

Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

Fiscal Year 2025

Capital Investment Grants Program and
Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program

Report of the Secretary of Transportation
to the United States Congress
Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 5309(o)(1),
Section 3005(b)(11) of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act,
and Division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

March 2024

Prepared by:
Federal Transit Administration

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

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

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
General Commitment Guidelines for Capital Investment Grants Program Projects	2
FY 2025 Funding Allocations and Recommendations.....	5

Tables

Table 1 FY 2025 Funding Proposed for Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program.....	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grants Program and Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program Projects	8
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2025 Local Financial Commitment Ratings.....	11
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2025 Project Justification Ratings.....	13

Introduction

This *Annual Report on Funding Recommendations* is issued by the United States Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) 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 (CIG) Program and Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) Pilot Program.

The Capital Investment Grants Program

The CIG Program, set forth in 49 U.S.C. § 5309 (Section 5309), was most recently authorized by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, enacted as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). In addition to funding Congress may appropriate annually, the IIJA also provided \$1.6 billion per year in advance appropriations for the CIG Program from FY 2022 through 2026.

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 (LRT), streetcars, bus rapid transit (BRT), and ferries, as well as corridor-based bus rapid transit investments that emulate the features of rail. Over the years, 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.

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 Section 5309, as amended by the IIJA, New Starts projects are those for which the sponsors request \$150 million or more in CIG Program funds or have an anticipated total capital cost of \$400 million or more. Core Capacity projects are substantial investments in existing fixed-guideway corridors that are at capacity today or will be in 10 years, where the proposed project will increase capacity by not less than 10 percent. Small Starts projects are those for which sponsors request less than \$150 million in CIG Program funds and have an anticipated total capital cost of less than \$400 million.

FTA awards Section 5309 CIG Program funding for a portion of the total project cost, including planning, design, and construction. Federal public transportation law limits New Starts projects to a maximum Section 5309 CIG Program share of 60 percent of the total project cost, while Core Capacity and Small Starts projects are limited to a maximum Section 5309 CIG Program share of 80 percent of the total project cost.

The law requires FTA to evaluate and rate all CIG projects on a set of statutorily defined project justification and local financial commitment criteria. Projects must receive and maintain a "Medium" or better overall rating to advance through the various phases of the CIG process and be eligible for CIG funding. Ratings are point-in-time evaluations by FTA and may change as

proposed projects proceed through planning and design, when information concerning costs, benefits, financial plans, and impacts is refined. The law does not require FTA to evaluate and rate projects once a construction grant agreement is awarded.

The Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program

Section 3005(b) of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act established the EPD Pilot Program, which allows FTA to select up to eight projects for participation in the pilot. Eligible projects include New Starts, Small Starts, and Core Capacity projects that are seeking no more than 25 percent in Federal grant funding, are supported in part through a public-private partnership, and will be operated and maintained by an existing public transportation provider. Similar to the requirements for the CIG Program, Section 3005(b)(11) of the FAST Act 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 and EPD Program, including the guidelines that the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) uses to make funding recommendations. Table 1 identifies the FY 2025 funding amount recommended for individual CIG and EPD projects, with information on each project's cost and funding history. Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C provide information on the CIG and EPD projects as well as the results of FTA's evaluation and rating of the CIG projects at this juncture.

Information Available on the FTA Website

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

More information on the EPD Pilot Program can be found on FTA's website at <https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/grant-programs/expedited-project-delivery-pilot-program-section-3005b>.

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, schedule, benefits, and impacts are considered

firm and final, the project sponsor has obtained all non-CIG funding commitments, and the project sponsor has completed all critical third-party agreements. Under the longstanding CIG Program framework, FTA establishes a maximum fixed CIG dollar amount upon entry into the Engineering phase for New Starts and Core Capacity projects, or at award of the construction grant agreement for Small Starts projects. Thereafter, the project sponsor assumes the risk for any cost overruns or funding shortfalls that may occur on a project.

The construction grant agreement, called either a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for New Starts and Core Capacity projects or a Small Starts Grant Agreement (SSGA) for Small Starts projects, defines the project, including its cost, scope, schedule, and level of service; commits to a maximum level of annual and total CIG financial assistance (subject to Congressional appropriation); establishes the terms and conditions of Federal financial participation; defines the period of time for completion of the project; and helps FTA oversee, and the project sponsor manage, the project in accordance with Federal law. Upon completion of the payment schedule outlined in an FFGA or SSGA, the CIG funding commitment has been fulfilled. Any additional costs are the responsibility of the project sponsor. 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. FTA recommends new projects not yet under construction grant agreements for funding only if proposed CIG Program funding levels are sufficient.

