

# Annual Report on Funding Recommendations

## Fiscal Year 2015 Capital Investment Grant Program

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

**2014**

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 2015 Funding Allocations and Recommendations .....	5

## **Tables and Maps**

Table 1 FY 2015 Funding for Capital Investment Grant Program .....	4
Table 2A Summary of Capital Investment Grant Program FY 2015 Project Ratings.....	8
Table 2B Detailed Summary of FY 2015 Local Financial Commitment Ratings .....	9
Table 2C Detailed Summary of FY 2015 Project Justification Ratings .....	10
Map of Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements With Remaining Funding Needs ...	11
Map of Projects in Project Development and Engineering.....	12



## **Introduction**

This *Annual Report on Funding Recommendations* is issued by the United States Secretary of Transportation to help inform the appropriations process for the upcoming fiscal year 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, most recently authorized in July 2012 by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act<sup>1</sup> (MAP-21), 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.

Under the preceding authorization to MAP-21 — the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) — the Capital Investment Grant Program included two categories of eligible projects referred to as New Starts and Small Starts. New Starts projects were required to complete an Alternatives Analysis and go through three steps called Preliminary Engineering, Final Design, and Construction. Small Starts projects were required to complete an Alternatives Analysis and go through two steps called Project Development and Construction.

MAP-21 changed the Capital Investment Grant Program to include three categories of eligible projects, referred to as New Starts, Core Capacity, and Small Starts. It also streamlined the number of steps in the project development and funding process. Lastly, MAP-21 eliminated the exemption from the evaluation and rating that existed for projects seeking less than \$25 million in Capital Investment Grant Program funding. Although SAFETEA-LU had eliminated the exemption, it only did so once a Final Rule implementing Small Starts was completed. That Final Rule was published in January 2013.

With regard to streamlining, MAP-21 eliminated Alternatives Analysis as a stand-alone requirement under the Capital Investment Grant Program and instead, it relies on the evaluation of alternatives that occurs during the planning and environmental review processes. Under MAP-21, New Starts and Core Capacity projects go through three steps - Project Development, Engineering, and Construction. Small Starts projects go through two steps - Project

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. MAP-21 made changes to the Capital Investment Grant Program, including the creation of the Core Capacity program.

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 corridor based investments in an existing fixed-guideway system that will increase capacity in the corridor 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 steps to be eligible for funding.

MAP-21 expires on October 1, 2014. As reflected in this report, FTA is proposing in its FY 2015 Budget Request to Congress that the amount of funding allowed for FTA oversight activities be increased from 1 percent to 1.5 percent. The increase will help FTA mitigate the cost and schedule risks 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 Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 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 the 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 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 ratings may be reassessed to reflect new information.

