,380,000	48.1%	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 893,380,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
MA	Boston Green Line Extension	LRT	\$ 2,297,618,856	\$ 996,121,000	43.4%	\$ 400,000,000	\$ 596,121,000	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 150,000,000
MD	Maryland National Capital Purple Line	LRT	\$ 2,407,030,286	\$ 900,000,000	37.4%	\$ 328,000,000	\$ 572,000,000		\$ 120,000,000
OR	Portland, Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project	LRT	\$ 1,490,350,173	\$ 745,175,087	50.0%	\$ 579,510,943	\$ 165,664,144	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 65,664,144
TX	Fort Worth, TEX Rail	CR	\$ 1,034,411,932	\$ 499,390,221	48.3%	\$ 254,000,000	\$ 245,390,221	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
Subtotal			\$ 16,124,740,971	\$ 7,290,966,308		\$ 2,641,510,943	\$ 4,649,455,365		\$ 835,664,144
Existing Core Capacity FFGAs									
CA	San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	CR	\$ 1,930,670,934	\$ 647,000,000	33.5%	\$ 172,956,593	\$ 474,043,407		\$ 100,000,000
IL	Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project Phase One	HR	\$ 2,066,702,783	\$ 956,607,772	46.3%	\$ 291,131,640	\$ 665,476,132	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
Subtotal			\$ 3,997,373,717	\$ 1,603,607,772		\$ 464,088,233	\$ 1,139,519,539		\$ 200,000,000
Other Projects That May Become Ready for Funding *							\$ 111,750,149		

The FY 2019 CIG budget request includes \$1 billion in new budget authority and \$46 million in anticipated prior year recoveries for a total of \$1.046 billion.

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

* The President's FY 2018 Budget Proposal included \$111,750,149 million for "Other projects that may become ready for funding" and noted, "The FFGA for the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project is planned to be signed shortly and the Maryland National Capital Purple Line FFGA remains under review due to pending litigation." Both FFGAs have since been signed.

The FY 2019 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

The FY 2019 proposal limits funding for the CIG Program to projects with existing full funding grant agreements. For the remaining projects in the CIG program, **FTA is not requesting or recommending funding.** Future investments in new transit projects would be funded by the localities that use and benefit from these localized projects. Therefore, FTA is recommending a total appropriation of \$1.046 billion in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants Program funds in FY 2019 with the proposed distribution as follows:

- \$1.037 billion for 10 existing FFGAs, including eight New Starts and two Core Capacity projects;
- No funding for new Small Starts Projects;
- No funding for the Expedited Delivery Pilot Program; and
- \$10.461 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2019 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 Administration has developed a comprehensive infrastructure proposal that accelerates projects, spurs private sector innovation, and improves how the Federal government delivers infrastructure projects. Transit projects will be eligible to compete for Federal financial support in this proposal. However, none of the projects listed in the tables below (2A, 2B, 2C) are recommended for funding from the CIG program.

Project Evaluation and Ratings

The Capital Investment Grants project evaluation and ratings included in this report are based on a process specified in statute. Federal 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 process toward a funding recommendation in the President's budget and a construction grant agreement, a project must be rated *Medium* or better overall. Even when a project is recommended for funding, receipt of Capital Investment Grants program funding is only awarded once the project sponsor can assure FTA that the proposed project scope, cost estimate, and budget are firm and reliable, all 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 a funding recommendation in the President's budget; 2) significant issues have been raised in prior year evaluations that warrant a rerating; 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 development 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 with applications that have asked to advance in the Capital Investment Grants program. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2019 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2019 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY 2019 Project Justification Ratings.

Since publication of the FY 2018 *Annual Report* in May 2017, three projects received construction grant agreements. In addition, one project entered the New Starts Engineering phase, two projects entered the Core Capacity Engineering phase, and five projects entered the New Starts, Small Starts, or Core Capacity Project Development phase. These include the following:

New Starts Project that Received Construction Grant Agreement

- MD National Capital Purple Line

Core Capacity Project that Received Construction Grant Agreement

- CA San Carlos Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project

Small Starts that Received Construction Grant Agreement

- FL Fort Lauderdale WAVE Streetcar

New Starts Projects Entered into Engineering

- NC Durham Durham-Orange LRT

Core Capacity Projects Entered into Engineering

- NY New York City Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements
- TX Dallas Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions

