

# **Appendix A**

## **New Starts Project Profiles**

**As of November 2002**

*Prepared by:*  
Office of Planning  
Federal Transit Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation

---

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Background .....</b>	<b>A-7</b>
<b>Existing Full Funding Grant Agreements .....</b>	<b>A-23</b>
Atlanta/North Springs (North Line Extension).....	A-25
Baltimore/Central LRT Double-Track.....	A-29
Boston/South Boston Piers Transitway Phase .....	A-33
Chicago/Douglas Branch Reconstruction.....	A-37
Chicago/North Central Corridor Commuter Rail .....	A-41
Chicago/South West Corridor Commuter Rail.....	A-45
Chicago/Union-Pacific West Line Extension .....	A-49
Dallas/North Central LRT Extension.....	A-53
Denver/Southeast Corridor LRT.....	A-57
Ft Lauderdale/Tri-County Commuter Rail Upgrades.....	A-61
Los Angeles/MOS-3 Extensions of Metro Rail (North Hollywood).....	A-65
Memphis/Medical Center Extension.....	A-69
Minneapolis/Hiwatha Corridor LRT.....	A-73
Northern New Jersey/Hudson-Bergen MOS-1 .....	A-77
Northern New Jersey/Hudson-Bergen MOS-2 .....	A-81
Northern New Jersey/Newark Rail Link - MOS-1 .....	A-85
Pittsburgh/Stage II LRT Reconstruction.....	A-89
Portland/Interstate MAX LRT Extension.....	A-93
St. Louis/Metrolink St. Clair Extension.....	A-97
Salt Lake City/CBD to University LRT.....	A-101
Salt Lake City/Medical Center Extension.....	A-105
Salt Lake City/North-South LRT.....	A-109
San Diego/Mission Valley East LRT Extension.....	A-113
San Diego/Oceanside-Escondido Rail Corridor .....	A-117
San Francisco/BART Extension to San Francisco Airport.....	A-121
San Juan/Tren Urbano.....	A-125
Washington, DC Metropolitan Area/Largo Metrorail Extension .....	A-129
<b>Pending Federal Funding Commitments.....</b>	<b>A-133</b>
Los Angeles/Eastside Light Rail Transit System.....	A-135
New Orleans/Canal Streetcar Line.....	A-139
<b>Projects in Final Design.....</b>	<b>A-143</b>
Baltimore, MARC Penn-Camden Connection.....	A-145
Chicago, Ravenswood Expansion Project .....	A-149
Cleveland, Euclid Corridor Transportation Project .....	A-157
Galveston, Rail Trolley Extension.....	A-167
Girdwood, Alaska Railroad – South Anchorage Double Track .....	A-171
Girdwood, Alaska Railroad – Eagle River to Knik River Track Improvements .....	A-173
Girdwood, Alaska Railroad – Knik River to Wasilla Track Improvements.....	A-175
Little Rock, River Rail Project.....	A-177
Los Angeles, LOSSAN Rail Corridor Improvements .....	A-181
Nashville, East Corridor Commuter Rail.....	A-185

---

New York, Long Island Rail Road East Side Access .....	A-189
Pawtucket, Commuter Rail Improvement Program .....	A-197
Prince William Sound, Alaska Marine Highway System .....	A-201
Seattle, Central Link Initial Segment .....	A-205
<b>Projects in Preliminary Engineering.....</b>	<b>A-213</b>
Austin, Rapid Transit Project MOS .....	A-215
Bridgeport, Intermodal Transportation Center .....	A-219
Boston, Silver Line Phase III .....	A-223
Burlington, Burlington-Essex Commuter Rail Project .....	A-231
Charlotte, South Corridor LRT .....	A-235
Cincinnati, Interstate 71 Corridor LRT .....	A-243
Columbus, North Corridor LRT .....	A-251
Dallas, Northwest/Southeast Light Rail MOS .....	A-259
Denver, West Corridor LRT .....	A-267
Fort Collins, Mason Street Transportation Corridor .....	A-275
Harrisburg, CORRIDORone Rail MOS .....	A-283
Hartford, New-Britain - Hartford Busway .....	A-287
Honolulu, Primary Corridor Transportation Project .....	A-295
Johnson County, I-35 Commuter Rail .....	A-303
Las Vegas, Resort Corridor Fixed Guideway .....	A-307
Los Angeles, Mid-City/Exposition LRT .....	A-315
Louisville, Transportation Tomorrow South Central Corridor Light Rail .....	A-323
Lowell, MA- Nashua NH, Commuter Rail Extension .....	A-325
Miami, North Corridor Metrorail Extension .....	A-329
Minneapolis, Northstar Corridor Rail Project .....	A-337
New Orleans, Desire Corridor Streetcar .....	A-345
New York, Second Avenue Subway .....	A-353
Norfolk, Norfolk LRT .....	A-361
Orange County, Centerline LRT Project .....	A-369
Philadelphia, Schuylkill Valley MetroRail .....	A-377
Phoenix, Central Phoenix/East Valley Corridor .....	A-385
Pittsburgh, North Shore Connector LRT .....	A-391
Raleigh, Phase I Regional Rail Project .....	A-399
San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor .....	A-407
San Francisco, New Central Subway Project .....	A-415
San Juan, Tren Urbano Minillas Extension .....	A-423
Santa Clara County, Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor .....	A-429
Seattle, Airport Link .....	A-437
Seattle, North Link .....	A-441
Seattle, Everett-to-Seattle Commuter Rail .....	A-445
Seattle, Lakewood-to-Tacoma .....	A-449
Silver Spring, Silver Spring Intermodal Transit Center .....	A-453
Stamford, Urban Transitway and Intermodal Transportation Center Improvements .....	A-457
Tampa Bay, Tampa Bay Regional Rail .....	A-461
Washington, Dulles Corridor Bus Rapid Transit .....	A-469
Washington, MARC Mid-Day Storage Facility .....	A-477

