

Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Investment Grant Program

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

2015

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 2016 Funding Allocations and Recommendations	6

Tables and Maps

Table 1 FY 2016 Funding for Capital Investment Grant Program	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grant Program FY 2016 Project Ratings.....	9
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2016 Local Financial Commitment Ratings	10
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2016 Project Justification Ratings	11
Map of Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements With Remaining Funding Needs ...	12
Map of Projects in Project Development and Engineering.....	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 Program outlined in 49 USC 5309, was most recently authorized in July 2012 by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act¹ (MAP-21). On July 31, 2014, Congress passed the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, which extended MAP-21 through May 31, 2015.

The Capital Investment Grant Program is the Federal Government's primary financial resource for supporting transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. The majority of the projects are fixed-guideway transit projects, meaning they use or occupy a separate right-of-way such as rails, catenaries, or exclusive bus lanes. This includes rapid rail, light rail, streetcar, commuter rail, and bus rapid transit (BRT). However, ferry projects and corridor-based BRT projects that do not use an exclusive bus lane but have other characteristics similar to rail transit service are also eligible. The program has helped to make possible dozens of new or extended transit systems across the country. These public transportation investments, in turn, have improved the mobility and quality of life of millions of Americans, provided alternatives to congested roadways, and fostered the development of more economically vibrant communities.

MAP-21 includes three categories of eligible projects under the Capital Investment Grant Program, referred to as New Starts, Core Capacity, and Small Starts projects. Under MAP-21, New Starts and Core Capacity projects go through three phases - Project Development, Engineering, and Construction. Small Starts projects go through two phases - Project Development and Construction. New Starts projects are those whose sponsors request \$75 million or more in Capital Investment Grant Program funds or have an anticipated total capital cost of \$250 million or more. Core Capacity projects are substantial investments in an existing fixed-guideway corridor that is 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 defined as those whose sponsors request less than \$75 million in Capital Investment Grant Program funds and have an anticipated total capital cost of less than \$250 million. All projects must be evaluated and rated on a set of statutorily defined project justification and local financial commitment criteria and receive and maintain at least a "Medium" overall rating to advance through the various phases and be eligible for funding.

As reflected in this report, FTA is proposing in its FY 2016 Budget Request to Congress that the amount of funding allowed for FTA oversight activities be increased from the 1 percent allowed under MAP-21 to 1.5 percent. The increase will help FTA mitigate the cost and schedule risks

¹ The mandate for the *Annual Report* (49 USC 5309(o)(1)) is a continuation of the detailed reporting requirement established by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) in 1998, reauthorized by SAFETEA-LU in August 2005, and reauthorized by MAP-21 in July 2012.

associated with the increasing number of mega projects with total project capital costs over \$1 billion.

This Report provides general information about the Capital Investment Grant Program, including the guidelines that the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) uses to make funding recommendations for proposed projects in the development pipeline and for projects currently in construction. Table 1 identifies the FY 2016 funding amount recommended for individual projects, with information on each project's cost and funding history. Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C provide the results of FTA's evaluation and rating of the projects.

Information Available on the FTA Web Site

More information on the Capital Investment Grant 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 Capital Investment Grant program pipeline in the row 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 Commitment Guidelines for Capital Investment Projects

- Any project recommended for a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) or Small Starts Grant Agreement (SSGA) should meet the project justification, local financial commitment, and process criteria established in Section 5309, and should be consistent with Executive Order 12893, *Principles for Federal Infrastructure Investments*, issued January 26, 1994.
- To the extent that funds can be obligated by FTA in the coming fiscal year under existing FFGAs and SSGAs, these commitments should be honored before any new funding recommendations are made.
- The FFGA or SSGA defines the project including its cost, scope, schedule, and level of service; commits to a maximum level of annual and total Capital Investment Grant Program financial assistance (subject to Congressional appropriation); establishes the terms and conditions of Federal financial participation; defines the period of time for completion of the project, and helps FTA and the project sponsor manage the project in accordance with Federal law. Upon completion of an FFGA or SSGA, the Section 5309 funding commitment has been fulfilled. Additional Section 5309 funding will not be recommended. Any additional costs beyond the scope of the commitment outlined in the FFGA or SSGA are the responsibility of the project sponsor. FTA works closely with project sponsors to identify and implement strategies for containing capital costs at the level indicated in the FFGA or SSGA at the time it was signed.
- Initial planning efforts conducted prior to entry into the first phase of the Capital Investment Grant process are not eligible for Section 5309 funding under MAP-21, but funding may be provided through grants under the Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program, the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, or Title 23 "flexible funding."
- Firm funding commitments, embodied in FFGAs or SSGAs, will not be made until the project sponsor has demonstrated that its project is ready for such an agreement, i.e., the

