Ph: 386-226-0422
www.volusiatpo.org

MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Please be advised that the Volusia Transportation Planning Organization (VTPO) **TIP SUBCOMMITTEE** will be meeting on:

DATE: Tuesday, May 1, 2012
TIME: 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: Volusia TPO
2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100 (Conference Room)
Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145

****

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ACTION ITEMS

A. Evaluation & Ranking of Project Applications for XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Funding *(contact Bob Keeth) (scoring criteria are attached; project applications to be provided under separate cover)*

B. Evaluation & Ranking of Project Applications for Transportation Enhancement Funding *(contact Bob Keeth) (scoring criteria are attached; project applications to be provided under separate cover)*

III. PUBLIC COMMENT/PARTICIPATION *(length of time at the discretion of the chairman)*

IV. VTPO STAFF COMMENTS

V. TIP SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

VI. ADJOURNMENT

TIP Subcommittee Members:

Bill McCord, Chairman	Clay Ervin, Vice Chairman	Frank Kinsley
A.J. Devies	Melissa Winsett	Bobby Ball
Mike Chuven		Heather Blanck

cc: TCC, CAC, BPAC Members
Steve Friedel, FDOT
Press

Note: Individuals covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in need of accommodations for this public meeting should contact the Volusia TPO office, 2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145, (386) 226-0422, extension 21 at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

MEETING SUMMARY
(TIP SUBCOMMITTEE)
MAY 1, 2012

II. ACTION ITEMS

A. EVALUATE AND RANK PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR XU TRAFFIC OPERATIONS/ITS/SAFETY FUNDING

Background Information:

Project Application packets were accepted for XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety funding from interested parties from February 8 to April 13, 2012. The TIP Subcommittee is expected to create a draft list of priority projects for review by the CAC and TCC on May 15, 2012.

The XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Proposal Requirements/Criteria and the 2012 VTPO Priority Process Schedule have been provided with this agenda packet for reference purposes.

ACTION REQUESTED:

RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A RANKED LIST OF PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR XU TRAFFIC OPERATIONS/ITS/SAFETY FUNDING.

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***PROVIDENCE AND EUSTACE INTERSECTION SAFETY UPGRADE***

Project Sponsor: ***DELTONA*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** _____

Project Description: The City, to enhance for the public safety and appropriately manage traffic flow, is applying jointly with Volusia County for a study of the intersection of Providence Boulevard and Eustace Avenue. The intent is to study the intersection to determine if a fully controlled intersection that features a push button activated stop light, (Also operating during school drop off and pick up hours.) and the addition of full intersection crosswalks are warranted. This intersection, along with the current crosswalk located at Joyner Avenue has a history of accidents including a pedestrian that was hit by a car in the crosswalk last year at the Joyner/Providence intersection. If the fully controlled intersection is warranted, all pedestrian activity in the area will be directed to the Eustace/Providence intersection in lieu of utilizing other intersections (including Joyner). Both City and County staffs suggest that eliminating the crosswalk at Joyner and adding full intersection crosswalks at Eustace with push button signalization will greatly increase the safety for pedestrians and vehicle operators.

Purpose and Need: The City, out of concern for the public's safety, is applying jointly with Volusia County for a study of the intersection of Providence Boulevard and Eustace Avenue with a hope that study will find sufficient need to improve the intersection with a stop light that operates during school drop off and pick up hours and push button crosswalks for the safety of the school patrons using the four schools and library in the area. This intersection, along with the current crosswalk located at Joyner Avenue has a history of accidents including a pedestrian that was hit by a car in the crosswalk this year. The City staff believe that eliminating the crosswalk at Joyner and adding full intersection crosswalks at Eustace with push button signalized crosswalks will greatly increase the safety for pedestrians and vehicle operators.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***FLAGLER BEACH PIERSON TRAFFIC CALMING***

Project Sponsor: ***FLAGLER BEACH*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 1

Project Description: Design traffic calming roadway features and add traffic calming devices on State Road A1A at Flagler Pier.