---

Washington County, Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Project .....	A-481
---	-------

### **Alphabetical List of Project Profiles**

Atlanta/North Springs (North Line Extension).....	A-25
Austin, Rapid Transit Project MOS .....	A-215
Baltimore, MARC Penn-Camden Connection.....	A-145
Baltimore/Central LRT Double-Track.....	A-29
Boston, Silver Line Phase III .....	A-223
Boston/South Boston Piers Transitway Phase .....	A-33
Bridgeport, Intermodal Transportation Center .....	A-219
Burlington, Burlington-Essex Commuter Rail Project .....	A-231
Charlotte, South Corridor LRT .....	A-235
Chicago, Ravenswood Expansion Project .....	A-149
Chicago/Douglas Branch Reconstruction .....	A-37
Chicago/North Central Corridor Commuter Rail .....	A-41
Chicago/South West Corridor Commuter Rail .....	A-45
Chicago/Union-Pacific West Line Extension .....	A-49
Cincinnati, Interstate 71 Corridor LRT .....	A-243
Cleveland, Euclid Corridor Transportation Project .....	A-157
Columbus, North Corridor LRT .....	A-251
Dallas, Northwest/Southeast Light Rail MOS .....	A-259
Dallas/North Central LRT Extension.....	A-53
Denver, West Corridor LRT .....	A-267
Denver/Southeast Corridor LRT .....	A-57
Fort Collins, Mason Street Transportation Corridor.....	A-275
Ft Lauderdale/Tri-County Commuter Rail Upgrades .....	A-61
Galveston, Rail Trolley Extension.....	A-167
Girdwood, Alaska Railroad – Eagle River to Knik River Track Improvements .....	A-173
Girdwood, Alaska Railroad – Knik River to Wasilla Track Improvements.....	A-175
Girdwood, Alaska Railroad – South Anchorage Double Track .....	A-171
Harrisburg, CORRIDORone Rail MOS .....	A-283
Hartford, New-Britain - Hartford Busway.....	A-287
Honolulu, Primary Corridor Transportation Project.....	A-295
Johnson County, I-35 Commuter Rail .....	A-303
Las Vegas, Resort Corridor Fixed Guideway.....	A-307
Little Rock, River Rail Project.....	A-177
Los Angeles, LOSSAN Rail Corridor Improvements .....	A-181
Los Angeles, Mid-City/Exposition LRT.....	A-315
Los Angeles/Eastside Light Rail Transit System.....	A-135
Los Angeles/MOS-3 Extensions of Metro Rail (North Hollywood) .....	A-65
Louisville, Transportation Tomorrow South Central Corridor Light Rail .....	A-323
Lowell, MA- Nashua NH, Commuter Rail Extension.....	A-325
Memphis/Medical Center Extension.....	A-69
Miami, North Corridor Metrorail Extension.....	A-329

---

Minneapolis, Northstar Corridor Rail Project.....	A-337
Minneapolis/Hiawatha Corridor LRT.....	A-73
Nashville, East Corridor Commuter Rail.....	A-185
New Orleans, Desire Corridor Streetcar.....	A-345
New Orleans/Canal Streetcar Line.....	A-139
New York, Long Island Rail Road East Side Access.....	A-189
New York, Second Avenue Subway.....	A-353
Norfolk, Norfolk LRT.....	A-361
Northern New Jersey/Hudson-Bergen MOS-1.....	A-77
Northern New Jersey/Hudson-Bergen MOS-2.....	A-81
Northern New Jersey/Newark Rail Link - MOS-1.....	A-85
Orange County, Centerline LRT Project.....	A-369
Pawtucket, Commuter Rail Improvement Program.....	A-197
Philadelphia, Schuylkill Valley MetroRail.....	A-377
Phoenix, Central Phoenix/East Valley Corridor.....	A-385
Pittsburgh, North Shore Connector LRT.....	A-391
Pittsburgh/Stage II LRT Reconstruction.....	A-89
Portland/Interstate MAX LRT Extension.....	A-93
Prince William Sound, Alaska Marine Highway System.....	A-201
Raleigh, Phase I Regional Rail Project.....	A-399
Salt Lake City/CBD to University LRT.....	A-101
Salt Lake City/Medical Center Extension.....	A-105
Salt Lake City/North-South LRT.....	A-109
San Diego, Mid-Coast Corridor.....	A-407
San Diego/Mission Valley East LRT Extension.....	A-113
San Diego/Oceanside-Escondido Rail Corridor.....	A-117
San Francisco, New Central Subway Project.....	A-415
San Francisco/BART Extension to San Francisco Airport.....	A-121
San Juan, Tren Urbano Minillas Extension.....	A-423
San Juan/Tren Urbano.....	A-125
Santa Clara County, Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor.....	A-429
Seattle, Airport Link.....	A-437
Seattle, Central Link Initial Segment.....	A-205
Seattle, Everett-to-Seattle Commuter Rail.....	A-445
Seattle, Lakewood-to-Tacoma.....	A-449
Seattle, North Link.....	A-441
Silver Spring, Silver Spring Intermodal Transit Center.....	A-453
St. Louis/MetroLink St. Clair Extension.....	A-97
Stamford, Urban Transitway and Intermodal Transportation Center Improvements.....	A-457
Tampa Bay, Tampa Bay Regional Rail.....	A-461
Washington County, Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Project.....	A-481
Washington, DC Metropolitan Area/Largo Metrorail Extension.....	A-129
Washington, Dulles Corridor Bus Rapid Transit.....	A-469
Washington, MARC Mid-Day Storage Facility.....	A-477