New Starts Projects Entered into Project Development

- AZ Phoenix Northwest Phase II LRT Extension
- MN St. Paul METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit

Small Starts Projects Entered into Project Development

- IN Indianapolis Purple Line BRT
- MO Kansas City Streetcar Expansion
- PA Pittsburgh Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End BRT Project
- WA Seattle Roosevelt RapidRide BRT

In the project evaluations in the tables below, there are five projects that earned an overall project rating below Medium. Notwithstanding the range of projects and ratings listed below, none are recommended for funding from the current CIG program in FY 2019. However, some

such projects may be eligible to use formula grant funds from other FTA programs, as such programs provided \$9.1 billion to state and local governments in FY 2017.

For a further discussion of the Administration's proposals for the CIG program, please refer to the proposed Budget of the United States for FY 2019. The Budget also includes proposals of expanded infrastructure investment, some of which may be applicable to projects listed in Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C below.

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2019 Project Ratings

CORE CAPACITY 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								
Core Capacity Engineering								
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	\$148.6	\$0.6	\$149.2	\$74.4	49.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
Core Capacity Project Development								
CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Project	\$2,606.1	\$103.5	\$2,709.5	\$1,250.0	46.1%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
IN Gary to Michigan City, NICTD Double Track - Northwest Indiana	\$321.0	\$33.5	\$354.6	\$177.2	50.0%	---	---	---
NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	\$1,428.6	\$134.1	\$1,562.7	\$772.0	49.4%	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low
TX Dallas, CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2 Subway)	\$1,321.3	\$78.3	\$1,399.5	\$699.8	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
NEW 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								
New Starts Engineering								
CA Santa Ana, Santa Ana - Garden Grove Streetcar Project	\$299.3	\$0.0	\$299.3	\$149.0	49.8%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	\$1,506.2	\$30.0	\$1,536.2	\$752.7	49.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	\$1,802.7	\$55.0	\$1,857.7	\$928.8	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
NC Durham, Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit	\$2,382.7	\$93.6	\$2,476.3	\$1,238.2	50.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	\$2,934.8	\$134.6	\$3,069.4	\$1,172.7	38.2%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
New Starts Project Development								
AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II	\$303.5	\$15.2	\$318.7	\$156.1	49.0%	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension	\$689.6	\$14.9	\$704.5	\$345.2	49.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3	\$2,913.0	\$564.7	\$3,477.8	\$1,300.0	37.4%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara	\$4,693.0	\$0.0	\$4,693.0	---	---	---	---	---
IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor	\$661.0	\$115.1	\$776.1	\$387.9	50.0%	---	---	---
MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$420.0	\$0.0	\$420.0	\$189.0	45.0%	---	---	---
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	\$11,429.1	\$2,170.4	\$13,599.5	\$6,718.2	49.4%	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
^ NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	\$6,000.0	---	\$6,000.0	\$2,000.0	33.3%	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension - Sound Transit	\$2,056.2	\$109.3	\$2,165.5	\$500.0	23.1%	Medium-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 2019 Project Ratings