**Table 1 - FY 2015 Funding for Capital Investment Grant Program**

Project	Rating	Total Project Cost	Section 5309 Request	Funds Appropriated/ Allocated Through FY14	Remaining Funding Needed	FY15 Budget Recommendations
<b>Totals by Project Type</b>						
Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements						\$ 1,410,137,944
Recommended New Starts Projects						\$ 578,221,561
Recommended Core Capacity Funding						\$ 275,000,000
Recommended Small Starts Projects						\$ 199,140,495
Oversight Activities						\$ 37,500,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 2,500,000,000</b>
<b>Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements With Remaining Funding Needs - Projects Are Under Construction or Open for Service</b>						
CA Los Angeles, Regional Connector Transit Corridor	FFGA	\$ 1,402,932,490	\$ 669,900,000	\$ 65,000,000	\$ 604,900,000	\$ 100,000,000
CA San Francisco - Third Street Light Rail-Central Subway Project	FFGA	\$ 1,578,300,000	\$ 942,200,000	\$ 469,181,899	\$ 473,018,101	\$ 150,000,000
CA San Jose - Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension	FFGA	\$ 2,230,021,971	\$ 900,000,000	\$ 402,585,423	\$ 497,414,577	\$ 150,000,000
CO Denver - RTD Eagle, Denver	FFGA	\$ 2,043,143,000	\$ 1,030,449,000	\$ 517,186,415	\$ 513,262,585	\$ 150,000,000
+ CT New Britain - Hartford Busway	FFGA	\$ 567,053,000	\$ 275,300,000	\$ 213,361,127	\$ 61,938,873	\$ 61,938,873
HI Honolulu - High Capacity Transit Corridor	FFGA	\$ 5,121,693,163	\$ 1,550,000,000	\$ 806,267,358	\$ 743,732,642	\$ 250,000,000
+ MN St. Paul-Min., Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project	FFGA	\$ 956,900,000	\$ 473,950,000	\$ 364,802,983	\$ 109,147,017	\$ 109,147,017
NC Charlotte, Blue Line Extension-Northeast Corridor	FFGA	\$ 1,160,084,496	\$ 580,042,248	\$ 205,807,660	\$ 374,234,588	\$ 100,000,000
+ NY New York - East Side Access	FFGA	\$ 7,386,003,583	\$ 2,632,113,826	\$ 2,584,890,866	\$ 47,222,960	\$ 47,222,960
OR Portland - Milwaukie LRT	FFGA	\$ 1,490,350,173	\$ 745,175,087	\$ 279,510,943	\$ 465,664,144	\$ 100,000,000
+ VA Northern Virginia-Dulles Wiehle Ave	FFGA	\$ 3,142,471,634	\$ 900,000,000	\$ 797,844,869	\$ 102,155,131	\$ 102,155,131
+ WA Seattle-University Link LRT Extension	FFGA	\$ 1,947,682,000	\$ 813,000,000	\$ 723,326,037	\$ 89,673,963	\$ 89,673,963
<b>Total Existing New Starts Full Funding Grant Agreements</b>		<b>\$ 29,026,635,510</b>	<b>\$ 11,512,130,161</b>	<b>\$ 7,429,765,579</b>	<b>\$ 4,082,364,582</b>	<b>\$ 1,410,137,944</b>
<b>Recommended New Starts Projects</b>						
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	High	\$ 2,821,957,153	\$ 1,250,000,000	\$ 65,000,000	\$ 1,185,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
* FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II South	Medium-High	\$ 173,599,720	\$ 86,799,860	\$ 2,427,245	\$ 84,372,615	\$ 63,221,561
* MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	Medium-High	\$ 1,656,556,658	\$ 714,406,000	\$ -	\$ 714,406,000	\$ 100,000,000
* MD Baltimore, Red Line	Medium-High	\$ 2,644,518,185	\$ 900,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 897,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
* MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	Medium-High	\$ 2,371,148,367	\$ 900,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 897,000,000	\$ 100,000,000
OR Portland, Columbia River Crossing Project	Medium-High	\$ 2,711,826,553	\$ 849,999,978	\$ 65,000,000	\$ 784,999,978	\$ 65,000,000
* TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	Medium-High	\$ 809,765,563	\$ 404,882,781	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 400,882,781	\$ 50,000,000
<b>Total Recommended New Starts Projects</b>		<b>\$ 13,189,372,198</b>	<b>\$ 5,106,088,619</b>	<b>\$ 142,427,245</b>	<b>\$ 4,963,661,374</b>	<b>\$ 578,221,561</b>
<b>Core Capacity Projects</b>						<b>\$ 275,000,000</b>
II Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project and Other Eligible Projects						
<b>Recommended Small Starts Projects</b>						
+ CA Oakland, East Bay BRT	Medium-High	\$ 177,986,172	\$ 74,999,999	\$ 47,410,000	\$ 27,589,999	\$ 27,589,999
*+ FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	Medium-High	\$ 142,589,000	\$ 49,650,000	\$ -	\$ 49,650,000	\$ 49,650,000
+ OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	Medium	\$ 95,567,000	\$ 74,999,999	\$ 24,423,479	\$ 50,576,520	\$ 50,576,520
* TN Nashville, East-West Connector BRT (The Amp)	Medium-High	\$ 173,997,855	\$ 74,999,999	\$ -	\$ 74,999,999	\$ 27,437,833
+ TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	Medium	\$ 35,892,457	\$ 20,400,000	\$ 15,237,058	\$ 5,162,942	\$ 5,162,942
*+ WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-High	\$ 53,404,002	\$ 38,723,202	\$ -	\$ 38,723,202	\$ 38,723,202
<b>Total Small Starts</b>		<b>\$ 679,436,486</b>	<b>\$ 333,773,199</b>	<b>\$ 87,070,537</b>	<b>\$ 246,702,662</b>	<b>\$ 199,140,495</b>

