

# Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

## Fiscal Year 2018 Capital Investment Grant 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

**May 2017**

Prepared by:  
Federal Transit Administration

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

<http://www.fta.dot.gov>



## **Table of Contents**

Introduction.....	1
General Commitment Guidelines for Capital Investment Grant Program Projects.....	2
The FY 2018 Funding Allocations and Recommendations .....	6

## **Tables**

Table 1 FY 2018 Funding Proposed for Capital Investment Grant Program .....	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grant Program FY 2018 Project Ratings.....	9
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2018 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	11
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2018 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 included in the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) discretionary Capital Investment Grant Program.

### ***The Capital Investment Grant Program***

The Capital Investment Grant (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).

The CIG Program is the Federal Government's primary financial resource for supporting transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. It provides funding for fixed guideway investments such as new and expanded heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, 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 FAST, New Starts projects are those whose sponsors request \$100 million or more in Capital Investment Grant 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 Grant Program funds and have an anticipated total capital cost of less than \$300 million.

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.

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 Stars, 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.

---

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

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 2018 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.

***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 are profiles of each of the projects in the program pipeline in the section labeled "Current Projects." There you can find project descriptions, project maps, notes on the projects' progress, and a discussion of any significant issues since FTA's last evaluation.

## **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.
- 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.
- 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 Grant Program financial assistance (subject to Congressional appropriation); establishes the terms and conditions of Federal financial participation; defines the period of time for completion of the project, and helps FTA 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 Section 5309 funding commitment has been fulfilled. Additional Section 5309 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 honors 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.

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 2018 Funding Recommendations for the Section 5309 Capital Investment Grant (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	FY 2018 Section 5309 CIG Funding Recommendations	
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs)							\$ 1,007,929,851	
Existing Core Capacity Full Funding Grant Agreement							\$ 100,000,000	
Other Projects							\$ 111,750,149	
Expedited Delivery Pilot Program							\$ -	
Oversight - 1% takedown by statute							\$ 12,320,000	
<b>Total</b>							<b>\$ 1,232,000,000</b>	
<b>Existing New Starts FFGAs</b>								
CA	Los Angeles, Regional Connector	LRT	\$ 1,402,932,490	\$ 669,900,000	47.7%	\$ 365,000,000	\$ 304,900,000	\$ 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
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	HR	\$ 2,499,239,536	\$ 1,187,000,000	47.5%	\$ 250,000,000	\$ 937,000,000	\$ 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
* CA	San Francisco, Third Street Light Rail Phase 2 - Central Subway	LRT	\$ 1,578,300,000	\$ 942,200,000	59.7%	\$ 919,181,899	\$ 23,018,101	\$ 23,018,101
* CA	San Jose, Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project	HR	\$ 2,330,021,971	\$ 900,000,000	38.6%	\$ 802,585,423	\$ 97,414,577	\$ 97,414,577
* CO	Denver, Eagle Commuter Rail	CR	\$ 2,043,143,000	\$ 1,030,449,000	50.4%	\$ 967,186,415	\$ 63,262,585	\$ 63,262,585
MA	Boston Green Line Extension	LRT	\$ 2,297,618,856	\$ 996,121,000	43.4%	\$ 400,000,000	\$ 596,121,000	\$ 150,000,000
* NC	Charlotte, LYNX Blue Line Extension - Northeast Corridor	LRT	\$ 1,160,084,496	\$ 580,042,248	50.0%	\$ 505,807,660	\$ 74,234,588	\$ 74,234,588
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
TX	Fort Worth, TEX Rail	CR	\$ 1,034,411,932	\$ 499,390,221	48.3%	\$ 254,000,000	\$ 245,390,221	\$ 100,000,000
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$ 20,829,260,152</b>	<b>\$ 9,843,657,556</b>		<b>\$ 5,558,272,340</b>	<b>\$ 4,285,385,216</b>	<b>\$ 1,007,929,851</b>
<b>Existing Core Capacity FFGAs</b>								
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
<b>Subtotal</b>							<b>\$ 100,000,000</b>	
<b>Other Projects That May Become Ready for Funding +</b>							<b>\$ 111,750,149</b>	

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

\* CIG payout completed with FY 2018 recommendation

+ 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.



## The FY 2018 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

The FY 2018 proposal limits funding for the CIG Program to projects with existing full funding grant agreements. 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 \$1,232.00 million in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grant Program funds in FY 2018 with the proposed distribution as follows:

- \$1,007.93 million for 12 existing FFGAs, including 11 New Starts and one Core Capacity project;
- No funding for Small Starts Projects;
- No funding for the Expedited Delivery Pilot Program;
- \$111.75 million for other projects that may become ready for funding in FY 2018; and
- \$12.32 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2018 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 New Starts commitment if the project is in the last year of its payment schedule.

