



# MEETING NOTICE & REVISED AGENDA

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

**DATE:** Tuesday, May 3, 2011  
**TIME:** 1:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Volusia TPO  
2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100 (Conference Room)  
Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145

\*\*\*\*\*

## REVISED AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II. ACTION ITEMS
  - A. Review/Recommend Approval of Corridor Ranking Criteria for Corridor Improvement Program *(contact Bob Keeth) (draft criteria to be provided under separate cover)*
  - B. Review and Recommend Approval of Prioritized Lists for SIS Roadway Projects and Regionally Significant Non-SIS Roadway Projects *(contact Bob Keeth) (enclosures)*
  - C. 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)*
  - D. 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. VTPO STAFF COMMENTS
- IV. TIP SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS
- V. ADJOURNMENT

### TIP Subcommittee Members:

Bill McCord, Chairman	Melissa Booker	A.J. Devies
Mike Holmes	Rocky Rivera	Gilles Blais

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 3, 2011**

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. REVIEW/RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CORRIDOR PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA FOR CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**Background Information:**

In March, the Volusia TPO Board approved Resolution 2011-02 which established the Corridor Improvement Program. Then, at their April meetings, the CAC and TCC identified corridors to be studied pursuant to this program. Corridors identified by the CAC and TCC as candidates for study include the following:

- SR 40
- SR 44 from I-95 to A1A
- SR 5A (Nova Rd) from SR 5/US 1 to SR 5/US 1
- US 92 from CR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) to A1A
- A1A from SR 421 to SR 40
- SR 430 (Mason Av) from SR 483 (Clyde Morris Blvd) to ???
- US 1 from SR 442 to SR 40 (D. Lear and G. Henrikson - extend south to Brevard Cnty)
- SR 44 from Kepler Rd to SR 15A (TCC - extend to Grand Av)
- SR 415 from Reed Ellis Rd to Acorn Lake Rd
- Williamson Blvd from SR 400 (Beville Rd) to north of The Pavilion
- SR 415 from CR 415 to Acorn Lake Rd
- US 17/92 to Putnam County

The TCC has asked this subcommittee to develop criteria for prioritizing the corridors. Staff will develop draft criteria for your consideration and forward them to you in advance of your meeting.

***ACTION REQUESTED:***

***RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CORRIDOR PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA.***

**MEETING SUMMARY  
(TIP SUBCOMMITTEE)  
May 3, 2011**

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

**B. Review and Recommend Approval of Prioritized Lists for SIS Roadway Projects and Regionally Significant Non-SIS Roadway Projects**

**Background Information:**

In your previous meeting, you reviewed the current Priority Project Lists for SIS Roadways and Regionally Significant Non-SIS Roadways, and gave your preliminary approval of the modified lists shown below. However, you reserved final approval until after you had considered input from all local jurisdictions through the TCC membership. The TCC has now considered your preliminary recommendation and suggested that you consider adding the following projects to the Prioritized List of Non-SIS Roadways: 1) Howland Boulevard widening from 2 lanes to 4 between Providence and Elkcam and 2) Hand Avenue extension from Williamson Blvd to the proposed Tymber Creek Rd extension. These projects were offered for consideration by Deltona and Ormond Beach, respectively.

Additionally, the TCC suggested that the limits of the SR 40 6-laning project (#7 on your preliminary SIS Roadways List) should be extended eastward to Williamson Blvd to reflect the scope of a PD&E study.