Initial planning efforts conducted prior to entry into the first phase of the CIG process are not eligible for CIG funding, but funding may be provided for that work through grants under the Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program, the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, or Title 23 "flexible funding."

FTA encourages project sponsors to provide an overmatch as a means of funding more projects and leveraging State, local, and private financial resources.

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

Table 1 FY 2025 Funding Recommendations for the Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program and the Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) Pilot Program

FTA is requesting in the President's FY 2025 Budget an appropriation of \$2.366 billion in funds for the Section 5309 CIG and EPD Programs, that when combined with the \$1.600 billion in advance appropriation, totals \$3.966 billion.

Project Name	State	Total Project Cost	CIG/EPD Amount Agreed Upon in FFGA and Engineering Approval	CIG/EPD Request	CIG/EPD Share	Total CIG/EPD Funding From Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 and Prior Years	Remaining CIG/EPD Funds Needed After FY 2023	FY 2024 CIG/EPD Total Funding (Advance plus Annual Appropriations) [@]	Remaining CIG/EPD Funding Needed After FY 2024	FY 2025 President's Budget Proposal ⁺
Existing New Starts FFGAs										
Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 2	CA	\$ 2,499,239,536	\$ 1,187,000,000		47.5%	\$ 1,021,983,701	\$ 165,016,299	\$ 165,016,299	\$ -	\$ -
^{**} Los Angeles, Westside Subway Section 3	CA	\$ 3,599,267,008	\$ 1,300,000,000		36.1%	\$ 821,983,701	\$ 478,016,299	\$ 162,339,756	\$ 315,676,543	\$ 315,676,543
^{**} Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	MN	\$ 2,003,152,549	\$ 928,840,370		46.4%	\$ 636,983,701	\$ 291,856,669	\$ 162,339,756	\$ 129,516,913	\$ 129,516,913
New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2	NY	\$ 7,699,030,840	\$ 3,404,883,991		44.2%	\$ 450,000,000	\$ 2,954,883,991	\$ 496,784,764	\$ 2,458,099,227	\$ 496,784,764
^{**} Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	WA	\$ 3,260,357,587	\$ 1,172,730,000		36.0%	\$ 921,983,701	\$ 250,746,299	\$ 162,339,755	\$ 88,406,544	\$ 88,406,544
Total for Existing New Starts FFGAs						\$ 3,852,934,804	\$ 4,140,519,557	\$ 1,148,820,330	\$ 2,991,699,227	\$ 1,030,384,764
Proposed New Starts Projects										
[^] Inglewood Transit Connector	CA	\$ 2,018,861,998	\$ 1,009,430,999		50.0%	\$ -	\$ 1,009,430,999	\$ -	\$ 1,009,430,999	\$ 200,000,000
San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II	CA	\$ 9,317,609,695	\$ 4,602,898,999		49.4%	\$ -	\$ 4,602,898,999	\$ 500,000,000	\$ 4,102,898,999	\$ -
[^] San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension	CA	\$ 8,254,785,938	\$ 4,077,864,253		49.4%	\$ -	\$ 4,077,864,253	\$ -	\$ 4,077,864,253	\$ 500,000,000
^{^&} Miami, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit Project	FL	\$ 538,069,194	\$ 263,653,905		49.0%	\$ -	\$ 263,653,905	\$ -	\$ 263,653,905	\$ 263,653,905
Chicago, Red Line Extension	IL	\$ 3,947,956,696	\$ 1,973,978,348		50.0%	\$ -	\$ 1,973,978,348	\$ 350,000,000	\$ 1,623,978,348	\$ 350,000,000
^{&} Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	NJ-NY	\$ 14,576,170,719	\$ 6,880,000,000		47.2%	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 6,552,903,085	\$ 700,000,000	\$ 5,852,903,085	\$ 700,000,000
Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	SC	\$ 625,100,843	\$ 375,060,506		60.0%	\$ -	\$ 375,060,506	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 275,060,506	\$ -
Houston, University Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project	TX	\$ 1,565,647,772	\$ 939,388,663		60.0%	\$ -	\$ 939,388,663	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 789,388,663	\$ -
[*] San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit North-South Corridor	TX	\$ 446,305,721	\$ 267,783,433		60.0%	\$ 158,080,000	\$ 109,703,433	\$ -	\$ 109,703,433	\$ 109,703,433
Other New Starts Projects That May Become Ready						\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000,000
Total for Proposed New Starts Projects						\$ 258,080,000	\$ 18,895,451,193	\$ 1,900,000,000	\$ 17,095,451,193	\$ 2,183,357,338
Proposed Core Capacity Projects										
Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	UT	\$ 1,449,090,000		\$ 1,006,525,776	69.5%	\$ 177,280,461	\$ 493,810,212	\$ 316,800,000	\$ 177,010,212	\$ -
Other Core Capacity Projects That May Become Ready						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000,000
Total for Proposed Core Capacity Projects						\$ 177,280,461	\$ 493,810,212	\$ 316,800,000	\$ 177,010,212	\$ 60,000,000
Proposed Small Starts Projects										
Monterey SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	CA	\$ 66,039,420	Not Applicable	\$ 22,170,621	33.6%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 14,036,021	\$ 14,036,021	\$ -	\$ -
Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	CO	\$ 255,308,919	Not Applicable	\$ 126,888,532	49.7%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 118,753,932	\$ 118,753,932	\$ -	\$ -
^{^&} Indianapolis, Blue Line Bus Rapid Transit	IN	\$ 371,908,298	Not Applicable	\$ 149,999,000	40.3%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 141,864,400	\$ -	\$ 141,864,400	\$ 141,864,400
Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	MN	\$ 97,999,501	Not Applicable	\$ 53,400,000	54.5%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 45,265,400	\$ 45,265,400	\$ -	\$ -
Rochester, Link Rapid Transit Project	MN	\$ 143,373,368	Not Applicable	\$ 84,917,168	59.2%	\$ 56,085,700	\$ 28,831,468	\$ 28,831,468	\$ -	\$ -
^{^&} Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit	NC	\$ 183,000,000	Not Applicable	\$ 146,400,000	80.0%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 138,265,400	\$ -	\$ 138,265,400	\$ 138,265,400
Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor	NC	\$ 173,916,583	Not Applicable	\$ 85,914,792	49.4%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 77,780,192	\$ 77,780,192	\$ -	\$ -
^{^&} San Antonio, Advanced Rapid Transit East-West Corridor	TX	\$ 289,171,729	Not Applicable	\$ 142,850,880	49.4%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 134,716,280	\$ -	\$ 134,716,280	\$ 134,716,280
Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	UT	\$ 103,417,257	Not Applicable	\$ 62,797,257	60.7%	\$ 8,134,600	\$ 54,662,657	\$ 54,662,657	\$ -	\$ -
^{^&} Madison, North-South BRT	WI	\$ 150,700,000	Not Applicable	\$ 118,131,520	78.4%	\$ -	\$ 118,131,520	\$ -	\$ 118,131,520	\$ 118,131,520
Other Small Starts Projects That May Become Ready						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,150,048
Total for Proposed Small Starts Projects						\$ 121,162,500	\$ 872,307,270	\$ 339,329,670	\$ 532,977,600	\$ 592,127,648
Proposed Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program										
Los Angeles East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Phase 1	CA	\$ 3,635,449,261		\$ 908,750,000	25.0%	\$ 841,800,000	\$ 66,950,000	\$ 66,950,000	\$ -	\$ -
Other EPD Pilot Program Projects that May Become Ready						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000,000
Total for EPD Pilot Program						\$ 741,800,000	\$ 166,950,000	\$ 66,950,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000,000
FTA Oversight (1%)								\$ 38,100,000		\$ 39,655,250
GRAND TOTAL								\$ 3,810,000,000	\$ 20,797,138,231	\$ 3,965,525,000