Over the next several months, the President and his Infrastructure Task Force will be developing a comprehensive proposal that accelerates projects, spurs private sector innovation, and improves how the Federal government delivers infrastructure projects.

## Project Evaluation and Ratings

The Capital Investment Grant project evaluation and ratings included in this report are based on a process specified in statute. FAST 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. Receipt of Capital Investment Grant program funding through a construction grant agreement is subject to Congressional appropriation, and 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. Once 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 currently advancing through the Capital Investment Grant program. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2018 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2018 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY2018 Project Justification Ratings.

Since publication of the FY 2017 *Annual Report* in February 2016, ten projects received construction grant agreements. In addition, three projects entered the New Starts Engineering phase, one project entered the Core Capacity Engineering phase, and 15 projects entered the New Starts, Small Starts, or Core Capacity Project Development phase. These include the following:

**New Starts Projects that Received Construction Grant Agreements**

- CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension Section 2 signed in December 2016
- CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor signed in September 2016
- TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail Project signed in December 2016

**Core Capacity Project That Received Construction Grant Agreement**

- IL Chicago, Red and Purple Modernization Phase One Project signed in January 2017

**Small Starts Projects that Received Construction Grant Agreements**

- CA San Francisco, Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project signed in December 2016
- CO Denver, Southeast Rail Extension Project signed in April 2016
- NC Charlotte, City LYNX Gold Line Phase 2 signed in May 2016
- NV Reno, 4th Street/Prater Way Bus Rapid Transit Project signed in December 2016
- OH Columbus, Cleveland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project signed in May 2016
- UT Utah County, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit Project signed in December 2016

**New Starts Projects Entered into Engineering**

- CA Santa Ana, Garden Grove Streetcar
- MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension
- MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT

**Core Capacity Projects Entered into Engineering**

- CA San Carlos, Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project

**New Starts Projects Entered into Project Development**

- CA San Jose BART Silicon Valley Phase II
- IN Northern Indiana, West Lake Extension
- NJ-NY Seacaucus, Hudson Tunnel
- NY New York, 2nd Ave Subway Phase 2
- WA Seattle, Sound Transit-Federal Way Link Extension

Small Starts Projects Entered into Project Development

- AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT
- CA San Bernardino, Redlands Passenger Rail Project
- FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project
- LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR Streetcar
- NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT
- VA Alexandria, West End Transitway
- WA Seattle, Madison Street Corridor BRT
- WI Milwaukee, East West Corridor BRT

Core Capacity Projects Entered into Project Development

- IN Gary to Michigan City, South Shore Line Northwest Indiana Connectivity Plan
- NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge Replacement



**Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2018 Project Ratings**

<b>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</b>								
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<b>Capital Cost</b> (millions)	<b>Financing</b> <b>Costs</b> (millions)	<b>Total Capital Cost</b> (millions)	<b>Total CIG</b> <b>Funding</b> <b>Request</b> (millions)	<b>CIG Share of</b> <b>Capital Costs</b>	<b>Overall Project</b> <b>Rating</b>	<b>Local Financial</b> <b>Commitment</b> <b>Rating</b>	<b>Project</b> <b>Justification</b> <b>Rating</b>
<b>Core Capacity Engineering</b>								
CA San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	\$1,923.7	\$7.0	\$1,930.7	\$647.0	33.5%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b>								
^ CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Project	\$1,600-\$2,000	---	\$1,600-\$2,000	\$900.0	---	---	---	---
^ IN Gary to Michigan City, South Shore Line Northwest Indiana Connectivity Plan	\$213.8	---	\$213.8	---	---	---	---	---
NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge Project	\$1,541.1	\$101.1	\$1,642.2	\$811.2	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	\$377.2	\$31.0	\$408.3	\$130.0	31.8%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
TX Dallas, CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2)	\$606.8	\$43.7	\$650.5	\$325.2	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	\$139.7	\$0.0	\$139.7	\$69.1	49.5%	Medium-High	High	Medium

^ 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.