Purpose and Need: Since the Pier is one of the premier attractions in the City and parking on the east side of State Road A1A (adjacent to the Pier) is very limited, the majority of residents and tourists visiting the Pier must cross State Road A1A without the benefit of a signal. Thus, the purpose of this request is to determine what steps can be taken to improve the safety of pedestrians crossing State Road A1A in the vicinity of the municipal Pier and downtown business district. Currently, State Road A1A is a two-lane roadway with angled parking spaces on the east side of the roadway and parallel parking spaces adjacent to the businesses on the west side of the roadway. Speed is limited to 35 mph, yet, even at this speed, it can still be a challenge to safely cross State Road A1A. During peak usage times such as summer, Bike Week, and Spring Break, this entire area becomes congested with traffic backing up in both directions and people attempting to cross State Road A1A at several locations, with only the one directly across from the pier being marked as a crosswalk. Although this crosswalk is striped and has a ground-mounted blinking light, there is no refuge island in the middle and sight lines tend to become extremely limited due to the parked cars on either side. In addition, the restaurant at the Pier has recently been leased to a new owner who is renovating the entire restaurant and adding a deck. Once the renovations are complete, we anticipate much greater usage of the new restaurant thus creating an even greater need to calm traffic in this area. Therefore, the City of Flagler Beach is requesting a Feasibility Study be performed on State Road A1A in the vicinity of the Pier and downtown business district to determine how traffic can be calmed and pedestrians can safely travel between the Pier and downtown.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***BEACH PARKING PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SIGNAL AT RACING'S NORTH TURN***

Project Sponsor: ***PONCE INLET*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 1

Project Description: Addition of new pedestrian crossing signals (rectangular rapid flashing beacons or RRFBs) and associated signage at the public off-beach parking facility located 4511 South Atlantic Avenue (west side of South Atlantic Avenue across from Racing's North Turn restaurant).

Purpose and Need: The Town of Ponce Inlet has observed that the pedestrian crossing signage and other safety installations do not match similar crossings north of this public off-beach parking area. There is concern given the access to the beach, as well as the commercial activity on the east side of South Atlantic Avenue, that signalization and upgraded signage is needed to further protect the pedestrian traffic at this busy location. The request simply continues the use of signals installed to the north at other public off-beach parking facilities in Wilbur-by-the-Sea and the City of Daytona Beach Shores. The Volusia TPO used the traffic engineering firm of GMB to develop a study of the pedestrian safety issues for this corridor (see attached). The findings of the study support the use of rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) as one the technical improvements to improve safety. This is very important since there is limited ROW to install other safety measures identified in the study, such a Danish Offset and Median Island Refuge. It is understood that there will need to be modifications to the location of the cross-walk and signage in order to comply with the MUTCD requirements.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***OLD MISSION ROAD - PARK AVENUE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS***

Project Sponsor: ***EDGEWATER*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 1

Project Description: Reconstruct the intersection to provide a southbound left turn lane by widening Old Mission Road 12' to the west; reconstruct the asphalt area located at the abandoned rail line to remove the "bump" while still providing access to pedestrians and bicycles; overall geometry of the intersection should be modified to provide safe and efficient access for heavy vehicles; install guard rail along the east side of the roadway to prevent errant vehicles from encroaching into the ditch area; reconstruct the east leg of the study intersection to reduce the skew and provide an exclusive right turn lane on westbound Park Avenue; mill and resurface entire project limits to provide uniform intersection geometry/surface; and install luminaires on existing utility poles within construction boundaries to provide additional roadway lighting.

Purpose and Need: The purpose of the project is to relieve several safety issues at the intersection and provide enhanced mobility from the I-95 interchange to the prime economic development area located along Park Avenue east of said intersection, which was developed through a spirit of partnership between the City of Edgewater and Volusia County. The need for this project arises from the high volume of turning movements at this sub-standard intersection and the public welfare issues raised by its current design. The traffic volume traversing this intersection has risen dramatically in recent years most likely due to the fact that both roads are collectors for school traffic to the middle school and high school located on 10th Street, of which, Edgewater residents provide the majority of students. Additionally, the current design constraints of the intersection prohibit large truck access to the City's largest industrial base areas, Parktowne Industrial Center and the airport industrial area. Currently, the majority of the industrial truck traffic from I-95 must travel east bound to US 1, turn north on US 1 to then turn west on Park Avenue. These improvements would facilitate the utilization of northbound movements on Old Mission Road from SR 442 which can then turn eastbound on Park Avenue. This will aid in creating a shorter distance in miles traveled from the interstate, lessening time spent in traffic and easing the number of trips along the City's two most heavily traveled roads, SR 442 and US 1. See attached support letter from the Volusia County Public Works Department.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***US 1(RIDGEWOOD AVENUE) TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPGRADES***

Project Sponsor: ***HOLLY HILL*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 1

Project Description: Replace existing wire span signals at several intersections along US 1 with Mast arm signals. The intersections include 3rd Street, 6th Street, 8th Street, Walker Street and Flomich Street. The City is willing to phase the project as necessary. Estimated Project cost is $975,000 based on a construction cost of $150,000 per intersection as stated in the FDOT approved cost estimate for Second Street and US 1; an allowance of 15% for Design and CEI; and an allowance of 15% for contingency.