+ indicates completion of FTA commitment to the project

\* indicates first time included as a funding recommendation in the President's budget



## The FY 2015 Funding Allocations and Recommendations

FTA is recommending a total appropriation of \$2,500 million in Section 5309 Capital Investment Grant Program funds in FY 2015. FTA recommends it be distributed as follows:

- \$1,410.14 million for existing FFGAs
- \$ 578.22 million to proposed New Starts FFGAs
- \$ 275.00 million for Core Capacity projects
- \$ 199.14 million to proposed Small Starts SSGAs
- \$ 37.50 million for management and oversight (1.5% of the FY15 funding level.)

## Project Evaluation and Ratings

The projects included in this report are the culmination of an evaluation and rating process specified in statute. Similar to SAFETEA-LU, MAP-21 establishes a five-point rating scale for candidate Capital Investment Grant projects seeking construction grants: *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 by FTA.

MAP-21 made significant changes to the Capital Investment Grant Program evaluation and rating criteria. Projects are still rated against a number of measures for project justification and local financial commitment. For New Starts projects, MAP-21 eliminated the operating efficiencies criterion under project justification and replaced it with a congestion relief criterion. Additionally, MAP-21 specified that the cost effectiveness criterion under project justification should be measured as cost per trip. For Small Starts projects, MAP-21 increased the number of project justification criteria from three to six (the same six as under New Starts). However, MAP-21 also specified that for Small Starts projects the project justification criteria shall be considered in relation to a no-action alternative and that the rating shall be based on an evaluation of the benefits of the project as compared to the Federal assistance to be provided. Federal assistance includes not only the funding from the Capital Investment Grant Program assumed but from any other Federal source as well.

FTA no longer requires project sponsors to submit annual information for evaluation and rating in the *Annual Report*, unless significant issues were raised in prior year evaluations that warranted a rerating or there was a significant change to the project.

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 2015 Project Ratings; Table 2B is the Detailed Summary of FY 2015 Local Financial Commitment Ratings; and Table 2C is the Detailed Summary of FY2015 Project Justification Ratings.

Since publication of the FY 2014 *Annual Report* in April 2013, some New and Small Starts projects received construction grant agreements. In addition, several projects have entered New Starts, Small Starts, and Core Capacity Project Development. These include the following:

New Starts Projects that Received Full Funding Grant Agreements

- Los Angeles, CA – Regional Connector

Small Starts Projects that Received Small Starts Grant Agreements

- Riverside, CA – Perris Valley Commuter Rail

New Starts Projects Entered into Project Development under MAP-21

- Durham, NC – Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project
- Seattle, WA – Lynwood Link Light Rail Extension Project

Small Starts Projects Entered into Project Development under MAP-21

- Los Angeles, CA – Downtown Streetcar
- San Jose, CA - El Camino Real Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project
- San Rafael, CA - SMART San Rafael to Larkspur Regional Connection
- Orlando, FL - SunRail Phase II North Extension
- Chicago, IL – Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit
- Charlotte, NC - CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2
- Albuquerque, NM - Central Ave BRT
- Reno, NV - 4th St/Prater Way Corridor
- Nashville, TN – East/West Connector BRT (The Amp)
- San Antonio, TX - Downtown Modern Streetcar

Core Capacity Projects Entered into Project Development under MAP-21

- Chicago, IL – Red and Purple Line Modernization Project

FTA also notes that although no funding is requested for the Fresno Area Express Blackstone/King Canyon Bus Rapid Transit project in FY 2015, it was recommended in prior budgets and has received a total of \$27.8 million in FY 2013 and FY 2014 funds. This should be sufficient to allow execution of a Small Starts Grant Agreement for the project prior to the end of FY 2015, if the project becomes ready for such a commitment.