---

## Background

The project profiles presented in this Appendix provide background information supporting the Department of Transportation's New Starts Program funding recommendations for FY 2004. The Department's funding recommendations are being provided to the Congress pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 5309(o)(1). The funding recommendations are based on the decision criteria defined in 49 U.S.C. 5309(e).

Under 49 U.S.C. 5309(e), discretionary capital grants and loans for the construction of a new fixed guideway system or the extension of an existing system may be made only if the Secretary determines that the proposed project is:

- (A) based on the results of an alternatives analysis and Preliminary Engineering;
- (B) justified based on a comprehensive review of its mobility improvements, environmental benefits, cost effectiveness, and operating efficiencies; and
- (C) supported by an acceptable degree of local financial commitment, including evidence of stable and dependable funding sources to construct, maintain, and operate the system or extension.

The 49 U.S.C. 5309(e) criteria provide a basis for selecting, from among the eligible projects, those which are the most worthy of Federal funds. To this end, the New Starts project profiles describe the fixed guideway projects that are most advanced, and evaluate them in terms of the 5309(e) criteria.

This *Annual Report on New Starts* includes profiles for each proposed project or study undergoing Final Design and Preliminary Engineering. In addition to providing information to Congress, the document serves as guidance to project sponsors, so that improvements can be made. Since projects can be expected to continue to change as they progress through the development process, the ratings for projects that are not yet recommended for full funding grant agreements should not be construed as a statement about the ultimate merits of the project, but, rather, an assessment of the project's current strengths and weaknesses.

Profiles for projects that are under construction have also been included in this report if additional funds are needed in FY 2004 to fulfill Full Funding Grant Agreements.

In general, the profiles for projects in Final Design and Preliminary Engineering include five sections. These are:

- (1) **Description:** This section briefly describes a project's physical characteristics and transportation benefits, and presents the latest estimates of cost and ridership. Unless otherwise noted, cost estimates are expressed in escalated (year of construction) dollars. This section includes a summary description of key project elements. This section also includes the summary rating of "Highly Recommended," "Recommended," or "Not Recommended" assigned to the proposed project, as well as the overall ratings for project justification and local financial commitment.

- (2) **Status:** This section identifies where the project is in the major investment planning and project development process. It indicates, for example, whether alternatives analysis (or a major investment study) and Preliminary Engineering have been completed. It also indicates when current studies are expected to be completed. Relevant statutory requirements are also noted here.
- (3) **Evaluation:** This section presents an evaluation of the project's merit based on the criteria cited in 49 U.S.C. 5309(e) and FTA's Final Rule on New Starts project evaluation and rating, which became effective April 6, 2001. Ratings and data are reported for the following criteria: mobility improvements, environmental benefits, operating efficiencies, and cost effectiveness. This section also includes FTA's rating of the project in terms of transit-supportive existing land use and future patterns.
- (4) **Local Financial Commitment:** This section reports FTA's ratings of the proposed non-Section 5309 share of total project capital costs, the stability and reliability of the capital financing plan, and the stability and reliability of the operating financing plan.
- (5) **Other Factors (Optional):** Other rating factors which may be relevant to evaluating the merit of the project are described in this section.

The profiles for projects covered by Full Funding Grant Agreements include only the description and status sections, because projects are not re-evaluated once a funding agreement is in place.

## How the Ratings were Developed

As part of the normal system planning and project development process, local agencies develop the information that FTA uses to assess projects in terms of project evaluation and local financial commitment. The specific information used for these evaluations is outlined below.

### Project Evaluation and Ratings

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) greatly broadened the criteria to evaluate New Starts projects. The Section 5309 New Starts criteria were updated in Federal Register Notices on December 19, 1996 and November 12, 1997. TEA-21 left prior Federal law and policy largely intact, including the New Starts criteria and the multiple-measure method of project evaluation. This year's evaluations and ratings address the full range of project evaluation criteria, including: mobility improvements, environmental benefits, operating efficiencies, cost effectiveness, transit-supportive existing land use and future patterns, local financial commitment, and other factors.

In September 1997, the Federal Transit Administration's Office of Planning and the Office of Budget and Policy released the *Technical Guidance on Section 5309 New Starts Criteria*. In October 1998, July 1999, and July 2000, FTA issued revised documentation of the *Technical Guidance on Section 5309 New Starts Criteria* to reflect lessons learned. In June 2002, FTA issued updated guidance entitled *Reporting Instructions for the Section 5309 New Starts Criteria*. In addition, since 1998 FTA has offered several national workshops annually to offer technical assistance.

---

On December 7, 2000, FTA published its Final Rule on New Starts project evaluation and rating in the Federal Register at 65 FR 76864. This regulation is required by Section 3009 of TEA-21, and governs how FTA will evaluate and rate new fixed-guideway transit systems and extensions that are proposed for section 5309 New Starts funding. It replaces the procedures set forth in the December 19, 1996 policy statement [61 FR 67093], as amended on November 12, 1997 [62 FR 60756]. The regulation became effective on April 6, 2001.