The cost and CIG request shown on this table may differ from what is reflected in Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C of this report. This is because those tables reflect only information for which FTA has received a formal submittal and completed its review. This table, by contrast, is based on the latest information submitted to FTA with a request from the project sponsor to advance to the next stage of the CIG process. FTA's review of the updated information may not yet be complete.

The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA when the project enters the Engineering phase. The amounts shown here reflect the project sponsors' latest information, but may change.

[@] Because a full year FY 2024 appropriation has not yet been enacted by Congress, FTA is assuming a full year continuing resolution is received in FY 2024. The FY 2024 assumptions for each project have an effect on the FY 2025 budget proposals. If appropriations/allocations in FY 2024 differ from the assumptions shown herein, then FY 2025 CIG/EPD funding needs for various projects may change.

⁺ For FY 2025 annual appropriations, FTA is proposing that Congress include no required funding levels to any category of projects (New Starts, Core Capacity, Small Starts or EPD Pilot Program) and instead provide FTA flexibility in moving the funding among categories to meet project needs. FTA is also proposing an administrative provision that the second through sixth provisos under the heading "Federal Transit Administration--Capital Investment Grants" in division J of Public Law 117-58 shall not apply in fiscal year 2025 to amounts made available under such heading in such Act.

^{*} CIG/EPD Funding for the project would be completed with the FY 2025 request.