Table 2A --Capital Investment Grant Program Summary of FY 2015 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
<b>New Starts Engineering</b>								
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	\$ 2,446.5	\$ 375.5	\$ 2,822.0	\$ 1,250.0	44%	High	High	Medium-High
FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II South	\$ 172.7	\$ 0.9	\$ 173.6	\$ 86.8	50%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	\$ 1,428.8	\$ 227.7	\$ 1,656.6	\$ 714.4	43%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
OR Portland, Columbia River Crossing Project	\$ 2,616.0	\$ 95.9	\$ 2,711.8	\$ 850.0	31%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	\$ 1,461.6	\$ 101.5	\$ 1,563.1	\$ 781.5	50%	Medium	Medium	Medium
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b>								
^ IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project	\$ 4,700.0	\$ -	\$ 4,700.0	\$ 1,500.0	32%	---	---	---
<b>New Starts Project Development</b>								
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	\$ 1,641.2	\$ 343.5	\$ 1,984.7	\$ 980.4	49%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
^ CO Denver, Southeast Extension	\$ 210.7	\$ -	\$ 210.7	\$ 92.0	44%	---	---	---
MD Baltimore, Red Line	\$ 2,644.5	\$ -	\$ 2,644.5	\$ 900.0	34%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	\$ 2,245.1	\$ 126.0	\$ 2,371.1	\$ 900.0	38%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	\$ 1,220.5	\$ 30.0	\$ 1,250.5	\$ 625.2	50%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT Project	\$ 1,820.6	\$ -	\$ 1,820.6	\$ 910.3	50%	---	---	---
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	\$ 795.7	\$ 14.1	\$ 809.8	\$ 404.9	50%	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
^ WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	\$ 1,200 - \$1,700	\$ -	\$ 1,200 - \$1,700	-	50%	---	---	---
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>								
^ AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	\$ 124.7	\$ 4.7	\$ 129.3	\$ 56.0	43%	---	---	---
CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	\$ 48.8	\$ -	\$ 48.8	\$ 39.0	80%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ CA Los Angeles, Downtown Streetcar	\$ 153 - \$162	\$ -	\$ 153 - \$162	\$ 75.0	46% - 49%	---	---	---
CA Oakland, East Bay BRT	\$ 173.0	\$ 5.0	\$ 178.0	\$ 75.0	42%	Medium-High	High	Medium
CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	\$ 125.6	\$ -	\$ 125.6	\$ 75.0	60%	Medium-High	Medium	High
^ CA San Jose, El Camino Real Corridor BRT Project	\$ 188.0	\$ -	\$ 188.0	\$ 75.0	40%	---	---	---
^ CA San Rafael, SMART San Rafael to Larkspur Regional Connection	\$ 30.0	\$ -	\$ 30.0	\$ 16.0	53%	---	---	---
^ FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	\$ 140.2	\$ 2.4	\$ 142.6	\$ 49.7	35%	Medium-High	High	Medium
FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor	\$ 33.2	\$ -	\$ 33.2	\$ 26.6	80%	Medium	Medium	Medium
FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	\$ 23.9	\$ -	\$ 23.9	\$ 19.1	80%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North Extension	\$ 79.2	\$ -	\$ 79.2	\$ 39.6	50%	---	---	---
^ IL Chicago, CTA Ashland Ave BRT Phase I Project	\$ 116.9	\$ -	\$ 116.9	\$ 58.3	50%	---	---	---
^ MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	\$ 215.4	\$ -	\$ 215.4	\$ 75.0	35%	---	---	---
^ NC Charlotte, CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2	\$ 126.0	\$ -	\$ 126.0	\$ 63.0	50%	---	---	---
^ NM Albuquerque, Central Ave BRT	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	---	---	---	---
^ NV Reno, 4th St/Prater Way Corridor	\$ 52.6	\$ -	\$ 52.6	\$ 24.6	47%	---	---	---
^ OH Columbus, COTA Northeast Corridor BRT Project	\$ 39.4	\$ -	\$ 39.4	\$ 31.5	80%	---	---	---
OR Eugene, West Eugene EmX Extension	\$ 95.6	\$ -	\$ 95.6	\$ 75.0	78%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TN Nashville, East-West Connector BRT (The Amp)	\$ 174.0	\$ -	\$ 174.0	\$ 75.0	43%	Medium-High	High	Medium
TX El Paso, Dyer Corridor BRT	\$ 35.9	\$ -	\$ 35.9	\$ 20.4	57%	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ TX El Paso, Montana Corridor BRT	\$ 43.4	\$ -	\$ 43.4	\$ 25.7	59%	---	---	---
^ TX San Antonio, Downtown Modern Streetcar	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	---	---	---	---
^ UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	\$ 146.4	\$ 13.0	\$ 159.4	\$ 75.0	47%	---	---	---
^ WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	\$ 53.4	\$ -	\$ 53.4	\$ 38.7	73%	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High

^ 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.