project's development and design have progressed to the point where its scope, costs, benefits, and impacts are considered firm and final.

- Funding should be provided to the most qualified projects to allow them to proceed through the implementation process on a reasonable schedule, to the extent that funds can be obligated to such projects in the upcoming fiscal year.
- Funding recommendations will be based on the results of the project evaluation process and resulting project justification, local financial commitment, overall project ratings, and considerations such as project readiness and the availability of funds.
- FTA encourages project sponsors to provide an overmatch as a means of funding more projects and leveraging State and local financial resources as well as other Federal financial resources.

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

Table 1 - FY 2016 Funding for Capital Investment Grant Program

Project	Rating	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 Request	Section 5309 Share	Funds Appropriated/ Allocated Through FY15	Remaining Needs After FY15	FY16 Budget Recommendation
Totals by Project Type								
Existing New Starts Construction Grant Agreements								\$ 1,385,000,000
Recommended New Starts Projects Not Yet Under FFGAs								\$ 792,000,000
Recommended Core Capacity Funding								\$ 351,066,101
Recommended Small Starts Projects Not Yet Under SSGAs								\$ 353,183,899
Accelerated Project Delivery and Development								\$ 320,000,000
Oversight Activities								\$ 48,750,000
GRAND TOTAL								\$ 3,250,000,000

Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements With Remaining Funding Needs - Projects Are Under Construction or Open for Service								
CA Los Angeles, Regional Connector Transit Corridor	FFGA	LRT	\$ 1,402,932,490	\$ 669,900,000	47.7%	\$ 165,000,000	\$ 504,900,000	\$ 115,000,000
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	FFGA	HR	\$ 2,821,957,153	\$ 1,250,000,000	44.3%	\$ 165,000,000	\$ 1,085,000,000	\$ 115,000,000
CA San Francisco - Third Street Light Rail-Central Subway Project	FFGA	LRT	\$ 1,578,300,000	\$ 942,200,000	59.7%	\$ 619,181,899	\$ 323,018,101	\$ 165,000,000
CA San Jose - Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension	FFGA	HR	\$ 2,230,021,971	\$ 900,000,000	40.4%	\$ 552,585,423	\$ 347,414,577	\$ 165,000,000
CO Denver - RTD Eagle, Denver	FFGA	CR	\$ 2,043,143,000	\$ 1,030,449,000	50.4%	\$ 667,186,415	\$ 363,262,585	\$ 165,000,000
HI Honolulu - High Capacity Transit Corridor	FFGA	HR	\$ 5,121,693,163	\$ 1,550,000,000	30.3%	\$ 1,056,267,358	\$ 493,732,642	\$ 265,000,000
MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	FFGA	LRT	\$ 2,297,618,856	\$ 996,121,000	43.4%	TBD	TBD	\$ 165,000,000
NC Charlotte, Blue Line Extension-Northeast Corridor	FFGA	LRT	\$ 1,160,084,496	\$ 580,042,248	50.0%	\$ 305,807,660	\$ 274,234,588	\$ 115,000,000
OR Portland - Milwaukie LRT	FFGA	LRT	\$ 1,490,350,173	\$ 745,175,087	50.0%	\$ 379,510,943	\$ 365,664,144	\$ 115,000,000
Total Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements			\$ 20,146,101,302	\$ 8,663,887,335		\$ 3,910,539,698	\$ 3,757,226,637	\$ 1,385,000,000