<b>SIS Roadways</b>		<b>Non-SIS Roadways</b>	
1	I-4 widening (4 lanes to 6) from SR 44 to I-95	1	SR 415 widening (2 lanes to 4) from Seminole Cnty to Reed Ellis Rd
2	I-95/I-4 Systems Interchange	2	SR 415 widening (2 lanes to 4) from Acorn Lake Rd to Reed Ellis Rd
3	I-95 widening (4 lanes to 6) from I-4 to SR 44	3	US 1 AIS Recommendations (7 intersections)
4	I-95/SR 421 Interchange Improvements	4	SR 483 widening (4 lanes to 6) from SR 400 to US 92
5	I-95 widening (4 lanes to 6) from Brevard Cnty to SR 44	5	I-95/SR 5 Interchange Modification (Ormond Crossings)
6	US 17 widening (2 lanes to 4) from Ponce de Leon Blvd to SR 40	6	SR 44 Misc. Improvements (SR 15A to SunRail Station)
7	SR 40 widening (4 lanes to 6) I-95 to Breakaway Tr	7	US 92 widening (4 lanes to 6) from I-4 to CR 415
8	SR 40 widening (2 lanes to 4) Cone Rd to SR 11	8	SR 472 widening (4 lanes to 6) from Graves Av to Kentucky/MLK Blvd
9	SR 40 widening (2 lanes to 4) from SR 11 to US 17	9	SR 44 widening (2 lanes to 4) from Voorhis Av to Kepler Rd
10	SR 40 widening (2 lanes to 4) from US 17 to Lake Cnty		
11	US 17 PD&E from SR 40 to Putnam Cnty		

**Action Requested:**

***REVIEW THE CURRENT PRIORITY LISTS FOR SIS PROJECTS AND REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT NON-SIS PROJECTS, AND RECOMMEND MODIFICATIONS TO EACH LIST AS YOU DEEM APPROPRIATE***

**MEETING SUMMARY  
(TIP SUBCOMMITTEE)  
MAY 3, 2011**

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

**C. 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 4 to April 15, 2011. The TIP Subcommittee is expected to create a draft list of priority projects for review by the CAC and TCC on May 17, 2011.

The XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Proposal Requirements/Criteria and the 2011 VTPO Priority Process Schedule (revised March 17, 2011) 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.***

**MEETING SUMMARY  
(TIP SUBCOMMITTEE)  
MAY 3, 2011**

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

**D. 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 4 to April 15, 2011. The TIP Subcommittee is expected to create a draft list of priority projects for review by the CAC and TCC on May 17, 2011.

The Transportation Enhancement Project Proposal Requirements/Criteria and the 2011 VTPO Priority Process Schedule (revised March 17, 2011) have been provided with this agenda packet for reference purposes.

***ACTION REQUESTED:***

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



## 2011 Priority Process Schedule **REVISED (3/17/11)**

### January/February 2011

- TPO staff issues “call” for new projects – application packets sent out to all interested parties (Friday February 4)
- **Local governments are NOT required to submit a new application for a candidate project already on this list. However, if a local government would like for their project(s) to remain as a “candidate project(s)” for funding, each local government must submit a letter to the TPO supporting their project(s)**
- TPO staff hosts **workshops** to discuss the Priority Project application process to provide information to local governments (Thursday February 18 – VTPO Offices in Daytona Beach and Tuesday February 22 – VC Traffic Engineering Conference Room in DeLand)

### March/April 2011

- **Deadline** to submit Priority Project Lists applications and/or letters of support for “candidate project(s)” **Friday April 15**

### May 2011

- TCC/CAC/BPAC - TIP Subcommittee meet to rank Transportation Enhancement and Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety projects (Tuesday May 3)
- BPAC Ranking Subcommittee meets to rank XU Bicycle/Pedestrian projects (Tuesday May 3)
- BPAC 1<sup>st</sup> review of draft XU Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transportation Enhancement Priority Project Lists (May 11)
- CAC 1<sup>st</sup> review of Transportation Enhancement and Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday May 17)
- TCC 1<sup>st</sup> review of draft Transportation Enhancement and Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday May 17)