**Table 2B -- Detailed Summary of FY 2015 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
<b>New Starts Engineering</b>					
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	High	Medium-High	High	Medium	44%
FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II South	Medium-High	High	High	Medium	50%
MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	Medium-High	Medium	High	Medium-Low	43%
OR Portland, Columbia River Crossing Project	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-Low	Medium	31%
TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	Medium	*	*	*	50%
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b>					
IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project	---	---	---	---	---
<b>New Starts Project Development</b>					
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	Medium-High	*	*	*	49%
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	---	---	---	---	---
MD Baltimore, Red Line	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	34%
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	38%
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	Medium	*	*	*	50%
NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT Project	---	---	---	---	---
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	Medium-High	Medium-High	High	Medium	50%
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>					
AZ Tempe, Tempe Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT	Medium	*	*	*	80%
CA Los Angeles, Downtown Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---
^ CA Oakland, East Bay BRT	High	*	*	*	42%
CA San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT	Medium	*	*	*	60%
CA San Jose, El Camino Real Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---
CA San Rafael, SMART San Rafael to Larkspur Regional Connection	---	---	---	---	---
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	35%
^ FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor	Medium	*	*	*	80%
^ FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	Medium	*	*	*	80%
FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North Extension	---	---	---	---	---
IL Chicago, CTA Ashland Ave BRT Phase I Project	---	---	---	---	---
MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	---	---	---	---	---
NC Charlotte, CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2	---	---	---	---	---
NM Albuquerque, Central Ave BRT	---	---	---	---	---
NV Reno, 4th St/Prater Way Corridor	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, COTA Northeast Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---
^ 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	---	---	---	---	---
TX San Antonio, Downtown Modern Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---
UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	---	---
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	73%

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 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 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.

"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 2015 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
<b>New Starts Engineering</b>							
CA Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension - Section 1	Medium-High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II South	Medium	High	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium-Low
MA Cambridge to Medford, Green Line Extension	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High
OR Portland, Columbia River Crossing Project	Medium-High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	High	Medium
TX Houston, University Corridor LRT	Medium	High	Medium-High	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low
<b>Core Capacity Project Development</b>							
IL Chicago, Red and Purple Line Modernization Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>New Starts Project Development</b>							
CA San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
CO Denver, Southeast Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MD Baltimore, Red Line	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High
MD Maryland National Capital Purple Line	Medium-High	High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium
MN Minneapolis, Southwest LRT	Medium	High	Medium	N/A	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium
NC Durham, Durham-Orange LRT Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX Fort Worth, TEX Rail	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium-Low
WA Seattle, Lynnwood Link Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Small Starts Project Development</b>							
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 Oakland, East Bay BRT	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
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	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FL Fort Lauderdale, Wave Streetcar	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium
^ FL Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
^ FL Jacksonville, BRT Southeast Corridor	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium
FL Orlando, SunRail Phase II North Extension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
IL Chicago, CTA Ashland Ave BRT Phase I Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MI Lansing, Michigan/Grand River BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NC Charlotte, CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NM Albuquerque, Central Ave BRT	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
NV Reno, 4th St/Prater Way Corridor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OH Columbus, COTA Northeast Corridor BRT Project	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
^ 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-Low	Low	Medium	Medium	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	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TX San Antonio, Downtown Modern Streetcar	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
UT Provo-Orem, Provo-Orem Bus Rapid Transit	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WA Vancouver, C-TRAN Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	Medium	High	Medium-High	Medium

--- 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.

"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. For the University Corridor LRT and Southwest LRT New Starts projects, the summary rating also reflects a Medium rating for Operating Efficiencies (not shown).

# Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements With Remaining Funding Needs in FY2015



# Capital Investment Grant Program Projects in Project Development and Engineering - FY 2015