New Starts Projects Recommended for Full Funding Grant Agreements								
CA Los Angeles Westside Section 2	MH	HR	\$ 2,374,436,573	\$ 1,187,000,000	50.0%	\$ -	\$ 1,187,000,000	+ \$ 100,000,000
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor	MH	LRT	\$ 2,112,114,987	\$ 1,043,384,804	49.4%	\$ 8,009,516	\$ 1,035,375,288	+ \$ 150,000,000
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	MH	LRT	\$ 224,295,280	\$ 92,000,000	41.0%	\$ -	\$ 92,000,000	*+ \$ 92,000,000
MD Baltimore, Red Line	MH	LRT	\$ 2,997,748,095	\$ 900,000,000	30.0%	TBD	TBD	\$ 100,000,000
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	MH	LRT	\$ 2,448,222,331	\$ 900,000,000	36.8%	TBD	TBD	\$ 100,000,000
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	MH	LRT	\$ 1,653,448,925	\$ 826,724,462	50.0%	\$ -	\$ 826,724,462	+ \$ 150,000,000
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	MH	CR	\$ 891,898,224	\$ 445,949,112	50.0%	TBD	TBD	\$ 100,000,000
Total Recommended New Starts Projects			\$ 12,702,164,414	\$ 5,395,058,378		TBD	TBD	\$ 792,000,000

Table 1 - FY 2016 Funding for Capital Investment Grant Program

Project	Rating	Mode	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 Request	Section 5309 Share	Funds Appropriated/ Allocated Through FY15	Remaining Needs After FY15	FY16 Budget Recommendation
Core Capacity (project listed for illustrative purposes only, projects not yet ready for construction grant)								\$ 351,066,101
IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project		HR						
NY Canarsie Line Power Improvements		HR						
TX Dallas DART Platform Extension		LRT						
Small Starts Projects Recommended for Small Starts Grant Agreements								
CA Fresno, FAX Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	M	BRT	\$ 48,530,694	\$ 38,824,555	80.0%	\$ 27,800,000	\$ 11,024,555	* \$ 11,024,555
CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	H	BRT	\$ 162,072,300	\$ 74,999,999	46.3%	\$ 45,396,000	\$ 29,603,999	* \$ 29,603,999
CA San Rafael to Larkspur Regional Connector	M	CR	\$ 42,532,750	\$ 22,532,873	53.0%	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 20,032,873	*+ \$ 20,032,873
NC Charlotte, CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2	MH	SC	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 74,999,999	50.0%	\$ -	\$ 74,999,999	*+ \$ 74,999,999
NV Reno, 4th St/Prater Way Corridor	MH	BRT	\$ 52,570,000	\$ 6,470,000	12.3%	\$ -	\$ 6,470,000	*+ \$ 6,470,000
OH Columbus, Cleveland Avenue BRT	M	BRT	\$ 47,667,067	\$ 38,133,654	80.0%	\$ -	\$ 38,133,654	*+ \$ 38,133,654
TX El Paso Montana Corridor BRT	M	BRT	\$ 45,516,813	\$ 26,972,509	59.3%	\$ -	\$ 26,972,509	*+ \$ 26,972,509
UT Provo Orem BRT	MH	BRT	\$ 149,927,986	\$ 74,964,311	50.0%	\$ 4,018,000	\$ 70,946,311	*+ \$ 70,946,311
WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Light Rail Expansion	MH	LRT	\$ 166,008,514	\$ 74,999,999	45.2%	\$ -	\$ 74,999,999	*+ \$ 74,999,999
Total Small Starts			\$ 864,826,123	\$ 432,897,898		\$ 79,714,000	\$ 353,183,898	\$ 353,183,899
Accelerated Project Delivery and Development^								\$ 320,000,000

Ratings abbreviations -- L=Low; ML=Medium-Low; M=Medium; MH=Medium-High; H=High

Mode abbreviations -- BRT=bus rapid transit; CR=commuter rail; HR=heavy rail; LRT=light rail transit; SC=streetcar

TBD = Allocation of FY 2015 funds is to be determined as the projects become ready for FFGAs. Legislative language directs FTA to "give funding priority to projects requiring a 40 percent or less Federal share."

