**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *LPGA Blvd at Jimmy Ann Drive Signalization***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***City of Daytona Beach***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Minor Arterial – TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |

**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *DeBary Elementary Turn Lanes***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***City of DeBary***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Urban Minor Collector- TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles, corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |

**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *Reed Canal Park Bridge Replacement***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***City of South Daytona***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Local Road – TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |

**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *Dunlawton Avenue Turn Lanes Bundle***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***City of Port Orange***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Principal Arterial - TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |

**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *SR A1A at SR 40 Signal Upgrades***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***Volusia County***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Principal Arterial – TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |

**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *SR 415 at Enterprise Osteen Traffic Signal***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***Volusia County***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Principal Arterial – TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |

**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *US 17/92 at Rich Ave Signal Upgrade***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***Volusia County***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Principal Arterial – TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |

**Scored By:**  **Date:**

**Project Title: *Williamson Blvd Access Management and Safety Improvement***

**Applying Agency (project sponsor)**: ***Volusia County***

**Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

| **Project located on a …** | |  | **Possible 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** |  |

**Commentary:** *Principal Arterial – TPO Staff*

**Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)**

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.

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

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| Mobility and Operational Benefits | |  |  | **Possible 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 |  | 3 |  |
| 1.00 to 1.25 |  | 4 |  |
| >1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO’s CMP/Performance Measures Report |  | 5 |  |
| Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide) | Select all that apply | None |  | 0 |  |
| Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming |  | 0 - 10 |  |
| Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis, or access management or ITS improvements | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. | Select only one | No |  | 0 |  |
| Yes |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  |  | **0 - 30** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST). The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

| **Safety Benefits** 8 | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) | Select all that apply |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the 2012 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. |  | 0 – 5 |  |
| The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. |  | 0 – 10 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 – 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.

| **Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality** | |  | **Possible Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 5 |  |
| Directly supports economic vitality (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** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score.

| **Infrastructure Impacts** | |  | **Possible 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 9 | Select only one |  | 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 | Select all that apply |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed |  | 0 - 4 |  |
| **Subtotal** | |  | **0 - 20** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the Applying Agency committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? | **Check One** | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
|  | | |  |
| 10.0% Local Matching Funds |  | 0 |  |
| 10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5% |  | 1 |  |
| 12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0% |  | 2 |  |
| 15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5% |  | 3 |  |
| 17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0% |  | 4 |  |
| 20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5% |  | 5 |  |
| 22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0% |  | 6 |  |
| 25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5% |  | 7 |  |
| 27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0% |  | 8 |  |
| 30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5% |  | 9 |  |
| 32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds |  | 10 |  |
| **Maximum Point Assessment** |  | **10** |  |

**Commentary:**

**Scoring Summary**

Populate table with scores from the Seven Criterion above to calculate Total Project Score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Criteria | **Max. Points** | **Points Awarded** |
| 1 - Location | 5 |  |
| 2 – Project Readiness | 15 |  |
| 3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits | 30 |  |
| 4 – Safety Benefits | 20 |  |
| 5 – Support of Comprehensive Planning and Economic Vitality | 10 |  |
| 6 – Infrastructure Impacts | 20 |  |
| 7 – Local Matching Funds | 10 |  |
| **Total Project Score** | **110** |  |