This regulation retains the familiar “multiple-measure method” of project evaluation used by FTA to evaluate proposed New Starts projects since 1994. It describes how each of the statutory project evaluation criteria will be evaluated; defines the overall project ratings of “Highly Recommended,” “Recommended,” and “Not Recommended”; and, defines how these ratings will be used to approve entry into the Preliminary Engineering and Final Design stages of project development. It is important to note that the purpose of this Rule is to regulate how FTA will evaluate and rate proposed projects for purposes of the Section 5309 New Starts program; it does not regulate the transit industry or other sponsors of New Starts projects, though it may affect the type of information FTA requests for evaluation purposes. As in the past, FTA will continue to issue guidance and work with project sponsors as we implement this rule.

For each of the project justification criteria (mobility improvements, environmental benefits, operating efficiencies, cost effectiveness), the proposed project is evaluated against a New Starts baseline, which represents low cost improvements that are cost effective compared to the New Starts project. Such a comparison results in a more accurate portrayal of the benefits of the New Starts project. For each proposed project, FTA assigns a rating of “high,” “medium-high,” “medium,” “low-medium,” or “low” for each of the five criteria (the four above plus land use), with “other factors” considered as appropriate. Similar ratings are assigned for the three factors used to evaluate local financial commitment, including the non-Section 5309 share, the capital financing plan, and the operating financing plan. Consistent with Section 5309(e)(6), summary ratings of “Highly Recommended,” “Recommended,” or “Not Recommended” are assigned to each proposed project, based on the results of the review and evaluation of each of the criteria for project justification and local financial commitment. To assign these summary ratings, the individual ratings for each of the project justification criteria and financial rating factors are combined into overall “project justification” and “finance” ratings, which in turn are combined to produce the summary rating for the project.

In evaluating the project justification criteria, FTA gives primary consideration to the measures of transit supportive land use, cost effectiveness, and mobility to arrive at the combined “project justification” rating. In rating local financial commitment, the proposed non-Section 5309 share of capital costs, and the strength of the capital and operating financing plans are the primary factors in determining the combined “finance” rating. Projects must also receive at least a “medium” rating for both capital and operating finance in order to receive a “medium” rating for the overall local financial commitment rating.

For a proposed project to be rated as “Recommended,” it must be rated at least “medium” in terms of both project justification and finance. To be “Highly Recommended,” a proposed project must be rated higher than “medium” for both project justification and finance. Proposed projects not rated at least “medium” in both project justification and finance are rated as “Not Recommended.”

As in previous reports, FTA has identified several projects as “Not Rated.” This year, “Not Rated” indicates that FTA has serious concerns about the information submitted for mobility improvements and cost effectiveness because the underlying assumptions used by the project sponsor may have produced an inaccurate representation of the benefits of the project. The principal source of inconsistencies has been in the definitions of the baseline alternative and the proposed New Starts project. These inconsistencies have made it impossible to isolate the impacts of the proposed project in terms of ridership, transportation benefits, operating and maintenance costs, capital costs, and cost-effectiveness. FTA will continue to work with project sponsors to validate assumptions, information, and projections. A rating for these projects will be made available to Congress and other interested parties when the issues are resolved.

In addition, in a few cases, project information has not yet been submitted by the project sponsor for FTA evaluation. In some cases, this is because the project has recently moved into preliminary engineering or become non-exempt. In others, the project sponsor, for a variety of reasons, has not submitted updated information for evaluation. The rating for all of these projects is noted as “Not Yet Available.” Like projects identified as “Not Rated,” ratings for these projects will be made available to Congress and other interested parties when information is submitted and the project evaluation is complete.

It is important to note that project evaluation is an ongoing process. The project ratings contained in this report are based on project information available through November 2002. As proposed New Starts projects proceed through the project development process, the estimates of costs, benefits, and impacts are refined. The FTA ratings and recommendations will be updated annually to reflect new information, changing conditions, and refined financing plans.

The U.S. Department of Transportation’s Major Capital Investment Projects Final Rule, published on December 7, 2000, specifies FTA’s approach to project evaluation and assignment of summary ratings that are effective April 6, 2001. The project ratings contained in this report incorporate changes introduced in the Final Rule, most significantly the change that ratings for many of the criteria are based on a comparison of the proposed New Starts project to a single baseline (as opposed to the previous comparison to both the no-build and the transportation systems management alternatives), and the use of transportation system user benefits for cost effectiveness and mobility improvements ratings.

### **Section 5309 New Starts Criteria**

A brief description of the Section 5309 New Starts criteria applied in project evaluation follows. For the first four criteria, the values are derived from comparing the New Starts project to the baseline alternative. This year, FTA has changed its measure used for two of the project justification factors: mobility improvements and cost effectiveness. The new measure, transportation system user benefits, quantifies travel-related benefits in terms of hours of travel-time saved for all users of the transit system (both existing riders and new riders). For mobility improvements, this measure replaces hours of travel-time savings for transit trips. For cost effectiveness, it replaces the number of new transit trips. Transportation system user benefits represents a broader set of benefits to transit riders – including reductions in walk times, wait times, ride times, number of transfers, and any other attribute employed in local ridership-forecasting procedures – in terms of travel-time savings.