+ Indicates first time included as a funding recommendation in the President's Budget.

* Indicates completion of FTA commitment to the project with proposed FY16 budget recommendation

^ For projects that may become ready for construction grant agreements during FY 2016, accelerated project development work including planning activities, and not less than \$75 million for projects in Small Urban/Rural areas with less than 200,000 in population meeting a set of new eligibility parameters and streamlined evaluation criteria.

The FY 2016 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

FTA is recommending a total appropriation of \$3,250 million in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grant Program funds in FY 2016. FTA recommends it be distributed as follows:

- \$1,385.00 million for nine existing FFGAs
- \$ 792.00 million to seven proposed New Starts Projects
- \$ 351.07 million for Core Capacity projects
- \$ 353.18 million to nine proposed Small Starts Projects
- \$ 320.00 million for Accelerated Project Development and Delivery Incentive category
- \$ 48.75 million for management and oversight (1.5% of the FY 2016 funding level.)

The funding proposed for the existing FFGAs shown above includes the negotiated payment outlined in each FFGA plus an additional \$15 million for each project. FTA believes accelerating FFGA payments can not only potentially lower financing costs incurred on these projects, but also allow FTA to better manage the overall program given the ever growing demand for funds.

The FY 2016 budget proposal also includes \$320 million for an “Accelerated Project Development and Delivery” category. This is proposed to be distributed as described below:

1. Approximately \$120 million would be for New and Small Starts projects currently in the program pipeline that were unable to receive a rating and funding recommendation at the time of the President’s FY 2016 budget submittal, but potentially could receive an acceptable rating of *Medium* or higher prior to the conclusion of FY 2016. This could include :
 - The Orlando SunRail Phase 2 South, Orlando SunRail Phase 2 North, and Sacramento Downtown Riverfront Streetcar projects that did not submit sufficient information to provide FTA with the necessary confidence at the time of the preparation of the FY 2016 President’s budget that they would receive the *Medium* or better overall rating required by statute to be recommended for a construction grant agreement. Funding in the “Accelerated Delivery” category can be assigned to these projects if the uncertainties are resolved and FTA agrees to advance them to construction grant agreements prior to September 30, 2016.
 - Other projects currently in FTA’s Capital Investment Grant pipeline that may be ready for a construction grant agreement before the conclusion of FY 2016, but were not able to prepare and submit the information required to be evaluated and rated for the President’s FY 2016 Budget. Importantly, FTA has been encouraging project sponsors to submit information for evaluation and rating on an on-going basis throughout the year, not simply by one fixed deadline for annual budget considerations. By providing projects in the pipeline the potential to advance to construction grant agreements when they are ready, rather than making them wait for the next federal budget cycle to be completed, an opportunity exists to advance the projects more quickly and thereby minimize cost escalation and possible financing costs. To the extent that pipeline projects can be advanced after the FY 2016 Budget

submittal, but sooner than the FY 2017 Budget submittal, they would be eligible for some portion of the funding proposed in this category.

2. Approximately \$200 million would be for Accelerated Project Development work for communities that have found it challenging to advance local resources for this purpose. Not less than \$75 million of this amount would be for a newly proposed subsection under Section 5309 that would set aside funding for areas under 200,000 in population (small urban and rural areas) seeking to implement corridor or regional based bus service with premium features such as use of advanced technologies, branding, and other amenities, that could meet a set of streamlined evaluation criteria.

Project Evaluation and Ratings

The Capital Investment Grant project evaluation and ratings included in this report are based on a process specified in statute. MAP-21 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, a project must be rated *Medium* or higher overall. Receipt of project funding through a construction grant is subject to Congressional appropriation, and is only obligated when the grantee can assure FTA that the proposed project scope, cost estimate, and budget are firm and reliable and local funding commitments are in place. Once a project receives a construction grant 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. 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 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 for projects that have not yet been recommended for FFGAs or SSGAs should not be construed as statements about the ultimate ratings of those projects. Rather, the ratings provide assessments of the projects' strengths and weaknesses at the time they were rated.

Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C present the ratings for all projects currently advancing through the process. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2016 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2016 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY2016 Project Justification Ratings.