Purpose and Need: The proposed improvements will assist the role and function of the Ridegwood Avenue corridor as a hurricane and emergency evacuation route. The selected cross-streets are local collectors within the city's road network. The project will also allow for better timing and signal integration through the upgrade of the signals to modern standards. The project is consistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan and the public facility design standards (refer to the CRA Redevelopment Plan).

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***SOUTH ATLANTIC AVENUE RAPID RECTANGULAR FLASHING BEACONS***

Project Sponsor: ***NEW SMYRNA BEACH*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 1

Project Description: Installation of 5 Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) at South Atlantic Avenue and Oyster Quay, East 24th Avenue, East 18th Avenue, East 12th Avenue and East 7th Avenue, as recommended by the Pedestrian Safety Study for South Atlantic Avenue (January 2012).

Purpose and Need: The pedestrian volumes collected in the field identified six intersections where pedestrian demand was significantly higher than the other intersections within the corridor. These intersections include Oyster Quay, Matthews Avenue, 26th Avenue, 27th Avenue, 24th Avenue and 7th Avenue. Currently 27th Avenue is controlled with a full traffic signal and the Matthews Avenue crosswalk is controlled with a pedestrian traffic signal, so they would not be considered candidates for RRFBs.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH TRAFFIC SIGNAL PREEMPTION***

Project Sponsor: ***NEW SMYRNA BEACH*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 3

Project Description: Install traffic preemption equipment on twenty three traffic lights within the New Smyrna Beach City limits. The City will pay the costs associated with installing traffic preemption devices on seven first response units of the New Smyrna Beach Fire Department.

Purpose and Need: In 2009, the Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization (now Transportation Planning Organization), contracted Traffic Engineering Data Solutions, Inc. to conduct a study on emergency vehicle preemption. The study's purpose was to determine which preemption system should be utilized throughout Volusia County. A countywide standard allows fire departments responding to an emergency situation to utilize their preemption equipment regardless of jurisdiction. The result would be an overall increase in safety with a reduction in response times. Utilization of a common system would allow emergency responders a safe and efficient method to traverse a signalized intersection along with minimizing disruption to traffic during installation. This is particularly important to the City of New Smyrna Beach, which experiences significant volumes of beach traffic during weekends, holidays and peak tourist months. Often during these periods, inbound traffic can be backed up to Interstate 95, causing significant delays for emergency responders.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***ADAPTIVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROL ALONG SR 40 FROM MAIN TRAIL TO TYMBER CREEK RD***

Project Sponsor: ***ORMOND BEACH*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** high

Project Description: This is to implement a real-time adaptive technology system on SR 40 from Main Trail to Tymber Creek Rd. Volusia County has a project to implement an adaptive signal control from Nova Rd to A1A. This project will extend the adaptive control throughout the SR 40 corridor.

Purpose and Need: The traditional signal timing process is time consuming and requires substantial amounts of manually collected traffic data. Traditional Time-of-Day signal timing plans do not accommodate variable and unpredictable traffic demands. Special events, construction, or traffic incidents typically wreak havoc on traffic conditions. While large-scale construction projects and regular events can be anticipated, determining their impact on traffic conditions can be extremely difficult. Other disruptions, such as crashes, are impossible for time-of-day signal timing to accommodate. With real-time Adaptive Signal Control Technologies, information is collected and signal timing is updated continually. Adaptive traffic signal control is the process by which the timing of a traffic signal is continuously adjusted based on the changing arrival patterns of vehicles at an intersection, usually with the goal of optimizing a given measure of effectiveness. Based upon a September 2010 survey of adaptive traffic control systems throughout the United States conducted by HDR, it is expected that the real-time adaptive control technology will have a combined lower costs with decreased maintenance and higher reliability than the current signal timing technology being used today.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***MAST ARM INSTALLATION ON A1A AT CARDINAL DRIVE***

Project Sponsor: ***ORMOND BEACH*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** high

Project Description: This is to convert the intersections from span wire assembly to mast arms.