SMALL 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
Small Starts Project Development									
^	AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	\$32.9	\$0.0	\$32.9	---	---	---	---	---
	AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	\$176.6	\$9.4	\$186.0	\$75.0	40.3%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
^	CA Los Angeles, Downtown Los Angeles Streetcar	\$295.4	\$0.0	\$295.4	\$100.0	33.9%	---	---	---
	CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	\$208.5	\$0.0	\$208.5	\$100.0	48.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	CA San Bernardino, Redlands Passenger Rail Project	\$274.3	\$1.9	\$276.2	\$80.0	29.0%	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low
	CA San Rafael, SMART Regional Rail - San Rafael to Larkspur Extension	\$55.4	\$0.0	\$55.4	\$22.5	40.6%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	FL Jacksonville, First Coast Flyer Bus Rapid Transit Southwest Corridor	\$33.2	\$0.0	\$33.2	\$23.2	70.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
	FL Jacksonville, JTA First Coast Flyer BRT East Corridor	\$33.9	\$0.0	\$33.9	\$16.9	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^	FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	\$175-\$225M	\$0.0	\$175-\$225M	---	---	---	---	---
+++	FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North	\$68.7	\$0.0	\$68.7	\$34.3	49.9%	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated
	FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$41.4	\$0.0	\$41.4	\$20.4	49.2%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	\$139.5	\$0.0	\$139.5	\$69.7	49.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Red Line Rapid Transit	\$96.3	\$0.0	\$96.3	\$75.0	77.8%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^	LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	\$167.5	\$2.3	\$169.8	\$84.0	49.5%	---	---	---
	MI Grand Rapids, Laker Line BRT	\$72.8	\$0.0	\$72.8	\$56.2	77.2%	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
	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
	MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Expansion	\$263.0	\$0.0	\$263.0	\$100.0	38.0%	---	---	---
	MO Kansas City, Prospect MAX	\$55.8	\$0.0	\$55.8	\$29.9	53.6%	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
^	NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	\$96.8-\$105.9	---	\$96.8-\$105.9	\$77.4-\$84.7	---	---	---	---
	NM Albuquerque, Rapid Transit Project	\$133.7	\$0.0	\$133.7	\$75.0	56.1%	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
	NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	\$80.8	\$0.0	\$80.8	\$40.4	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	\$40.9	\$0.0	\$40.9	\$32.7	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
	NY Albany, Washington-Western Bus Rapid Transit	\$108.8	\$0.0	\$108.8	\$87.1	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
	NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$225.7	\$0.0	\$225.7	\$97.1	43.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	OR Portland, Division Transit Project	\$168.5	\$6.2	\$174.7	\$87.3	50.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End BRT	\$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
^	VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	\$119-\$140M	---	\$119-\$140M	---	---	---	---	---
	WA Everett, Swift II BRT	\$73.6	\$0.0	\$73.6	\$43.2	58.7%	Medium	Medium	Medium
	WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	\$120.0	\$0.0	\$120.0	\$59.9	49.9%	High	Medium-High	High
	WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	\$77.2	\$0.0	\$77.2	\$38.6	50.0%	High	Medium-High	High
	WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	\$177.0	\$0.0	\$177.0	\$75.0	42.4%	High	Medium-High	High
	WA Spokane, Spokane Central City Line	\$72.0	\$0.0	\$72.0	\$53.4	74.2%	Medium	Medium	Medium
	WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Extension	\$214.6	\$0.0	\$214.6	\$75.0	34.9%	High	Medium	Medium-High
	WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	\$53.5	\$0.0	\$53.5	\$37.4	70.0%	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 2019 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS	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	
Phase State, City, Project					
Core Capacity Engineering					
NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	Medium	High	Medium-Low	26.8%	Medium-High High
TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	
Core Capacity Project Development					
CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Project	High	Medium	Medium-Low	46.1%	Medium-High ---
IN Gary to Michigan City, NICTD Double Track - Northwest Indiana	---	---	---	50.0%	
NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	49.4%	Medium-Low Medium-High
TX Dallas, CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2 Subway)	Medium-High	High	Medium	50.0%	