<b>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</b>								
<b>Phase</b> State, City, Project	<b>Capital Cost</b> (millions)	<b>Financing</b> <b>Costs</b> (millions)	<b>Total Capital Cost</b> (millions)	<b>Total CIG</b> <b>Funding</b> <b>Request</b> (millions)	<b>CIG Share of</b> <b>Capital Costs</b>	<b>Overall Project</b> <b>Rating</b>	<b>Local Financial</b> <b>Commitment</b> <b>Rating</b>	<b>Project</b> <b>Justification</b> <b>Rating</b>
<b>New Starts Engineering</b>								
CA Santa Ana, Santa Ana - Garden Grove Streetcar Project	\$297.9	\$0.0	\$297.9	\$149.0	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
MD Bethesda to New Carrollton, Maryland National Capital Purple Line	\$2,380.2	\$26.8	\$2,407.0	\$900.0	37.4%	High	High	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	\$1,506.2	\$30.0	\$1,536.2	\$752.7	49.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	\$1,802.7	\$55.0	\$1,857.7	\$928.8	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	\$2,168.5	\$179.3	\$2,347.7	\$1,172.7	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
<b>New Starts Project Development</b>								
AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension	\$689.6	\$14.9	\$704.5	\$348.5	49.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3	\$2,658.9	\$0.0	\$2,658.9	\$1,075.0	40.4%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara	\$4,693.0	---	\$4,693.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor	\$563.0	---	\$563.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT	\$2,476.3	---	\$2,476.3	\$1,238.2	50.0%	---	---	---
^ NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
^ 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	\$1,440.0	---	\$1,440.0	---	---	---	---	---

^ 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 2018 Project Ratings

<b>SMALL STARTS PROJECTS</b>								
<b>Phase</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Financing</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost</b>	<b>Total CIG</b>	<b>CIG Share of</b>	<b>Overall Project</b>	<b>Local Financial</b>	<b>Project</b>
State, City, Project	(millions)	Costs	(millions)	Funding	Capital Costs	Rating	Commitment	Justification
		(millions)		Request			Rating	Rating
				(millions)				
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>								
^ AZ Flagstaff, Transit Spine BRT	\$32.9	---	\$32.9	---	---	---	---	---
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	\$176.6	\$9.5	\$186.1	\$75.0	40.3%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
^ CA Los Angeles, Downtown Los Angeles Streetcar	\$295.4	---	\$295.4	\$100.0	33.9%	---	---	---
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	\$200.0	\$0.0	\$200.0	\$100.0	50.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ CA San Bernardino, Redlands Passenger Rail Project	\$262.0	---	\$262.0	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Rafael, SMART Regional Rail - San Rafael to Larkspur Extension	\$42.5	\$0.0	\$42.5	\$22.5	52.9%	Medium	Medium	Medium
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	\$195.3	\$0.0	\$195.3	\$60.8	31.1%	Medium-High	High	Medium
FL Jacksonville, JTA First Coast Flyer BRT East Corridor	\$33.9	\$0.0	\$33.9	\$16.9	50.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
FL Jacksonville, FCF BRT Southwest Corridor	\$47.5	\$0.0	\$47.5	\$38.0	80.0%	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
^ 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	49.9%	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated
^ FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue BRT	\$16.5	---	\$16.5	\$8.3	50.0%	---	---	---
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	\$70.5	\$0.0	\$70.5	\$56.4	80.0%	Medium-High	Medium	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-Low	Medium
MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$150.7	\$0.0	\$150.7	\$74.1	49.2%	Medium-High	High	Medium
MO Kansas City, Prospect MAX	\$53.8	\$0.0	\$53.8	\$29.9	55.5%	Medium-High	Medium	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-High	Medium	Medium-High
NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	\$77.8	\$0.0	\$77.8	\$38.9	50.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	\$45.3	\$0.0	\$45.3	\$29.5	65.2%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit Line	\$64.0	---	\$64.0	---	---	---	---	---
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$225.8	\$0.0	\$225.8	\$97.1	43.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ OR Portland, Powell-Division Transit and Development	\$184.0	---	\$184.0	\$100.0	54.3%	---	---	---
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-\$140	---	\$119-\$140	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift II BRT	\$73.6	\$0.0	\$73.6	\$47.9	65.1%	Medium	Medium	Medium
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	\$120.0	\$0.0	\$120.0	\$59.9	49.9%	High	High	Medium-High
WA Seattle, Seattle Streetcar Center City Connector	\$166.6	\$0.0	\$166.6	\$75.0	45.0%	High	High	Medium-High
^ WA Spokane, Spokane Central City Line	\$72.0	---	\$72.0	---	---	---	---	---
WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Expansion	\$175.6	\$0.0	\$175.6	\$75.0	42.7%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ WI Milwaukee East-West Corridor BRT	\$51.9	---	\$51.9	\$31.1	59.9%	---	---	---

+++ 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 2018 Local Financial Commitment Ratings**

<b>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</b> Phase State, City, Project	<b>Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Factors</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> CA San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	High	Medium-Low	33.5%
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b> CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Project	---	---	---	---	---
IN Gary to Michigan City, South Shore Line Northwest Indiana Connectivity Plan	---	---	---	---	---
NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge Project	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	49.4%
NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	High	Medium-Low	31.8%
TX Dallas, CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2)	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium-High	High	Medium	50.0%
TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.5%

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.