Purpose and Need: While Signal head placement has a negligible effect on intersection capacity, the placement of traffic signal heads on mast arms at A1A and Cardinal will be particularly advantageous for heavy vehicles, giving them additional time to decelerate and come to a full stop. Span wire installations at these intersections have higher maintenance costs than mast arms. While it is recognized that span wire and mast arm types may need additional reinforcements if installed in a location known for strong winds, FDOT policy is to convert all span wire intersections along the coast (east of I-95) to mast arms. As a side benefit, span wire installations are generally considered less aesthetically pleasing than mast arms because of overhead wires. The existing span wire installation is in poor conditions and under size concrete poles.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***MAST ARM INSTALLATION ON A1A AT HARVARD DRIVE***

Project Sponsor: ***ORMOND BEACH*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** high

Project Description: This is to convert the intersections from span wire assembly to mast arms.

Purpose and Need: While Signal head placement has a negligible effect on intersection capacity, the placement of traffic signal heads on mast arms at A1A and Harvard Dr will be particularly advantageous for heavy vehicles, giving them additional time to decelerate and come to a full stop. Span wire installations at these intersections have higher maintenance costs than mast arms. While it is recognized that span wire and mast arm types may need additional reinforcements if installed in a location known for strong winds, FDOT policy is to convert all span wire intersections along the coast (east of I-95) to mast arms. As a side benefit, span wire installations are generally considered less aesthetically pleasing than mast arms because of overhead wires.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***HERBERT STREET WESTBOUND TURN LANE AT CLYDE MORRIS BOULEVARD***

Project Sponsor: ***PORT ORANGE*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 3

Project Description: Construct an exclusive westbound right turn lane on Herbert Street at Clyde Morris Boulevard to provide channelized through/left movements and right turn movements.

Purpose and Need: The project will reduce delays at the Herbert Street/Clyde Morris Blvd. intersection and improve traffic flow on all approaches. This intersection experiences congestion several times a day, most notably in the early afternoon when Silver Sands Middle School is dismissed (see Exhibit 3). The p.m. peak hour generally does not occur at the same time as the peak hour of traffic for the majority of the area roadway network. A recent traffic impact analysis study indicates that in 2010 the p.m. peak hour westbound approach volumes at the intersection are projected to be 255 vehicles which will represent an operating level of service (LOS) of D for this movement. This represents the worst directional operation movement within the intersection. In 2008, there were 117 westbound left turning vehicles (52%) and 106 westbound right turning vehicles (47%) and only 2 (1%) through vehicles (Exhibit 4). A.M. peak hour movements are also at LOS D but the delay is not as great as in the p.m. peak hour. What is not represented in the study is the heavy volume of traffic in the early afternoon when school is dismissed. There is sufficient right-of-way to construct a turn lane. A sidewalk will need to be relocated on the north side of Herbert Street and a fire hydrant would have to be moved (see Exhibit 2 and 3). By providing channelized turn lanes, vehicle delay and queue lengths can be reduced and additional time can be allocated to through movements on Clyde Morris Boulevard.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***LED TRAFFIC SIGNAL LIGHTING REPLACEMENT***

Project Sponsor: ***PORT ORANGE*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 4

Project Description: Replace existing traffic signal heads that have incandescent bulbs with lower wattage LED traffic signal heads/light fixtures. There are 20 signalized intersections identified by Volusia County that need to be replaced. Each intersection will cost approximately $5,000 for a total of $100,000.

Purpose and Need: In order to provide more energy efficient operations, the City in conjunction with Volusia County is proposing to change the signal lighting fixtures at intersections throughout the City. The City currently has 19 signals that have LED lighting fixtures. The City proposes to convert the remaining 20 signals to LED lighting. The City Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Element established Sustainability as the primary goal and Objective 1.1 establishes Energy Efficiency as a priority of the City. This project will continue to improve energy efficiency of public facilities. Several policies have been adopted to implement energy efficiency objectives and to meet the sustainability goal as described below.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

Volusia TPO - 2012 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Scoring Form - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***BIG TREE RD/GOLFVIEW BLVD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS***

Project Sponsor: ***SOUTH DAYTONA*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 5

Project Description: this project involves improving the intersection of Big Tree Road and Golfview Boulevard by replacing the existing span wire traffic signals with mast arm assemblies, enhancing crosswalk and sidewalk approaches, resurfacing the intersection and installing a covered school bus stop.