Since publication of the FY 2015 *Annual Report* in April 2014, three projects received construction grant agreements. Another is in the final stages of review prior to receipt of a construction grant agreement. In addition, two projects entered the New Starts Engineering phase and eleven projects entered the New Starts, Small Starts, or Core Capacity Project Development phase. These include the following:

New Starts Projects that Received Full Funding Grant Agreements

- Cambridge to Medford, MA – Green Line Extension
- Los Angeles, CA – Westside Subway Extension – Section 1

Small Starts Project that Received Small Starts Grant Agreement

- Oakland, CA – East Bay BRT

Small Starts Project in the Final Stages of Review for a Small Starts Grant Agreement

- Jacksonville, FL – North Corridor Bus Rapid Transit

New Starts Projects Entered into Engineering under MAP-21

- Los Angeles, CA – Westside Purple Line Extension Section 2
- Maryland National Capital Purple Line

New Starts Projects Entered into Project Development under MAP-21

- Minneapolis, MN METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)

Small Starts Projects Entered into Project Development under MAP-21

- Albany, NY – Washington/Western BRT
- Everett, WA – Swift II Bus Rapid Transit
- Minneapolis, MN METRO Orange Line BRT
- Reno, NV Virginia Street BRT Extension
- Sacramento, CA – Downtown Riverfront Streetcar
- Salt Lake County, UT – Provo-Orem BRT
- Seattle, WA – Seattle Center City Connector Streetcar
- Tacoma, WA – Link Light Rail Expansion

Core Capacity Projects Entered into Project Development under MAP-21

- New York, NY – Canarsie Line Power Improvements
- Dallas, TX – DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions

Table 2A --Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2016 Project Ratings

Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Overall Project Rating	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating
New Starts Engineering								
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 2	\$2,273.2	\$101.2	\$2,374.4	\$1,187.0	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II South	\$183.9	\$1.0	\$184.9	\$92.4	50.0%	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	\$2,325.1	\$123.1	\$2,448.2	\$900.0	36.8%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	\$1,461.6	\$101.5	\$1,563.1	\$781.5	50.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
New Starts Project Development								
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	\$1,687.7	\$424.4	\$2,112.1	\$1,043.4	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ CO Denver, Southeast Extension	\$224.3	\$0.0	\$224.3	\$92.0	41.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
MD Baltimore, Red Line	\$2,888.9	\$108.8	\$2,997.7	\$900.0	30.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
^ MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	\$1,002.0	\$0.0	\$1,002.0	\$501.0	50.0%	---	---	---
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	\$1,588.4	\$65.0	\$1,653.4	\$826.7	50.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT Project	\$1,820.6	\$0.0	\$1,820.6	\$910.3	50.0%	---	---	---
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	\$881.0	\$10.9	\$891.9	\$445.9	50.0%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
^ WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	\$1,200.0 - 1,700.0	\$0.0	\$1,200.0 - 1,700.0	---	50.0%	---	---	---
Core Capacity Project Development								
^ IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project - Phase One	\$1,700.0	\$0.0	\$1,700.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ NY New York City, Canarsie Power Improvements	\$300.0	\$0.0	\$300.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	\$188.4	\$0.0	\$188.4	---	---	---	---	---
Small Starts Project Development								
^ AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	\$124.7	\$4.7	\$129.3	\$56.0	43.3%	---	---	---
CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	\$48.5	\$0.0	\$48.5	\$38.8	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ CA Los Angeles, Downtown Streetcar	\$153.0 - 162.0	\$0.0	\$153.0 - 162.0	\$75.0	46 - 49%	---	---	---
@ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar	\$165.9	\$0.0	\$165.9	\$75.0	45.2%	Not Rated	High	Not Rated
CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	\$162.1	\$0.0	\$162.1	\$75.0	46.3%	High	High	High
^ CA San Jose, El Camino Real Corridor BRT Project	\$188.0	\$0.0	\$188.0	\$75.0	39.9%	---	---	---
^ CA San Rafael, SMART San Rafael to Larkspur Regional Connection	\$42.5	\$0.0	\$42.5	\$22.5	53.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	\$161.9	\$0.0	\$161.9	\$59.3	36.6%	Medium-High	High	Medium
FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	\$23.9	\$0.0	\$23.9	\$19.1	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North Extension	\$68.2	\$0.5	\$68.7	\$34.3	50.0%	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated
^ IL Chicago, CTA Ashland Ave BRT Phase I Project	\$116.9	\$0.0	\$116.9	\$58.3	49.9%	---	---	---
^ MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	\$215.4	\$0.0	\$215.4	\$75.0	34.8%	---	---	---
^ MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line BRT	\$150.7	\$0.0	\$150.7	\$64.6	42.9%	---	---	---
^ NC Charlotte, CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2	\$150.0	\$0.0	\$150.0	\$75.0	50.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ NM Albuquerque, Central Ave BRT	---	\$0.0	---	---	---	---	---	---
^ NV Reno, 4th St/Prater Way Corridor	\$52.6	\$0.0	\$52.6	\$6.5	12.3%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ NV Reno, Virginia Street BRT Extension	\$27.4	\$0.0	\$27.4	---	---	---	---	---
^ NY Albany, Washington/Western BRT	\$64.0	\$0.0	\$64.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ OH Columbus, COTA Cleveland Avenue BRT Project	\$47.7	\$0.0	\$47.7	\$38.1	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	\$95.6	\$0.0	\$95.6	\$75.0	78.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TN Nashville, East-West Connector BRT (The Amp)	\$174.0	\$0.0	\$174.0	\$75.0	43.1%	Medium-High	High	Medium
TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	\$35.8	\$0.0	\$35.8	\$20.4	56.9%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TX El Paso, Montana Corridor BRT	\$45.5	\$0.0	\$45.5	\$27.0	59.3%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TX San Antonio, Downtown Modern Streetcar	\$232.0	\$0.0	\$232.0	\$75.0	32.3%	---	---	---
^ UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	\$149.9	\$0.0	\$149.9	\$75.0	50.0%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ WA Everett, Swift II Bus Rapid Transit	\$48.0	\$0.0	\$48.0	\$38.0	79.2%	---	---	---
^ WA Seattle, Center City Connector	\$110.0	\$0.0	\$110.0	\$55.0 - 75.0	50 - 68%	---	---	---
^ WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Light Rail Extension	\$166.0	\$0.0	\$166.0	\$75.0	45.2%	Medium-High	High	Medium
^ WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	\$53.0	\$0.0	\$53.0	\$38.4	72.5%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High

+++ Questions remain on the capital and operating costs submitted by the project sponsor. Therefore, FTA was unable to develop ratings for the projects. FTA will work with the project sponsor to address the matters.

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

@ FTA was unable to develop an overall rating for the project due to unreliable travel forecasts. FTA will work with the project sponsor to address the matter.

Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2016 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

Phase State, City, Project	Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating	Local Financial Commitment Factors			
		Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Program Funding Share
New Starts Engineering					
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 2	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	50%
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II South	Not Rated	---	---	---	50%
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	37%
^ TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	Medium	*	*	*	50%
New Starts Project Development					
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	Medium-High	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	49%
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	41%
MD Baltimore, Red Line	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	30%
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	---	---	---	---	50%
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	High	High	High	Medium-High	50%
NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT Project	---	---	---	---	50%
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	Medium-High	Medium-High	High	Medium-High	50%
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	---	---	---	---	50%
Core Capacity Project Development					
IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project - Phase One	---	---	---	---	---
NY New York City, Canarsie Power Improvements	---	---	---	---	---
TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	---	---	---	---	---
Small Starts Project Development					
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	---	---	---	---	43%
^ CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	Medium	*	*	*	80%
CA Los Angeles, Downtown Streetcar	---	---	---	---	46 - 49%
CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	45%
^ CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	High	*	*	*	46%
CA San Jose, El Camino Real Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	40%
CA San Rafael, SMART San Rafael to Larkspur Regional Connection	Medium	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	53%
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	37%
^ FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	Medium	*	*	*	80%
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North Extension	Not Rated	---	---	---	50%
IL Chicago, CTA Ashland Ave BRT Phase I Project	---	---	---	---	50%
MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	---	---	---	---	35%
MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line BRT	---	---	---	---	43%
NC Charlotte, CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	50%
NM Albuquerque, Central Ave BRT	---	---	---	---	---
NV Reno, 4th St/Prater Way Corridor	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	12%
NV Reno, Virginia Street BRT Extension	---	---	---	---	---
NY Albany, Washington/Western BRT	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, COTA Cleveland Avenue BRT Project	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	80%
^ OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	Medium	*	*	*	78%
TN Nashville, East-West Connector BRT (The Amp)	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	43%
^ TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	Medium	*	*	*	57%
TX El Paso, Montana Corridor BRT	Medium	Medium	High	Medium-Low	59%
TX San Antonio, Downtown Modern Streetcar	---	---	---	---	32%
UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	50%
WA Everett, Swift II Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	---	79%
WA Seattle, Center City Connector	---	---	---	---	50 - 68%
WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Light Rail Extension	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	45%
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	72%