---

### **Mobility Improvements**

Mobility improvements are based on two measures. The first is the transportation system user benefits per project passenger mile. It is derived by dividing the user benefits for all users of the transit system by passenger miles traveled on the New Starts project. The second measure has not changed from last year. It reflects the number of low-income households and total employment within one-half mile of a station or stop of the New Starts project. Low income is defined as the number of households below the poverty level. This measure is reported for stations or stops directly related to the proposed fixed guideway project or system.

### **Environmental Benefits**

The first measure is the Change in Criteria Pollutant Emissions and Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the Forecast Year, comparing the New Starts project to the baseline. The measure is expressed as the change in the number of tons of emissions for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), volatile organic compounds (VOC) or hydrocarbons (HC), particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>).

Energy consumption is measured as the Net Change in the Forecast Year in the Regional Consumption of British Thermal Units (BTU), comparing the New Starts project to the baseline.

The third measure includes the Current Regional Designation by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

### **Operating Efficiencies**

The measure for this criterion reports the Change in Operating Cost per Passenger-Mile in the Forecast Year, comparing the New Starts project to the baseline. This measure, expressed in terms of absolute dollar value, is to address the impact on operating efficiencies for the entire regional transit system.

### **Cost-Effectiveness**

The measure of cost effectiveness is the incremental cost of the project divided by its hours of transportation system user benefits compared to the baseline. It is reported in units of dollars per hour. Cost is defined as the annualized capital cost plus annual operating and maintenance costs. Transportation system user benefit is defined as all annual travel-related benefits in terms of hours for all users of the transit system (both existing riders and new riders). For informational purposes, FTA has included the measure used for cost effectiveness last year, cost per new transit trip, in the profile of each project. FTA has considered only the cost per hour measure in the development of project ratings.

### **Transit Supportive Existing Land Use and Future Patterns**

Assessment of land use was introduced in the spirit of ISTEA, continued in TEA-21, and is consistent with FTA initiatives to encourage transit supportive land use and development. The measure, expressed in terms of a combined rating of “high,” “medium-high,” “medium,” “low-medium,” or “low,” addresses the degree to which existing development patterns and local land use policies are likely to foster transit supportive land use. The combined rating considers each of the following factors: existing land use; growth management policies; transit-supportive

corridor policies; supportive zoning regulations; tools to implement land use policies; and, performance of land use policies.

### **Local Financial Commitment**

FTA's evaluation of the local financial commitment to a proposed project focuses on the proposed non-Section 5309 share of project costs, the strength of the proposed capital financing plan, and the stability and reliability of the operating financing plan.

Non-Section 5309 share refers to the percentage of capital costs to be met with non-Federal funding, particularly non-Section 5309 New Starts funding, and includes both the local match required by Federal law and any additional capital matching funds. Local or other non-New Starts matching funds above the level required are accounted for in the rating process because they reduce the required Federal New Starts commitment and because they indicate a stronger local commitment to the project. Previous non-Federal funding support for other significant fixed guideway systems implemented in the area is also considered, though not counted toward the calculation of share. The use of flexible funds and innovative financing techniques is noted, where appropriate. Non-Section 5309 share is rated "high," "medium-high," "medium," "low-medium," or "low."

FTA continues to encourage project sponsors to request a Federal New Starts funding share that is as low as possible. The Conference Report that accompanied the FY 2002 Department of Transportation Appropriations Act instructs "FTA not to sign any new full funding grant agreements after September 30, 2002 that have a maximum Federal share of higher than 60 percent." Consistent with this Congressional direction, projects seeking a Federal New Starts share over 60 percent have been given a "low" rating for local financial commitment, which results in a "Not Recommended" rating. In addition, the Administration is seeking legislation that would limit the Federal New Starts share to no more than 50 percent beginning in FY 2004. None of the four new projects recommended for funding in the President's FY 2004 budget and this report has a proposed Federal New Starts share greater than 50 percent.

The evaluation of each project's proposed capital financing plan takes two principal forms. First, the plan is reviewed to determine the stability and reliability of each proposed source of local match. This includes a review of inter-governmental grants, tax sources, and debt obligations. Each revenue source is reviewed for availability within the project timetable. Second, the financing plan is evaluated to determine if adequate provisions have been made to cover unanticipated cost overruns. The strength of the capital finance plan is rated "high," "medium-high," "medium," "low-medium," or "low." The indicators used to assign these ratings are further explained in Table A-1.

The third component of the financial rating is an assessment of the ability of the local transit agency to fund operation of the entire transit system as planned once the guideway project is built. This rating focuses on the operating revenue base and its ability to expand to meet the incremental operating costs associated with a new fixed guideway investment and any other new services and facilities. The strength of the operating finance plan is rated "high," "medium-high," "medium," "low-medium," or "low." The indicators used to assign these ratings are further explained in Table A-2.

**Other Factors (Optional)**

This criterion has traditionally been included as an option to provide an opportunity to identify any additional factors that may be relevant to local and national priorities and relevant to the success of the project.

