

Federal Transit Admin., DOT

§611.11

- (b) The criteria are as follows:
 - (1) Mobility Improvements.
 - (2) Environmental Benefits.
 - (3) Operating Efficiencies.
 - (4) Transportation System User Benefits (Cost-Effectiveness).
 - (5) Existing land use, transit supportive land use policies, and future patterns.
 - (6) Other factors. Additional factors, including but not limited to:
 - (i) The degree to which the programs and policies (e.g., parking policies, etc.) are in place as assumed in the forecasts,
 - (ii) Project management capability, including the technical capability of the grant recipient to construct the project, and
 - (iii) Additional factors relevant to local and national priorities and relevant to the success of the project.
- (c) In evaluating proposed new starts projects under these criteria:
 - (1) As a candidate project proceeds through preliminary engineering and final design, a greater degree of certainty is expected with respect to the scope of the project and a greater level of commitment is expected with respect to land use.
 - (2) For the criteria under §611.9(b)(1)-(4), the proposed new start will be compared to the baseline alternative.
 - (d) In evaluating proposed new starts projects under these criteria, the following factors shall be considered:
 - (1) The direct and indirect costs of relevant alternatives;
 - (2) Factors such as congestion relief, improved mobility, air pollution, noise pollution, energy consumption, and all associated ancillary and mitigation costs necessary to carry out each alternative analyzed, and recognize reductions in local infrastructure costs achieved through compact land use development;
 - (3) Existing land use, mass transportation supportive land use policies, and future patterns;
 - (4) The degree to which the project increases the mobility of the mass transportation dependent population or promotes economic development;
 - (5) Population density and current transit ridership in the corridor;

- (6) The technical capability of the grant recipient to construct the project;
- (7) Differences in local land, construction, and operating costs; and
- (8) Other factors as appropriate.
- (e) FTA may amend the measures for these criteria, pending the results of ongoing studies regarding transit benefit evaluation methods.
- (f) The individual ratings for each of the criteria described in this section will be combined into a summary rating of "high," "medium-high," "medium," "low-medium," or "low" for project justification. "Other factors" will be considered as appropriate.

§611.11 Local financial commitment criteria.

In order to approve a grant or loan under 49 U.S.C. 5309, FTA must find that the proposed project is supported by an acceptable degree of local financial commitment, as required by section 5309(e)(1)(C). The local financial commitment to a proposed project will be evaluated according to the following measures:

- (a) The proposed share of project capital costs to be met using funds from sources other than the section 5309 new starts program, including both the non-Federal match required by Federal law and any additional capital funding ("overmatch"), and the degree to which planning and preliminary engineering activities have been carried out without funding from the section 5309 new starts program;
- (b) The stability and reliability of the proposed capital financing plan for the new starts project; and
- (c) The stability and reliability of the proposed operating financing plan to fund operation of the entire transit system as planned over a 20-year planning horizon.
- (d) For each proposed project, ratings for paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section will be reported in terms of descriptive indicators, as follows: "high," "medium-high," "medium," "low-medium," or "low." For paragraph (a) of this section, the percentage of Federal funding sought from 49 U.S.C. §5309 will be reported.
- (e) The summary ratings for each measure described in this section will

§611.13

be combined into a summary rating of “high,” “medium-high,” “medium,” “low-medium,” or “low” for local financial commitment.

§611.13 Overall project ratings.

(a) The summary ratings developed for project justification local financial commitment (§§611.9 and 611.11) will form the basis for the overall rating for each project.

(b) FTA will assign overall ratings of “highly recommended,” “recommended,” and “not recommended,” as required by 49 U.S.C. 5309(e)(6), to each proposed project.

(1) These ratings will indicate the overall merit of a proposed new starts project at the time of evaluation.

(2) Ratings for individual projects will be updated annually for purposes of the annual report on funding levels and allocations of funds required by section 5309(o)(1), and as required for FTA approvals to enter into preliminary engineering, final design, or FFGAs.

(c) These ratings will be used to:

(1) approve advancement of a proposed project into preliminary engineering and final design;

(2) Approve projects for FFGAs;

(3) Support annual funding recommendations to Congress in the annual report on funding levels and allocations of funds required by 49 U.S.C. 5309(o)(1); and

(4) For purposes of the supplemental report on new starts, as required under section 5309(o)(2).

(d) FTA will assign overall ratings for proposed new starts projects based on the following conditions:

(1) Projects will be rated as “recommended” if they receive a summary rating of at least “medium” for both project justification (§611.9) and local financial commitment (§611.11);

(2) Projects will be rated as “highly recommended” if they receive a summary rating higher than “medium” for both local financial commitment and project justification.

(3) Projects will be rated as “not recommended” if they do not receive a summary rating of at least “medium” for both project justification and local financial commitment.

49 CFR Ch. VI (10–1–03 Edition)

APPENDIX A TO PART 611—DESCRIPTION OF MEASURES USED FOR PROJECT EVALUATION.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

FTA will use several measures to evaluate candidate new starts projects according to the criteria established by 49 U.S.C. 5309(e)(1)(B). These measures have been developed according to the considerations identified at 49 U.S.C. 5309(e)(3) (“Project Justification”), consistent with Executive Order 12893. From time to time, FTA has published technical guidance on the application of these measures, and the agency expects it will continue to do so. Moreover, FTA may well choose to amend these measures, pending the results of ongoing studies regarding transit benefit evaluation methods. The first four criteria listed below assess the benefits of a proposed new start project by comparing the project to the baseline alternative. Therefore, the baseline alternative must be defined so that comparisons with the new start project isolate the costs and benefits of the major transit investment. At a minimum, the baseline alternative must include in the project corridor all reasonable cost-effective transit improvements short of investment in the new start project. Depending on the circumstances and through prior agreement with FTA, the baseline alternative can be defined appropriately in one of three ways. First, where the adopted financially constrained regional transportation plan includes within the corridor all reasonable cost-effective transit improvements short of the new start project, a no-build alternative that includes those improvements may serve as the baseline. Second, where additional cost-effective transit improvements can be made beyond those provided by the adopted plan, the baseline will add those cost-effective transit improvements. Third, where the proposed new start project is part of a multimodal alternative that includes major highway components, the baseline alternative will be the preferred multimodal alternative without the new start project and associated transit services. Prior to submittal of a request to enter preliminary engineering for the new start project, grantees must obtain FTA approval of the definition of the baseline alternative. Consistent with the requirement that differences between the new start project and the baseline alternative measure only the benefits and costs of the project itself, planning factors external to the new start project and its supporting bus service must be the same for both the baseline and new start project alternatives. Consequently, the highway and transit networks defined for the analysis must be the same outside the corridor for which the new start project is proposed. Further, policies affecting travel demand and travel costs,