[#] The FY 2023 Consolidated Appropriations Act provided \$425 M for existing New Starts and Core Capacity FFGAs to supplement their CIG funding. The law directed that this funding is not to count toward the CIG funding specified in the FFGA. Allocations of this special funding are not included in the column on this table showing total funding appropriated/allocated in FY 2023 and prior years. A Full Year FY 2024 CR would provide a similar amount of funding that would not count toward the CIG funding specified in the FFGA.

[^] FY 2025 proposal would be the first time the project has been recommended for funding in the President's budget.

[&] The Hudson Tunnel project is a joint intercity rail and public transportation project. The latest overall project cost submitted to FTA is \$16.1 billion, with a public transportation component of \$14.7 billion. Per 49 U.S.C § 5309(g) CIG funding may only be used on the public transportation component of the project.

FY 2025 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

FTA is requesting in the FY 2025 President’s Budget an appropriation of \$2.366 billion for the Section 5309 CIG and EPD Programs, that when combined with the \$1.600 billion in advance appropriations totals \$3.966 billion.¹ The proposed distribution of this funding is as follows:

- \$1.030 billion for four existing New Starts FFGAs;
- \$2.123 billion for six New Starts projects not yet under construction grants;
- \$60.0 million for New Starts projects that may become ready for construction funding during FY 2025;
- \$60.0 million for Core Capacity projects that may become ready for construction funding during FY 2025;
- \$533.0 million for four Small Starts projects not yet under construction grants;
- \$59.2 million for Small Starts projects that may become ready for construction funding during FY 2025;
- \$60.0 million for projects under the Section 3005(b) EPD Pilot Program that may become ready for construction funding during FY 2025; and
- \$39.7 million for management and oversight (1.0% of the FY 2025 funding level).

FTA is proposing funding for New Starts, Core Capacity, Small Starts, and EPD Pilot Program projects that are not yet currently ready for a funding recommendation but might successfully advance and become ready for construction funding in FY 2025. 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.

Because a full-year FY 2024 appropriation has not yet been enacted by Congress, FTA is assuming a full-year continuing resolution for FY 2024, but without specified funding levels for the various categories of projects (New Starts, Small Starts, Core Capacity, and EPD Pilot Program) for either the annual appropriations or the advance appropriations. The FY 2024 program funding level and assumed allocations for each project shown in Table 1 of this report have an effect on the FY 2025 budget proposal. If appropriations amounts and allocations in FY 2024 differ from the assumptions shown in Table 1, then FY 2025 funding needs for various projects may change.

Project Evaluation and Ratings

The CIG project evaluation and ratings included in this report are based on a process specified in statute. Section 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

¹ Pursuant to Division J of the IIJA, the potential projects that may receive FY 2025 advance appropriations funding are those that have entered the CIG or EPD programs. As new projects enter the CIG or EPD Programs, the Department updates the relevant congressional committees.

advance in the CIG process toward a construction grant agreement, a project must be rated *Medium* or better overall. FTA awards CIG construction grant agreements only once the project sponsor can assure FTA that the proposed project scope, cost estimate, schedule, and budget are firm and reliable, all non-CIG funding commitments are in place, and all critical third-party agreements are completed. Once a project receives a construction grant agreement, FTA does not have to continue to evaluate and rate the project.

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

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

Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C present information on CIG and EPD projects, including the ratings for projects currently in the Project Development or Engineering phase of the CIG Program. Table 2A is the Summary of FY 2025 CIG and EPD Projects; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2025 Local Financial Commitment Ratings for CIG projects; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY 2025 Project Justification Ratings for CIG projects.

The latest information on CIG projects in the Project Development and Engineering phases can be found on the FTA website at <https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/grant-programs/capital-investments/capital-investment-grant-cig-dashboard>. In some cases, the cost and CIG request for each project listed in Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C may not match the data contained on the public dashboard. This is because the information contained in these tables is based on FTA's completed review of formal submittals from project sponsors. As projects progress through planning and design, project costs can and often do change before project sponsors formally submit updated information to FTA and such information is included on the public dashboard.