**TABLE A-1  
FINANCIAL RATINGS: CAPITAL FINANCING COMMITMENTS**

<b>Final Design</b>	High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in very sound financial condition. Non-Section 5309 New Starts Funds are committed and available to fund the project. The applicant has the fiscal capability to construct the project and has sufficient funds to cover the entire Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of the overall undertaking, including provision for contingent cost overruns, without exhausting such capacity.
	Medium-High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in sound financial condition. Non-Section 5309 New Starts funds are committed to the project, but funds may not yet be available. The applicant has the fiscal capacity to construct the project and has sufficient funds to cover the entire Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of the overall undertaking, including provision for contingent cost overruns.
	Medium	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in reasonably sound financial condition. The majority of Non-Section 5309 New Starts funds are committed to the project. However, a significant portion of the Non-Section 5309 New Starts funding either does not yet exist or exists but is not yet committed to the project. It is highly likely that sufficient funds will be committed to cover the entire Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of the overall undertaking, including provision for contingent cost overruns.
	Low-Medium	Sponsoring agency may be in reasonably sound financial condition. The applicant may have identified potential sources of Non-Section 5309 New Starts funds to construct the project. However, the majority of Non-Section 5309 New Starts funds have not been committed to cover the Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of project costs, including the provision for contingent cost overruns. The plan assumes some local funding which does not yet exist.
	Low	The sponsoring agency is not in sound financial condition. The applicant has not yet identified nor committed sufficient funding to cover the Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of project costs.
<b>Preliminary Engineering</b>	High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in very sound financial condition. Non-Section 5309 New Starts funds are identified and committed to fund the project, but a portion of the funds may not yet be available. Sufficient funds to cover the Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of the overall undertaking, including provision for contingent cost overruns, have been committed.

**TABLE A-1 (Continued)**

<b>Preliminary Engineering (cont'd)</b>	Medium-High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in sound financial condition. The applicant has identified and committed sufficient funds to cover the majority of the Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of the overall undertaking, including provision for contingent cost overruns.
	Medium	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in reasonably sound financial condition. The applicant has adopted a realistic capital finance plan that adequately covers projected local capital costs. Some portion of funding to cover the Non-Section 5309 New Starts share of project costs has been committed, but a significant portion of local funding either does not yet exist or exists but is not yet committed to the project.
	Low-Medium	Sponsoring agency may be in sound financial condition, with some correctable deficiencies. The applicant has not yet adopted a realistic capital finance plan that adequately covers projected local capital costs. Non-Section 5309 New Starts funds are not committed and proposed new sources of funding are not available to fund the construction of the project.
	Low	Sponsoring agency is not considered to be in reasonably sound financial condition. The applicant has adopted a capital finance plan that FTA considers inadequate or infeasible. Non-Section 5309 New Starts funds have not been identified to finance construction of the project.

**TABLE A-2  
FINANCIAL RATINGS: STABLE AND RELIABLE OPERATING REVENUE**

<b>Final Design</b>	High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in very sound financial condition. Ample dedicated transit funding sources are committed and available and there is a good history of general appropriations from State or local government to provide a balanced budget for the transit system. Existing transit vehicles and facilities have been well maintained and replaced through continuing reinvestment in the system. The applicant has demonstrated the financial capacity to operate and maintain the proposed New Starts project, other programmed projects, and the existing regional transit system.
	Medium-High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in sound financial condition. The lead agency demonstrates that funding for operating an expanded transit system is committed. Existing transit facilities have been well maintained and replaced through continuing reinvestment in the system. Financial projections indicate adequate financial capacity to operate an expanded transit system.

TABLE A-2 (Continued)

<b>Final Design (cont'd)</b>	Medium	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in reasonably sound financial condition. The applicant has adopted a realistic operating finance plan that adequately covers projected operating costs for the existing and proposed transit system expansion. Demonstrates that funding for operating an expanded transit system is identified and will likely be committed. Existing facilities are adequately maintained. Financial projections indicate adequate financial capacity to operate an expanded transit system.
	Low-Medium	Sponsoring agency may be in sound financial condition, with some correctable deficiencies. The applicant has not yet adopted a realistic operating finance plan that adequately covers projected operating costs, and potential sources of operating funds have not been committed. Current sources of local funding are not sufficient to operate the proposed system expansion and operate and maintain the current transit system.
	Low	Sponsoring agency is not considered to be in reasonably sound financial condition. The applicant has adopted an operating finance plan that FTA considers inadequate or infeasible. Local funding does not generate sufficient revenue to operate and maintain the current transit system, and no new sources have been identified or committed to finance an expanded public transit system. Local transit system operating assistance is not reliable, resulting in deferred capital replacement and/or routine maintenance and/or service reductions.
<b>Preliminary Engineering</b>	High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in very sound financial condition. Ample dedicated transit funding sources are committed and available and there is a good history of general appropriations from State or local government to provide a balanced budget for the transit system. Existing transit vehicles and facilities have been well maintained and replaced through continuing reinvestment in the system. The applicant has demonstrated the financial capacity to operate and maintain the proposed New Starts project, other programmed projects, and the existing regional transit system.
	Medium-High	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in sound financial condition. Demonstrates that funding for operating an expanded transit system is committed. Existing transit facilities have been well maintained and replaced through continuing reinvestment in the system. Financial projections indicate adequate financial capacity to operate an expanded transit system.

