Agenda

• Brief overview of New Starts/Small Starts program
• Recent and proposed changes to the program
• Interactive discussion regarding several projects
• Hear from project sponsors regarding their experiences
Funding: Supply and Demand

- **Demand:**
  - 18 New Starts projects in PE and Final Design
  - 21 Small Starts projects in PD
  - Total cost of pipeline: ~ $30 billion, ~ $11 billion in New Starts/Small Starts funding
  - FTA tracking > 100 corridor-focused planning studies considering major transit capital investments

- **Supply:** $1.6+ billion annually
New Starts Project Development Process

- Project Development: Typically 6-12 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>~ 100 AA Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>10 PE Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>3-7 years</td>
<td>0 FD Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 FFGA Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTA Approval Required
FTA Approval Required for Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA)
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Small Starts Project Development Process

- Project Development: Typically 3-5 Years

FTA Approval Required

FTA Approval Required for PCGA

Alternative Analysis 1-2 years

~ 100 AA Studies

Project Development 2-3 years

13 PD Projects

Construction
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## Evolution of New Starts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005-08</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Future*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>• Projects greater than $250 M in total project cost and/or</td>
<td>• Projects greater than $250 M in total project cost and/or</td>
<td>• Seek more than $100 M in section 5309 monies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seek greater than $75 M in section 5309 monies</td>
<td>• Seek greater than $75 M in section 5309 monies</td>
<td>• No cap on project cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Review</td>
<td>• 4 step process</td>
<td>• 4 step process</td>
<td>• Eliminate New Starts AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compare project to baseline alternative</td>
<td>• Compare project to baseline alternative</td>
<td>• Eliminate baseline alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rely on NEPA AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>• Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>• Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>• Community benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public transit supportive land use</td>
<td>• Public transit supportive land use</td>
<td>• Congestion Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic development</td>
<td>• Economic development</td>
<td>• Energy and Environmental Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobility benefits</td>
<td>• Mobility benefits</td>
<td>• Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental benefits</td>
<td>• Environmental benefits</td>
<td>• Transit supportive land use and future patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operating efficiencies</td>
<td>• Operating efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, July 2009
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## Evolution of New Starts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005-08</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Future*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Weights | • Cost effectiveness – 50%  
• Public transit supportive land use/Economic development – 20%  
• Mobility benefits – 20%  
• Environmental benefits – 0%  
• Operating efficiencies - 10% | • Cost effectiveness – 20%  
• Public transit supportive land use – 20%  
• Economic development – 20%  
• Mobility benefits – 20%  
• Environmental benefits – 10%  
• Operating efficiencies - 10% | • Comparable but not necessarily equal consideration to benefits |
| Cost Effectiveness | • Require “medium” to advance through rating and evaluation process  
• Require “medium” to be recommended for funding | • Can receive a “low” or “medium-low” to advance through rating and evaluation process  
• Require “medium” to be recommended for funding | • Eliminated as a criteria |

*House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, July 2009*
# Evolution of Small Starts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*</th>
<th>2005-08</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Future*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Eligibility** | • $250 M cap on project cost  
• $75 M cap on Section 5309 monies  
• Substantial portion of project operates in separate ROW, or substantial investment in a defined corridor | • $250 M cap on project cost  
• $75 M cap on Section 5309 monies  
• Substantial portion of project operates in separate ROW, or substantial investment in a defined corridor | • $100 M cap on Section 5309 monies  
• No cap on project cost  
• Majority of project operates in dedicated ROW and represents substantial investment in a defined corridor |
| **Project Review** | • 3 step process  
• Compare project to baseline alternative | • 3 step process  
• Compare project to baseline alternative | • Eliminate New Starts/Small Starts AA  
• Eliminate baseline alternative  
• Rely on NEPA AA |
| **Categorical Exclusion for Streetcars** | • None | • None | • Located within existing ROW |

*House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, July 2009
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## Evolution of Small Starts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>2005-08</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Future*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                           | • Cost effectiveness, public transit supportive land use and economic development | • Cost effectiveness, public transit supportive land use and economic development | • Community benefits  
• Congestion Relief  
• Energy and Environmental Benefits  
• Economic Development  
• Transit supportive land use and future patterns |
| Weights                   | • 50% cost effectiveness  
• 50% Land use/Economic Development | • Comparable but not necessarily equal consideration  
• 33% each to cost effectiveness, land use and economic development | • Comparable but not necessarily equal consideration to benefits |
| Cost Effectiveness        | • Require “medium” to advance through rating and evaluation process  
• Require “medium” to be recommended for funding | • Can receive a “low” or “medium-low” to advance through rating and evaluation process  
• Require “medium” to be recommended for funding | • Eliminated as a criteria |

*House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, July 2009
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