Between publication of the FY 2024 *Annual Report* in March 2023, and publication of this report in March 2024, FTA awarded eight construction grant agreements. At the time of publication of this *Annual Report*, there is an additional grant award pending. In addition, FTA approved four projects into the New Starts Engineering phase, with one project pending approval. Lastly, two projects entered the New Starts Project Development phase, and ten projects entered the Small Starts Project Development phase. These approvals are listed below:

New Starts Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since March 2023

- MN St. Paul Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit
- NY New York City Second Avenue Subway Phase 2

Small Starts Projects Awarded Construction Grant Agreements since March 2023

- CA San Bernardino West Valley Connector
- PA Pittsburgh Downtown-Uptown-Oakland BRT
- TX Austin Expo Center Bus Rapid Transit
- TX Austin Pleasant Valley Bus Rapid Transit
- WA Seattle RapidRide J Line BRT
- WI Madison East West Bus Rapid Transit

Small Starts Project Construction Grant Agreement pending as of March 2024

- NV Las Vegas Maryland Parkway BRT

New Starts Projects Approved into Engineering since March 2023

- CA Inglewood Inglewood Transit Connector Project
- IL Chicago Red Line Extension
- NJ-NY Secaucus Hudson Tunnels
- TX San Antonio Advanced Rapid Transit North-South Corridor

New Starts Project Pending Entry into Engineering as of March 2024

- CA San Francisco Transbay Downtown Rail Extension

New Starts Projects that Entered Project Development since March 2023

- AZ Phoenix Capital Extension
- WA-OR Vancouver/Portland Interstate Bridge Replacement Program

Small Starts Projects that Entered Project Development since March 2023

- AL Huntsville University-Medical BRT
- AZ Tucson High-Capacity Transit Project
- CO Denver Federal Boulevard BRT
- LA New Orleans East West Bank BRT Corridor
- OH Cincinnati Hamilton Avenue Corridor BRT
- OH Cincinnati Reading Road Corridor BRT
- TX Houston METRORapid Gulfport Corridor
- UT Salt Lake City Davis-Salt Lake City Community Connector
- WA Spokane Division Street BRT
- WI Madison North South BRT

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grants Program Summary of FY 2025 Project Ratings

The latest information on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard.

This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS								
Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
Core Capacity Engineering NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	\$336.8	\$36.2	\$372.9	\$100.0	26.8%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
Core Capacity Project Development *								
^ MA Boston, Green Line Transformation Program	\$2,100.0	---	\$2,100.0	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	\$966.2	---	\$966.2	\$671.1	69.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium

* The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. For projects that are not yet in Engineering, the CIG request amount shown here may change.

^ Project Development 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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

NEW STARTS PROJECTS								
Phase State, City, Project	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
New Starts Engineering								
CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector	\$1,890.0	\$128.9	\$2,018.9	\$1,211.0	60.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
IL Chicago, Red Line Extension	\$3,648.8	\$299.1	\$3,948.0	\$2,368.8	60.0%	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
# MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	\$13,144.5	\$2,504.5	\$15,649.0	\$7,409.0	47.3%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	\$593.5	\$31.6	\$625.1	\$375.1	60.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
TX San Antonio, VIA Advanced Rapid Transit North/South Corridor Project	\$446.3	---	\$446.3	\$267.8	60.0%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
New Starts Project Development *								
^ AZ Phoenix, Capitol Extension Project	\$499.0	---	\$499.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA Livermore, Valley Link Rail Project Phase 1	\$1,800.0	---	\$1,800.0	\$450.0	25.0%	---	---	---
^ CA Los Angeles, Southeast Gateway Line	\$4,900 - \$5,100	---	\$4,900 - \$5,100	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension	\$7,879.4	\$375.4	\$8,254.8	\$4,077.9	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension	\$8,752.7	\$565.0	\$9,317.6	\$4,602.9	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
FL Miami-Dade County, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit Project	\$538.1	---	\$538.1	\$263.7	49.0%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT	\$445.0	---	\$445.0	\$218.0	49.0%	---	---	---
TX Houston, University Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$1,559.6	\$6.0	\$1,565.6	\$939.4	60.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	\$730.0	---	\$730.0	\$285.0	39.0%	---	---	---
^ WA-OR Vancouver/Portland, Interstate Bridge Replacement Program	\$1,800.0	---	\$1,800.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ WA Seattle, Ballard Link Extension	\$9,000.0	---	\$9,000.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ WA Seattle, West Seattle Link Extension	\$3,200.0	---	\$3,200.0	---	---	---	---	---

In March 2021, the project sponsor began a process of public outreach on several revised alignments under consideration.

* The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amount shown here may change.

^ Project Development 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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

Table 2A -- Capital Investment Grants Program Summary of FY 2025 Project Ratings

The latest information on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard.