Purpose and Need: The purpose of this project is to more effectively manage the interaction of pedestrians and vehicles at the intersection of Big Tree Road and Golfview Boulevard. There is a major school crossing and bus stop at this location. A crossing guard has been assigned to this intersection due to its heavy use to get school children from the subdivisions north of Big Tree Road to South Daytona Elementary to the south. The sidewalk approaches and pedestrian signals at this intersection need to be improved to enhance safety. In addition, the span wire traffic signals have been shown to fail in high winds. Since this intersection is located within a coastal area, the traffic signals need to be replaced with a more sturdy mast arm assembly designed to withstand high winds. This project also calls for the installation of enhanced crosswalks which makes them more noticeable to drivers.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Max. Points	Points Awarded
(1) Location	5	
(2) Project Readiness	15	
(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits	30	
(4) Safety Benefits	20	
(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development	10	
(6) Infrastructure Impacts	20	
Total	**100**	

(1) Location (5 points max.)

Project located on a …			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	☐	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		☐	5	
Subtotal			**0 - 5**	

(2) Project Readiness (15 points max.)

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required[1]		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
PE (Design)		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Environmental		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Right-of-Way Acquisition		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Permitting		☐	☐	☐	☐	0 - 3	
Subtotal						**0 - 15**	

(3) Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Max. Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select only one	< 0.75	☐	0	
		0.75 to 0.99	☐	0 - 3	
		1.00 to 1.25	☐	0 - 4	
		>1.25	☐	0 - 5	
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	☐	0	
		Bike, Pedestrian or Transit	☐	0 - 5	
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming[2]	☐	0 - 10	
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification[3], access management or ITS improvements[4]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting critical traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.[5]	Select only one	No	☐	0	
		Yes	☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal				**0 - 30**	

(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)

Safety Benefits [6]			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 4	
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles[7]		☐	0 - 4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2[7])		☐	0 - 4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

(5) Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Benefits (10 points max.)

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 5	
Directly supports economic development (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities)		☐	0 - 5	
Subtotal			**0 - 10**	

(6) Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined	Select only[8]	☐	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		☐	0 - 2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		☐	0 - 4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required[8]	Select all that apply	☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required[9]		☐	0 - 3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required[10]		☐	0 - 3	
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		☐	0 - 3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		☐	0 - 4	
Subtotal			**0 - 20**	

MEETING SUMMARY
(TIP SUBCOMMITTEE)
MAY 1, 2012

II. ACTION ITEMS

B. EVALUATE AND RANK PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDING

Background Information:

Project application packets were accepted for Transportation Enhancement funding from interested parties from February 8 to April 13, 2012. The TIP Subcommittee is expected to create a draft list of priority projects for review by the CAC and TCC on May 15, 2012.

The Transportation Enhancement Project Proposal Requirements/Criteria and the 2012 VTPO Priority Process Schedule have been provided with this agenda packet for reference purposes.

ACTION REQUESTED:

RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE RANKED LIST OF TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROJECT APPLICATIONS.

Volusia TPO - 2012 TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: _____ **Date**: _____

Project Title: ***FLAGLER BEACH MULTIMODAL HUB***

Project Sponsor: ***FLAGLER BEACH*** **Priority (relative to other applications submitted by this Sponsor):** 1

Project Description: This project will construct a Multimodal Hub on City-owned property, develop a transit circulation route from the Hub, and provide for educational materials to direct vehicles from the downtown core and oceanfront to the multimodal hub where residents and visitor can utilize a trolley system to move about town, rent bicycles, or safely walk to the downtown shops, restaurants, oceanfront, and pier

Project Location (include project length and termini, if appropriate, and attach location map): S. Flagler Avenue with a circulation route throughout the downtown business district between SRA1A and Flagler Avenue and from 9th Street South to 9th Street North.