### June 2011

- BPAC 2<sup>nd</sup> review of draft XU Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transportation Enhancement Priority Project Lists (Wednesday June 8)
- CAC 2<sup>nd</sup> review of draft Transportation Enhancement & Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday June 21)
- TCC 2<sup>nd</sup> review of draft Transportation Enhancement & Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety Priority Project Lists (Tuesday June 21)
- 30-day Public Notice for Public to Review the draft Priority Project Lists (June 24)
- MPO 1st review of draft Priority Project Lists (June 28)
- TPO staff transmits draft Transportation Enhancement list(s) to FDOT for review (June 28)

### July 2011

- Submit Draft Priority Project Lists to TPO Board for 2nd review (July 15)
- TPO Board holds a Public Hearing on the Draft Priority Project Lists (July 26, unless meeting canceled, then August 23)
- **TPO Board adopts Priority Project Lists** (July 26, unless meeting canceled, then August 23)

### August 2011

- TPO staff compiles all of the prioritization process information (including the adopted priority lists) and transmit this information to FDOT prior to the October 1, 2011 deadline

Volusia TPO  
2011 Priority Application for  
**XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Projects**

---

February 2011

**General Instructions:**

This is the first of two calls for projects for the 2011 calendar year. Applications for Feasibility Studies and Project Implementation will be accepted with this call for projects. A second call for projects this summer will only be for projects for which Feasibility Studies have already been completed or are not required.

Applicants must use the attached VTPO XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Application form whether applying for a Feasibility Study or for Project Implementation. If applying for a Feasibility Study, you will complete only the first part of the application.

No project will advance beyond a Feasibility Study unless the VTPO receives an application for Project Implementation for the project. Applications for Project Implementation will be accepted only if a Feasibility Study has already been completed or if the project does not require a Feasibility Study. When applying for Project Implementation, you must complete the entire application. Information that was provided previously in an application for Feasibility Study must be updated to reflect findings and recommendations from the completed Feasibility Study.

Applications will be ranked based on the information supplied in the application.

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

**Project Qualification:**

Except for certain improvements identified in 23 U.S.C. §133<sup>1</sup>, projects located on roads functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors may not be funded with Federal XU funds unless such roads are on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991.

Only applications for Traffic Operations, ITS and Safety Projects will be considered. These projects are relatively low-cost enhancements to improve the operational safety and efficiency of the existing traffic circulation system. They are quick responses to implement low-cost improvements. They are typically narrow in scope and focus on improvements to traffic operations and modifications to traffic control devices. The following list of projects is representative of qualifying projects; however, it is not exhaustive:

1. left and/or right turn lanes, improved signage or signalization,
2. targeted traffic enforcement,
3. limitation or prohibition of driveways, turning movements, trucks and on-street parking,
4. modification of median openings,
5. replacement of standard intersections with traffic circles or roundabouts,
6. incident response plans,
7. extension of turn lanes,
8. realignment of a road,
9. intelligent transportation systems (ITS),
10. provision of traffic calming roadway designs or devices, and
11. installation of street lighting.

---

<sup>1</sup> These exceptions include, carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways, modification of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings.

*General Instructions*

*XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Application*

*Pg. 2 of 2*

**Local Match Requirement:**

VTPO Resolution 2011-03 requires a local match of ten (10) percent of the total amount of XU funds programmed for each project. For this purpose, local match is defined as non-federal cash match and/or in-kind services that advance the project. This resolution also reaffirms the VTPO's policy that the applicant (project originator) shall be responsible for any cost overruns encountered on a project funded with XU funds unless the project is on the state highway system, in which case, the State DOT shall be responsible for any cost overruns.

**Electronic and "Hard Copy" Submittal Requirement:**

1. Applications and supporting documentation shall be submitted as digital media in Portable Document Format (PDF), compatible with MS Windows and Adobe Acrobat Version 9.3 or earlier.
2. Electronic documents may be submitted through our FTP site, as an attachment to email, on a CD or DVD.
3. The application and all supporting documentation shall be included in one electronic PDF file.
4. All document pages shall be oriented so that the top of the page is always at the top of the computer monitor.
5. Page size shall be either 8-1/2" by 11" (letter) or 11" by 17" (tabloid).
6. PDF documents produced by scanning paper documents are inherently inferior to those produced directly from an electronic source. Documents which are only available in paper format should be scanned at a resolution which ensures the pages are legible on both a computer screen and a printed page. We recommend scanning at a minimum 300 dpi to balance legibility and file size.
7. If you are unable to produce an electronic document as prescribed here, please call us to discuss other options.
8. In addition to the digital submittal, we require one (1) complete paper copy of the application and all supporting documents. This must be identical to the digital submittal.