<b>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</b> Phase State, City, Project	<b>Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Factors</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 Santa Ana, Santa Ana - Garden Grove Streetcar Project	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium-High	High	Medium	50.0%
MD Bethesda to New Carrollton, Maryland National Capital Purple Line	<b>High</b>	Medium	High	Medium	37.4%
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	<b>High</b>	Medium-High	High	Medium	49.0%
MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium-High	High	Medium	50.0%
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	<b>Medium</b>	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	50.0%
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension	<b>Medium</b>	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	49.5%
CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-Low	40.4%
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara	---	---	---	---	---
IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT	---	---	---	---	50.0%
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel Project	---	---	---	---	---
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	---	---	---	---	33.3%
WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension	---	---	---	---	---

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 2018 Local Financial Commitment Ratings**

<b>SMALL STARTS PROJECTS</b> Phase State, City, Project	<b>Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating</b>	<b>Local Financial Commitment Factors</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	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	High	Medium-Low	40%
CA Los Angeles, Downtown Los Angeles Streetcar	---	---	---	---	33.9%
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%
CA San Bernardino, Redlands Passenger Rail Project	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Rafael, SMART Regional Rail - San Rafael to Larkspur Extension	<b>Medium</b>	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	52.9%
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	31.1%
FL Jacksonville, JTA First Coast Flyer BRT East Corridor	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%
FL Jacksonville, FCF BRT Southwest Corridor	<b>Medium</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.0%
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North	<b>Not Rated</b>	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	49.9%
FL St. Petersburg, Central Avenue BRT	---	---	---	---	50.0%
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Red Line Rapid Transit	<b>Medium</b>	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	77.8%
LA Baton Rouge, TramLinkBR	---	---	---	---	49.5%
MI Grand Rapids, Laker Line BRT	<b>Medium</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.0%
MI Lansing, Capital Area Transportation Authority Bus Rapid Transit Project	<b>Medium-Low</b>	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Low	69.0%
MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.2%
MO Kansas City, Prospect MAX	<b>Medium</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	55.5%
NC Chapel Hill, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---
NM Albuquerque, Rapid Transit Project	<b>Medium</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	56.1%
NV Reno, Virginia Street Bus RAPID Transit Extension	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0%
NY Albany, River Corridor Bus Rapid Transit	<b>Medium</b>	Medium-High	Medium-High	Low	65.2%
NY Albany, Washington/Western Bus Rapid Transit Line	---	---	---	---	---
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	43.0%
OR Portland, Powell-Division Transit and Development	---	---	---	---	54.3%
TX El Paso, Montana RTS Corridor	<b>Medium</b>	Medium	High	Medium-Low	60.0%
VA Alexandria, West End Transitway	---	---	---	---	---
WA Everett, Swift II BRT	<b>Medium</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	65.1%
WA Seattle, Madison Street BRT	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.9%
WA Seattle, Seattle Streetcar Center City Connector	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.0%
WA Spokane, Spokane Central City Line	---	---	---	---	---
WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Expansion	<b>High</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	42.7%
WI Milwaukee East-West Corridor BRT	---	---	---	---	59.9%

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 2018 Project Justification Ratings**

<b>CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS</b>	<b>Project Justification Summary Rating</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>Phase</b> State, City, Project							
<b>Core Capacity Engineering</b> CA San Carlos, Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b> CA San Francisco, Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IN Gary to Michigan City, South Shore Line Northwest Indiana Connectivity Plan	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NJ Hudson County, Portal North Bridge Project	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium-High
TX Dallas, CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2)	<b>Medium-High</b>	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium	Medium
TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	<b>Medium</b>	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.

<b>NEW STARTS PROJECTS</b>	<b>Project Justification Summary Rating</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>Phase</b> State, City, Project							
<b>New Starts Engineering</b> CA Santa Ana, Santa Ana - Garden Grove Streetcar Project	<b>Medium</b>	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
MD Bethesda to New Carrollton, Maryland National Capital Purple Line	<b>Medium-High</b>	High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	<b>Medium</b>	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, Southwest Light Rail Transit	<b>Medium</b>	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	<b>Medium-High</b>	High	Medium-High	High	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
<b>New Starts Project Development</b> AZ Phoenix, South Central Light Rail Extension	<b>Medium</b>	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
CA Los Angeles, Westside Purple Line Extension, Section 3	<b>Medium-High</b>	High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II - Extension to San Jose and Santa Clara	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IN Lake County, West Lake Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NY New York City, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Federal Way Link Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

--- 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 2018 Project Justification Ratings

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

+++ 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.