This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS								
Phase	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total CIG Funding Request (millions)	CIG Share of Capital Costs	Local Financial Commitment Rating	Project Justification Rating	Overall Project Rating
State, City, Project								
Small Starts Project Development								
^ AL Huntsville, University-Medical BRT	\$49.0	---	\$49.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ AZ Tucson, Tucson High-Capacity Transit Project	\$117 - \$137	---	\$117 - \$137	---	---	---	---	---
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$66.0	---	\$66.0	\$22.2	33.6%	High	Medium	Medium-High
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	\$117.0	---	\$117.0	\$50.0	42.7%	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
CO Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	\$255.3	---	\$255.3	\$126.9	49.7%	High	Medium-High	High
^ CO Denver, Federal Boulevard BRT	\$300.0	---	\$300.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth BRT Corridor Project	\$74.3	---	\$74.3	---	---	---	---	---
^ FL Broward County, Broward Commuter Rail South	\$297.0	---	\$297.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ FL Miami-Dade County, East-West Corridor Rapid Transit Phase 1 Project	\$281.0	---	\$281.0	\$92.7	33.0%	---	---	---
^ FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	\$175 - \$225	---	\$175 - \$225	---	---	---	---	---
& FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension and Modernization	\$234.5	---	\$234.5	\$99.9	42.6%	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
^ GA Atlanta, Campbellton CIC BRT	\$274.7	---	\$274.7	---	---	---	---	---
^ GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	\$338.1	---	\$338.1	\$150.0	44.4%	---	---	---
^ IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$360.5	\$11.4	\$371.9	\$150.0	40.3%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ LA New Orleans, East-West Bank BRT Corridor	\$326.0	---	\$326.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ MD Montgomery County, Veirs Mill Road Flash BRT	\$102.0	---	\$102.0	---	---	---	---	---
MN Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$98.0	---	\$98.0	\$53.4	54.5%	Medium	Medium	Medium
MN Rochester, Link Rapid Transit Project	\$143.4	---	\$143.4	\$84.9	59.2%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit (NSBRT)	\$179.0	\$4.0	\$183.0	\$146.4	80.0%	Medium	Medium	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor Project	\$173.9	---	\$173.9	\$85.9	49.4%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor	\$180.0	---	\$180.0	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$305.0	---	\$305.0	\$150.0	49.2%	High	Medium	Medium-High
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	\$258.8	---	\$258.8	\$97.2	37.5%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ OH Cincinnati, Hamilton Avenue Corridor BRT Project	\$143.6	---	\$143.6	---	---	---	---	---
^ OH Cincinnati, Reading Road Corridor BRT Project	\$150.0	---	\$150.0	---	---	---	---	---
^ OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	\$50.0	---	\$50.0	\$20.0	40.0%	---	---	---
^ OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	\$220 - \$230	---	\$220 - \$230	---	---	---	---	---
^ OH Columbus, West Broad Street Bus Rapid Transit	\$180 - \$190	---	\$180 - \$190	---	---	---	---	---
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	\$71.7	\$1.7	\$73.3	\$46.0	62.8%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TX Houston, METRORapid Gulfon Corridor Project	\$220.0	---	\$220.0	---	---	---	---	---
TX San Antonio, VIA Advanced Rapid Transit East/West Corridor Project	\$289.2	---	\$289.2	\$142.9	49.4%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
^ UT Salt Lake City, Davis-Salt Lake City Community Connector	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	\$103.4	---	\$103.4	\$62.8	60.7%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	\$141.1	---	\$141.1	\$66.7	47.3%	High	Medium	Medium-High
^ WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	\$89.8	---	\$89.8	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Culture Connector	\$285.5	---	\$285.5	\$75.0	26.3%	High	Medium-High	High
^ WA Spokane, Division Street Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$202.0	---	\$202.0	---	---	---	---	---
WI Madison, Madison North-South Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$146.9	\$3.8	\$150.7	\$118.1	78.4%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ WI Milwaukee, North-South BRT	\$148.2	---	\$148.2	---	---	---	---	---

^ Project Development 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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

+++ In September 2020, the project sponsor adopted a shortened project alignment but has not yet provided FTA with the information needed to update the rating.

& In February 2021, the Florida Supreme Court ruled a key funding source is unconstitutional.

Table 2A-EPD -- Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program Summary for FY 2025

<u>EXPEDITED PROJECT DELIVERY (EPD) PROJECTS</u>	Capital Cost (millions)	Financing Costs (millions)	Total Capital Cost (millions)	Total EPD Funding Request (millions)	EPD Share of Capital Costs	Project Selection
State, City, Project						
New Starts EPD						
CA Los Angeles, East San Fernando Valley (ESFV) Transit Corridor Phase 1 Project	\$3,575.5	\$60.0	\$3,635.4	\$908.8	25.0%	Letter of Intent

Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2025 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

The latest information on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard.

This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS Phase State, City, Project	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
Core Capacity Engineering NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	Medium	High	Medium-Low	26.8%	Medium-High
Core Capacity Project Development * MA Boston, Green Line Transformation Program	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	69.5%	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.