TABLE A-2 (Continued)

<b>Preliminary Engineering (cont'd)</b>	Medium	Sponsoring agency is considered to be in reasonably sound financial condition. The applicant has adopted a realistic operating finance plan that adequately covers projected operating costs for the existing and proposed transit system expansion. Demonstrates that funding for operating an expanded transit system is identified and will likely be committed. Existing facilities are adequately maintained. Financial projections indicate adequate financial capacity to operate an expanded transit system.
	Low-Medium	Sponsoring agency may be in sound financial condition, with some correctable deficiencies. The applicant has not yet adopted a realistic operating finance plan that adequately covers projected operating costs, and potential sources of operating funds have not been committed. Current sources of local funding are not sufficient to operate the proposed system expansion and operate and maintain the current transit system.
	Low	Sponsoring agency is not considered to be in reasonably sound financial condition. The applicant has adopted an operating finance plan that FTA considers inadequate or infeasible. Local funding does not generate sufficient revenue to operate and maintain the current transit system, and no new sources have been identified or committed to finance an expanded public transit system. Local transit system operating assistance is not reliable, resulting in deferred capital replacement and/or routine maintenance and/or service reductions.

**TABLE A-3  
RATINGS APPLIED IN ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE CRITERION**

<b>I. EXISTING LAND USE</b>		
<i>a. Existing Land Use</i>		
Phase of Project Development	Land Use Assessment Ratings	
Preliminary Engineering and Final Design	HIGH	Current levels of population, employment, and other trip generators in station areas are sufficient to support a major transit investment. Most station areas are pedestrian-friendly and fully accessible.
	MEDIUM	Current levels of population, employment, and other trip generators in station areas marginally support a major transit investment. Some station areas are pedestrian-friendly and accessible. Significant growth must be realized.
	LOW	Current levels of population, employment, and other trip generators in station areas are inadequate to support a major transit investment. Station areas are not pedestrian-friendly.
Ratings based on assessment of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing corridor and station area development;</li> <li>• Existing corridor and station area development character;</li> <li>• Existing station area pedestrian facilities, including access for persons with disabilities; and</li> <li>• Existing corridor and station area parking supply.</li> </ul>		
<b>II. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE PLANS AND POLICIES</b>		
<i>a. Growth Management</i>		
Phase of Project Development	Land Use Assessment Ratings	
Preliminary Engineering and Final Design	HIGH	Adopted and enforceable growth management and land conservation policies are in place throughout the region. Existing and planned densities and market trends in the region and corridor are strongly compatible with transit.
	MEDIUM	Significant progress has been made toward implementing growth management and land conservation policies. Strong policies may be adopted in some jurisdictions but not others, or only moderately enforceable policies (e.g., incentive-based) may be adopted regionwide. Existing and/or planned densities and market trends are moderately compatible with transit.
	LOW	Limited consideration has been given to implementing growth management and land conservation policies; adopted policies may be weak and apply to only a limited area. Existing and/or planned densities and market trends are minimally or not supportive of transit.
Ratings based on assessment of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentration of development around established activity centers and regional transit; and</li> <li>• Land conservation and management.</li> </ul>		

TABLE A-3 (Continued)

<b>II. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE PLANS AND POLICIES</b>		
<b><i>b. Transit-Supportive Corridor Policies</i></b>		
Final Design	HIGH	Conceptual plans for the corridor and station areas have been developed. Local jurisdictions have adopted or drafted revisions to comprehensive and/or small area plans in most or all station areas. Land use patterns proposed in conceptual plans and local and institutional plan revisions are strongly supportive of a major transit investment.
	MEDIUM	Conceptual plans for the corridor and station areas have been developed. Local jurisdictions have initiated the process of revising comprehensive and/or small area plans. Land use patterns proposed in conceptual plans and local and institutional plan revisions are at least moderately supportive of a major transit investment.
	LOW	Limited progress, to date, has been made toward developing station area conceptual plans or revising local comprehensive or small area plans. Existing station area land uses identified in local comprehensive plans are marginally or not transit-supportive.
Preliminary Engineering	HIGH	Conceptual plans for the corridor and station areas have been developed. Discussions have been undertaken with local jurisdictions about revising comprehensive plans. Land use patterns proposed in conceptual plans for station areas (or in existing comprehensive plans and institutional master plans throughout the corridor) are strongly supportive of a major transit investment.
	MEDIUM	Conceptual plans for the corridor and station areas are being developed. Discussions have been undertaken with local jurisdictions about revising comprehensive plans. Land use patterns proposed in conceptual plans for station areas (or existing in local comprehensive plans and institutional master plans) are at least moderately supportive of a major transit investment.
	LOW	Limited progress, to date, has been made toward developing station area conceptual plans or working with local jurisdictions to revise comprehensive plans. Existing station area land uses identified in local comprehensive plans are marginally or not transit-supportive.
Ratings based on assessment of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans and policies to increase corridor and station area development;</li> <li>• Plans and policies to enhance transit-friendly character of corridor and station area development;</li> <li>• Plans to improve pedestrian facilities, including facilities for persons with disabilities; and</li> <li>• Parking policies.</li> </ul>		

TABLE A-3 (Continued)