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 projects. FTA will work with the project sponsor to address the matters.
 - This project entered Project Development (PD) under MAP-21, which does not require FTA to perform an evaluation and rating of projects entering PD.
 - * The rating shown is from the last evaluation and rating that was performed under the SAFETEA-LU process. Because the subfactors in the SAFETEA-LU process differ from those in the MAP-21 process, only the summary rating is shown.
 - ^ This project was grandfathered under the SAFETEA-LU evaluation and rating process.
- "N/A" signifies that this subfactor does not apply because the project qualified for the financial rating "warrant" outlined in FTA's August 2013 New and Small Starts Final Policy Guidance.

Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2016 Project Justification Ratings

Phase	Project Justification Summary Rating	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating
New Starts Engineering							
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 2	Medium-High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II South	Not Rated	---	---	---	---	---	---
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	Medium-High	High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
^ TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	Medium	High	Medium-High	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low
New Starts Project Development							
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	Medium-High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-Low
MD Baltimore, Red Line	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	Medium	High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Core Capacity Project Development							
IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project - Phase One	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NY New York City, Canarsie Power Improvements	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Dallas, DART Red and Blue Line Platform Extensions	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Small Starts Project Development							
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
CA Los Angeles, Downtown Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
@ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar	Not Rated	---	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	High	High	High
CA San Jose, El Camino Real Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Rafael, SMART San Rafael to Larkspur Regional Connection	Medium	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium-Low
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
^ FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
+++ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North Extension	Not Rated	---	---	---	---	---	---
IL Chicago, CTA Ashland Ave BRT Phase I Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MN Minneapolis, METRO Orange Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NC Charlotte, CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
NM Albuquerque, Central Ave BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NV Reno, 4th St/Prater Way Corridor	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Medium-Low	Medium
NV Reno, Virginia Street BRT Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NY Albany, Washington/Western BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, COTA Cleveland Avenue BRT Project	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
^ OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	High	Medium	Low
TN Nashville, East-West Connector BRT (The Amp)	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Not Rated	Medium-High	Medium
^ TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
TX El Paso, Montana Corridor BRT	Medium	High	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Low
TX San Antonio, Downtown Modern Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	Medium	High	Medium-Low	Medium	High	Medium-Low	Medium
WA Everett, Swift II Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Center City Connector	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Tacoma, Tacoma Link Light Rail Extension	Medium	High	Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	Medium	High	Medium-High	Medium

+++ Questions remain on the capital and operating costs submitted by the project sponsor. Therefore, FTA was unable to develop ratings for the projects. FTA will work with the project sponsor to address the m

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

^ This project was grandfathered under the SAFETEA-LU evaluation and rating process.

@ FTA was unable to develop an overall rating for the project due to unreliable travel forecasts. FTA will work with the project sponsor to address the matter.

"N/A" signifies that this criterion does not apply because the project rating shown is based on the SAFETEA-LU evaluation and rating process rather than the MAP-21 process.

Capital Investment Grant Program

Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements

With Remaining Funding Needs in FY 2016



Capital Investment Grant Program

Projects in Project Development and Engineering - FY 2016