"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.

* The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amount shown here may change.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

NEW STARTS PROJECTS Phase State, City, Project	Local Financial Commitment Factors				Local Financial Commitment Summary Rating
	Current Financial Condition Rating	Commitment of Funds Rating	Reasonableness of the Financial Plan Rating	CIG Share of Capital Costs	
New Starts Engineering CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	60.0%	Medium
IL Chicago, Red Line Extension	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	60.0%	Medium
# MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	TBD	Under Review
NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	47.3%	Medium-High
TX San Antonio, VIA Advanced Rapid Transit North/South Corridor Project	High	High	Medium-Low	60.0%	Medium-High
SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	High	High	Medium-Low	60.0%	Medium-High
New Starts Project Development * AZ Phoenix, Capitol Extension Project	---	---	---	---	---
CA Livermore, Valley Link Rail Project Phase 1	---	---	---	25.0%	---
CA Los Angeles, Southeast Gateway Line	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	49.4%	Medium-High
CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension	Medium-High	Medium-High	Low	49.4%	Medium-High
FL Miami-Dade County, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit Project	Medium-High	High	Medium	49.0%	High
MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT	---	---	---	49.0%	---
TX Houston, University Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	60.0%	Medium
VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT	---	---	---	39.0%	---
WA-OR Vancouver/Portland, Interstate Bridge Replacement Program	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Ballard Link Extension	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, West Seattle 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.

In March 2021, the project sponsor began a process of public outreach on several revised alignments under consideration.

* The CIG amount for each New Starts and Core Capacity project is determined by FTA at the time the project enters the Engineering phase. The amount shown here may change.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2025 Local Financial Commitment Ratings

The latest information on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard. This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

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	
Small Starts Project Development					
AL Huntsville, University-Medical BRT	---	---	---	---	---
AZ Tucson, Tucson High-Capacity Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.6%	High
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	42.7%	Under Review
CO Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.7%	High
CO Denver, Federal Boulevard BRT	---	---	---	---	---
CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth BRT Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---
FL Broward County, Broward Commuter Rail South	---	---	---	---	---
FL Miami-Dade County, East-West Corridor Rapid Transit Phase 1 Project	---	---	---	33.0%	---
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---
& FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension and Modernization	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	42.6%	Under Review
GA Atlanta, Campbellton CIC BRT	---	---	---	---	---
GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	---	---	---	44.4%	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	40.3%	High
LA New Orleans, East-West Bank BRT Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
MD Montgomery County, Veirs Mill Road Flash BRT	---	---	---	---	---
MN Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	54.5%	Medium
MN Rochester, Link Rapid Transit Project	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	59.2%	Medium-High
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit (NSBRT)	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.0%	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor Project	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	49.4%	High
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	49.2%	High
NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	37.5%	High
OH Cincinnati, Hamilton Avenue Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---
OH Cincinnati, Reading Road Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---
OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	---	---	---	40.0%	---
OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, West Broad Street Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	---	---
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	62.8%	Medium
TX Houston, METRORapid Gulfport Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---
TX San Antonio, VIA Advanced Rapid Transit East/West Corridor Project	High	Medium	Medium-Low	49.4%	Medium-High
UT Salt Lake City, Davis-Salt Lake City Community Connector	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	Medium-High	High	Medium	60.7%	Medium-High
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.3%	High
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Culture Connector	N/A	N/A	N/A	26.3%	High
WA Spokane, Division Street Bus Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---
WI Madison, Madison North-South Bus Rapid Transit Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	78.4%	Medium
WI Milwaukee, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---

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.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

+++ In September 2020, the project sponsor adopted a shortened project alignment but has not yet provided FTA with the information needed to update the rating.

& In February 2021, the Florida Supreme Court ruled a key funding source is unconstitutional.

"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 2025 Project Justification Ratings

The latest information on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard.

This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

CORE CAPACITY PROJECTS							
Phase State, City, Project	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Capacity Needs Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Core Capacity Engineering NY New York City, Canarsie Line Power and Station Improvements	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
Core Capacity Project Development MA Boston, Green Line Transformation Program UT Salt Lake City, FrontRunner Strategic Double Track Project	--- Medium	--- Medium-Low	--- High	--- Not Rated	--- Medium	--- Medium	--- Medium