Project Purpose and Need: The main goal is to provide a parking facility on Flagler Avenue from which residents and visitors can easily access downtown by trolley, on foot, or by bicycle. By keeping vehicles out of the downtown core, this project will improve traffic and pedestrian circulation throughout the city and thereby create a safe pedestrian environment within the downtown business area to encourage transit, walking, and bicycling. Adequate, easy to find parking and traffic/pedestrian circulation issues are the greatest challenges facing downtown Flagler Beach. Now that the majority of the streetscaping improvements have been completed in the core downtown area, one of the most critical concerns remaining is the development of a parking and traffic and pedestrian circulation plan that will take advantage of our substantial investment in our complete streets. For instance, if visitors are driving by, they are not stopping; if they are not stopping and getting out of their vehicle, they are not buying. Furthermore, without this additional parking facility, the available downtown on-street parking does not provide enough spaces to maintain a viable business district into the future.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	**Maximum Points**	**Points Awarded**
(1) Contribution to "Livability" and Sustainability in the Community	25	
(2) Enhancements to the Transportation System	25	
(3) Demand/Accessibility	15	
(4) Safety/Security	15	
(5) Project Readiness	10	
(6) Matching Funds Provided	10	
Total	**100**	

Criteria Definitions

(1) Contribution to "Livability" and Sustainability in the Community (Maximum 25 Points)
This criterion looks at how the project positively impacts the "Livability" and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility.

(2) Enhancements to the Transportation System (maximum 25 points)
This criterion considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

(3) Demand/Accessibility (Maximum 15 points)
This criterion looks at how this project satisfies demand and improves accessibility.

(4) Safety Benefits (Maximum 15 Points)
This criterion looks at how and to what extent the proposed facility would enhance safety conditions for motorized travelers, non-motorized travelers, or the community.

(5) Project "Readiness" (Maximum 10 Points)
This criterion looks at the amount of work required to develop the project and get it ready for construction. The closer a project is to the construction phase, the more points it is eligible for.

(6) Matching Funds (Maximum 10 Points)

Points may be awarded in proportion to the size of the match.

2012 Priority Project Process Schedule

February 2012

- TPO staff issues **call for new projects** – application packets sent out to all interested parties (Tuesday, February 7)
- **Except as noted below, local governments are NOT required to submit a new application for a candidate project already on one of the VTPO's Priority Project lists. However, if a local government would like for its project(s) to remain on a list for funding, that local government must submit a letter to the VTPO reaffirming its support for the project(s). Candidate projects on the list of projects ready for Feasibility Study will not be moved to the list of projects ready for Project Implementation until a Feasibility Study has been completed AND the local government has submitted an application for Project Implementation to the VTPO.**
- TPO staff hosts **workshops** with local governments to discuss the Priority Project process and application requirements: East Volusia and West Volusia (dates, times and locations to be determined).

March/April 2012

- **Deadline** to submit Priority Project applications and/or letters of support for **"**candidate project(s)" **5:00 p.m. Friday, April 13, 2012**

May 2012

- TCC/CAC/BPAC - TIP Subcommittee meets to rank Transportation Enhancement and Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety projects (Tuesday, May 1)
- BPAC Ranking Subcommittee meets to rank XU Bicycle/Pedestrian projects (Tuesday, May 1)
- BPAC 1st review of draft XU Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transportation Enhancement Priority Project Lists (Wednesday, May 9)
- CAC 1st review of Transportation Enhancement and Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday, May 15)
- TCC 1st review of draft Transportation Enhancement and Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday, May 15)

June 2012

- BPAC 2nd review of draft XU Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transportation Enhancement Priority Project Lists (Wednesday, June 13)
- CAC 2nd review of draft Transportation Enhancement & Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday, June 19)
- TCC 2nd review of draft Transportation Enhancement & Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday, June 19)
- 30-day public notice for public to Review the draft Priority Project Lists (Friday, June 22)
- TPO 1st review of draft Priority Project Lists (Tuesday, June 26)
- TPO staff transmits draft Transportation Enhancement list(s) to FDOT for review (Friday, June 29)

July 2012

- Submit draft Priority Project Lists to TPO Board for 2nd review (July 10)
- TPO Board holds a Public Hearing on the Draft Priority Project Lists (Tuesday, July 24, unless meeting canceled, then Tuesday, August 28)
- **TPO Board adopts Priority Project Lists** (Tuesday, July 24, unless meeting canceled, then Tuesday, August 28)

August 2012

- TPO staff compiles all of the prioritization process information (including the adopted priority lists) and transmits this information to FDOT prior to the October 1, 2012 deadline