<b>II. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE PLANS AND POLICIES</b>		
<i>c. Supportive Zoning Regulations Near Transit Stations</i>		
Final Design	HIGH	Local jurisdictions have adopted zoning changes that strongly support a major transit investment in most or all transit station areas.
	MEDIUM	Local jurisdictions are in the process of adopting zoning changes that moderately or strongly support a major transit investment in most or all transit station areas. Alternatively: strongly transit-supportive zoning has been adopted in some station areas but not in others.
	LOW	No more than initial efforts have begun to prepare station area plans and related zoning. Existing station area zoning is marginally or not transit-supportive.
Preliminary Engineering	HIGH	A conceptual planning process is underway to recommend zoning changes for station areas. Conceptual plans and policies for station areas are recommending transit-supportive densities and design characteristics. Local jurisdictions have committed to examining and changing zoning regulations where necessary. Alternatively, a “high” rating can be assigned if existing zoning in most or all transit station areas is already strongly transit-supportive.
	MEDIUM	A conceptual planning process is underway to recommend zoning changes for station areas. Local jurisdictions are in the process of committing to examining and changing zoning regulations where necessary. Alternatively, a “medium” rating can be assigned if existing zoning in most or all transit station areas is already moderately transit-supportive.
	LOW	Limited consideration has been given to preparing station area plans and related zoning. Existing station area zoning is marginally or not transit-supportive.
Ratings based on assessment of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning ordinances that support increased development density in transit station areas;</li> <li>• Zoning ordinances that enhance transit-oriented character of station area development and pedestrian access; and</li> <li>• Zoning allowances for reduced parking and traffic mitigation.</li> </ul>		

TABLE A-3 (Continued)

<b>II. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE PLANS AND POLICIES</b>		
<i>d. Tools to Implement Land Use Policies</i>		
Final Design	HIGH	Transit agencies and/or regional agencies are working proactively with local jurisdictions, developers, and the public to promote transit-supportive land use planning and station area development. The transit agency has established a joint development program and identified development opportunities. Agencies have adopted effective regulatory and financial incentives to promote transit-oriented development. Public and private capital improvements are being programmed in the corridor and station areas which implement the local land use policies and which leverage the Federal investment in the proposed corridor.
	MEDIUM	Transit agencies and/or regional agencies have conducted some outreach to promote transit-supportive land use planning and station area development. Regulatory and financial incentives to promote transit-oriented development are being developed, or have been adopted but are only moderately effective. Capital improvements are being identified that support station area land use plans and leverage the Federal investment in the proposed major transit corridor.
	LOW	Limited effort has been made to reach out to jurisdictions, developers, or the public to promote transit-supportive land use planning; to identify regulatory and financial incentives to promote development; or to identify capital improvements.
Preliminary Engineering	HIGH	Transit agencies and/or regional agencies are working proactively with local jurisdictions, developers, and the public to promote transit-supportive land use planning and station area development. Local agencies are making recommendations for effective regulatory and financial incentives to promote transit-oriented development. Capital improvement programs are being developed that support station area land use plans and leverage the Federal investment in the proposed major transit corridor.
	MEDIUM	Transit agencies and/or regional agencies have conducted some outreach to promote transit-supportive land use planning and station area development. Agencies are investigating regulatory and financial incentives to promote transit-oriented development. Capital improvements are being identified that support station area land use plans and leverage the Federal investment in the proposed major transit corridor.
	LOW	Limited effort has been made to reach out to jurisdictions, developers, or the public to promote transit-supportive land use planning; to identify regulatory and financial incentives to promote development; or to identify capital improvements.

TABLE A-3 (Continued)

<b>II. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE PLANS AND POLICIES</b>		
<b><i>d. Tools to Implement Land Use Policies (Continued)</i></b>		
Ratings based on assessment of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach to government agencies and the community in support of land use planning;</li> <li>• Regulatory and financial incentives to promote transit-supportive development; and</li> <li>• Efforts to engage the development community in station area planning and transit-supportive development.</li> </ul>		
<b>III. PERFORMANCE AND IMPACTS OF LAND USE POLICIES</b>		
<b><i>a. Performance of Land Use Policies</i></b>		
Final Design	HIGH	A significant number of development proposals are being received for transit-supportive housing and employment in station areas. Significant amounts of transit-supportive development have occurred in other, existing transit corridors and station areas in the region.
	MEDIUM	Some development proposals are being received for transit-supportive housing and employment in station areas. Moderate amounts of transit-supportive development have occurred in other existing transit corridors and station areas in the region.
	LOW	A limited number of proposals for transit-supportive housing and employment development in the corridor are being received. Other existing transit corridors and station areas in the region lack significant examples of transit-supportive housing and employment development.
Preliminary Engineering	HIGH	Transit-supportive housing and employment development is occurring in the corridor. Significant amounts of transit-supportive development have occurred in other, existing transit corridors and station areas in the region.
	MEDIUM	Station locations have not been established with finality, and therefore, development would not be expected. Moderate amounts of transit-supportive housing and employment development have occurred in other, existing transit corridors and station areas in the region.
	LOW	Other existing transit corridors and station areas in the region lack significant examples of transit-supportive housing and employment development.
Ratings based on assessment of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated cases of development affected by transit-oriented policies; and</li> <li>• Station area development proposals and status.</li> </ul>		

TABLE A-3 (Continued)

<b>III. PERFORMANCE AND IMPACTS OF LAND USE POLICIES</b>		
<b><i>b. Potential Impact of Transit Project on Regional Land Use</i></b>		
Preliminary Engineering and Final Design	HIGH	A significant amount of land in station areas is available for new development or redevelopment at transit-supportive densities. Local plans, policies, and development programs, as well as real estate market conditions, strongly support such development.
	MEDIUM	A moderate amount of land in station areas is available for new development or redevelopment at transit-supportive densities. Local plans, policies, and development programs, as well as real estate market conditions, moderately support such development.
	LOW	Only a modest amount of land in station areas is available for new development or redevelopment. Local plans, policies, and development programs, as well as real estate market conditions, provide marginal support for new development in station areas.
Ratings based on assessment of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptability of station area land for development; and</li> <li>• Corridor economic environment.</li> </ul>		