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

NEW STARTS PROJECTS							
Phase 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
New Starts Engineering CA Inglewood, Inglewood Transit Connector IL Chicago, Red Line Extension # MN Minneapolis, METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) NJ-NY Secaucus, Hudson Tunnel TX San Antonio, VIA Advanced Rapid Transit North/South Corridor Project SC Charleston, Lowcountry Rapid Transit	Medium Medium-High Under Review Medium Medium-High Medium	Low Medium-High Under Review High Medium-Low Medium-Low	Medium Medium-High Under Review Low Medium-Low Medium-Low	Low Medium Under Review High Medium-High Medium-Low	Medium-High Medium Under Review Medium-High Medium Medium	Medium Medium-High Under Review High Medium Medium	Medium Medium-High Under Review Medium-High Medium Medium
New Starts Project Development AZ Phoenix, Capitol Extension Project CA Livermore, Valley Link Rail Project Phase 1 CA Los Angeles, Southeast Gateway Line CA San Francisco, Transbay Downtown Rail Extension CA San Jose, BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension FL Miami-Dade County, Northeast Corridor Rapid Transit Project MN Twin Cities, METRO Purple Line BRT TX Houston, University Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project VA Fairfax County, Richmond Highway BRT WA-OR Vancouver/Portland, Interstate Bridge Replacement Program WA Seattle, Ballard Link Extension WA Seattle, West Seattle Link Extension	--- --- --- Medium-High Medium Medium-High --- Medium-Low --- --- --- --- ---	--- --- --- Medium Medium Medium --- Medium --- --- --- ---	--- --- --- Medium Medium Medium --- Medium --- --- --- ---	--- --- --- Low Low Medium-Low --- Medium-Low --- --- --- ---	--- --- --- Medium-High High Medium --- Medium-Low --- --- --- ---	--- --- --- High Medium-High Medium --- Medium --- --- --- ---	--- --- --- Medium Medium Medium --- Medium --- --- --- ---

In March 2021, the project sponsor began a process of public outreach on several revised alignments under consideration.

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

Table 2C -- Detailed Summary of FY 2025 Project Justification Ratings

The latest information on CIG projects can be found on the FTA public website dashboard. In some cases, the data in this table may not match the latest data on the dashboard.

This is because the information below is based on FTA's completed reviews of formal submittals from project sponsors.

SMALL STARTS PROJECTS	Environmental Benefits Rating	Mobility Improvements Rating	Congestion Relief Rating	Cost Effectiveness Rating	Economic Development Rating	Land Use Rating	Project Justification Summary Rating
Phase State, City, Project							
Small Starts Project Development							
AL Huntsville, University-Medical BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
AZ Tucson, Tucson High-Capacity Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CA Monterey Bay, SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium	Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium
+++ CA Sacramento, Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
CO Denver, East Colfax Avenue BRT	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
CO Denver, Federal Boulevard BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CO Fort Collins, West Elizabeth BRT Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Broward County, Broward Commuter Rail South	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Miami-Dade County, East-West Corridor Rapid Transit Phase 1 Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Orlando, SunRail Connector to the Orlando International Airport	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
& FL Tampa, Tampa Streetcar Extension and Modernization	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review	Under Review
GA Atlanta, Campbellton CIC BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
GA Atlanta, Clayton Southlake BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IN Indianapolis, IndyGo Blue Line Bus Rapid Transit	High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
LA New Orleans, East-West Bank BRT Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MD Montgomery County, Veirs Mill Road Flash BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
■ MN Minneapolis, METRO F Line Bus Rapid Transit	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
MN Rochester, Link Rapid Transit Project	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
NC Chapel Hill, North-South Bus Rapid Transit (NSBRT)	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Southern Corridor Project	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
NC Raleigh, Wake Bus Rapid Transit: Western Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NV Las Vegas, Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium
■ NY New York City, Woodhaven Boulevard Select Bus Service	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium
OH Cincinnati, Hamilton Avenue Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Cincinnati, Reading Road Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Cleveland, MetroHealth Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, East Main Street BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, West Broad Street Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TN Memphis, Memphis Innovation Corridor Project	Medium	Medium-Low	Low	High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
TX Houston, METRORapid Gulfport Corridor Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX San Antonio, VIA Advanced Rapid Transit East/West Corridor Project	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium
UT Salt Lake City, Davis-Salt Lake City Community Connector	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Salt Lake County, Midvalley Connector	High	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium
WA Seattle, RapidRide I Line	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium
WA Seattle, RapidRide K Line BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Seattle, Culture Connector	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	Medium-High
WA Spokane, Division Street Bus Rapid Transit Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WI Madison, Madison North-South Bus Rapid Transit Project	Medium-Low	Low	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
WI Milwaukee, North-South BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

--- The project sponsor has not yet requested a rating.

+++ In September 2020, the project sponsor adopted a shortened project alignment but has not yet provided FTA with the information needed to update the rating.

& In February 2021, the Florida Supreme Court ruled a key funding source is unconstitutional.

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