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	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	
Phase State, City, Project					
New Starts Engineering					
CA Santa Ana, Santa Ana - Garden Grove Streetcar Project	Medium-High	High	Medium	49.8%	Medium-High High
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	High	High	Medium-Low	49.0%	
MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	High	High	Medium-Low	50.0%	Medium-High Medium
NC Durham, Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-Low	50.0%	
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-Low	38.2%	Medium-High
New Starts Project Development					
AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	49.0%	Medium-Low Medium-High
AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	49.0%	
CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	37.4%	Medium-High ---
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara	---	---	---	---	
IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor	---	---	---	50.0%	---
MN St. Paul, METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	45.0%	
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	Medium	Low	Low	49.4%	Medium-Low ---
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	---	---	---	33.3%	
WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension - Sound Transit	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-Low	23.1%	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 2019 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	---	---	---	---	---
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	Medium	High	Medium-Low	40.3%	Medium-High
CA Los Angeles, Downtown Los Angeles Streetcar	---	---	---	33.9%	---
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	48.0%	High
CA San Bernardino, Redlands Passenger Rail Project	Medium	High	Low	29.0%	Medium-High
CA San Rafael, SMART Regional Rail - San Rafael to Larkspur Extension	High	High	Medium	40.6%	High
FL Jacksonville, First Coast Flyer Bus Rapid Transit Southwest Corridor	N/A	N/A	N/A	70.0%	Medium
FL Jacksonville, JTA First Coast Flyer BRT East Corridor	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	49.9%	Not Rated
FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.2%	High
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	High
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Red Line Rapid Transit	Medium	High	Medium-Low	77.8%	Medium
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	49.5%	---
MI Grand Rapids, Laker Line BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	77.2%	Medium
MI Lansing, Capital Area Transportation Authority Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Low	69.0%	Medium-Low
MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.2%	High
MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Expansion	---	---	---	38.0%	---
MO Kansas City, Prospect MAX	N/A	N/A	N/A	53.6%	Medium
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---
NM Albuquerque, Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	56.1%	Medium
NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.0%	Medium
NY Albany, Washington-Western Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.0%	Medium
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	43.0%	High
OR Portland, Division Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	Medium	High	Medium-Low	60.0%	Medium
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift II BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	58.7%	Medium
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%	High
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%	High
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	N/A	N/A	N/A	42.4%	High
WA Spokane, Spokane Central City Line	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-Low	74.2%	Medium
WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Extension	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.9%	High
WI Milwaukee, Milwaukee East-West BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	70.0%	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 2019 Project Justification Ratings

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS	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 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	Medium-High Medium
Core Capacity Project Development CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Project IN Gary to Michigan City, NICTD Double Track - Northwest Indiana NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge TX Dallas, CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2 Subway)	Medium --- Medium Medium	High --- High Medium	High --- Medium High	High --- High High	Medium --- Medium Medium	Medium-High --- Medium Medium	Medium-High --- 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.

NEW STARTS PROJECTS	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 CA Santa Ana, Santa Ana - Garden Grove Streetcar Project MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit NC Durham, Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	Medium-High Medium-High Medium Medium-High Medium-High	Medium-Low Medium Medium Medium Medium-High	Medium Medium-High Medium Medium-High Medium-High	Medium Medium-Low Medium-Low Low Medium-High	Medium-High Medium Medium-High Medium Medium-High	Medium-High Medium-High Medium Medium Medium	Medium Medium Medium Medium Medium-High
New Starts Project Development AZ Phoenix, Northwest Extension Phase II AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3 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 NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2 WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension - Sound Transit	High Medium-High High --- --- --- --- Low --- High	Medium-Low Medium Medium-High --- --- --- --- High --- Medium	Medium Medium Medium --- --- --- --- Low --- Medium	Medium-High Medium-Low Medium --- --- --- --- High --- Medium	Medium Medium Medium-High --- --- --- --- Medium-High --- Medium	Medium-Low Medium Medium --- --- --- --- Medium-High --- Medium	Medium Medium Medium-High --- --- --- --- Medium --- Medium

--- 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 2019 Project Justification Ratings

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS State, City, Project	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Small Starts Project Development							
AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	Medium-Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium
CA Los Angeles, Downtown Los Angeles Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
CA San Bernardino, Redlands Passenger Rail Project	High	Low	Medium-Low	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low
CA San Rafael, SMART Regional Rail - San Rafael to Larkspur Extension	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium-Low	Medium
FL Jacksonville, First Coast Flyer Bus Rapid Transit Southwest Corridor	High	Low	Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ FL Jacksonville, JTA First Coast Flyer BRT East Corridor	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium
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
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Purple Rapid Transit Line	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Red Line Rapid Transit	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MI Grand Rapids, Laker Line BRT	High	Medium-Low	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High
MI Lansing, Capital Area Transportation Authority Bus Rapid Transit Project	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
■ MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
MO Kansas City, Kansas City Streetcar Expansion	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MO Kansas City, Prospect MAX	High	Medium-Low	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NM Albuquerque, Rapid Transit Project	High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
■ NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
■ NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	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	Medium	Medium
■ OR Portland, Division Transit Project	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
■ PA Pittsburgh, Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End BRT	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	High	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Low	Medium
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift II BRT	Medium-High	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium-High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, Roosevelt RapidRide Project	High	Medium	Medium-Low	High	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, Seattle Center City Connector	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium-High
WA Spokane, Spokane Central City Line	Medium	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Extension	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	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.