**VTPO staff will provide assistance in completing an application to any member local government that requests it.**



Volusia TPO  
2011 Priority Application for  
**XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Projects**

---

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant (project sponsor): \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Job Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ FAX: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Governmental entity with maintenance responsibility for roadway facility on which proposed project is located: \_\_\_\_\_

*[If not the same as Applicant, attach a letter of support for proposed project from the responsible entity.]*

Is the Applicant LAP certified to administer the proposed project?     Yes     No

If the Applicant is not LAP certified, explain how you intend to comply with the Local Agency Program (LAP) requirements: \_\_\_\_\_

Priority of this proposed project relative to other applications submitted by the Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Location (include project length and termini, if appropriate, and attach location map): \_\_\_\_\_

Project Eligibility for XU Funds (check the appropriate box):

- the proposed improvement is located on the Federal-aid system;
- the proposed improvement is **not** located on the Federal-aid system, but qualifies as a type of improvement identified in 23 U.S.C. §133 that is not restricted to the Federal-aid system.

The Applicant is requesting (check only one):     Feasibility Study     Project Implementation

*[If requesting a Feasibility Study, the Applicant will be required to submit a new application for Project Implementation after the Feasibility Study has been completed. If requesting Project Implementation, attach a copy of the completed Feasibility Study, or explain in the space provided below for commentary why a Feasibility Study is not necessary.]*

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Purpose and Need Statement:**

In the space provided below, describe the Purpose and Need for this proposed project. It is very important that your Purpose and Need statement is clear and complete. It will be the principal consideration in ranking your application for a Feasibility Study. It must convince the public and decision-makers that the expenditure of funds is necessary and worthwhile and that the priority the project is being given relative to other needed transportation projects is warranted. The project Purpose and Need will also help to define the scope for the Feasibility Study, the consideration of

alternatives (if appropriate), and ultimate project design.

The Purpose is analogous to the problem. It should focus on particular issues regarding the transportation system (e.g., mobility and/or safety). Other important issues to be addressed by the project such as livability and the environment should be identified as ancillary benefits. The Purpose should be stated in one or two sentences as the positive outcome that is expected. For example, the purpose is to reduce intersection delays or to reduce rear end collisions. It should avoid stating a solution as a purpose as in - the purpose of the project is to add an exclusive left turn lane. It should be stated broadly enough so that no valid solutions will be dismissed prematurely.

The Need should establish the evidence that the problem exists, or will exist if anticipated conditions are realized. It should support the assertion made in the Purpose statement. For example, if the Purpose statement is based on safety improvements, the Need statement should support the assertion that there is or will be a safety problem to be corrected. When applying for a Feasibility Study, you should support your Need statement with the best available evidence. However, you will not be expected to undertake new studies.

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

**\*\*\* STOP HERE IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR A FEASIBILITY STUDY. COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS ONLY IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION. \*\*\***

**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.

VTPO staff will review the application to determine the classification of the roads benefitting from the proposed project.

Project located on a ...		Max. Points	
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	5
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>5</b>

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

**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.

Check the appropriate boxes to indicate which phases of work have already been completed or will not be required. For each phase that will not be required, explain why in the space provided for commentary. Include

with this application a copy of any relevant studies, warrants, designs, and/or permits. If this is an application for Project Implementation, you must attach a copy of the project scope and cost estimate.

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required <sup>1</sup>		Completed	Not Required	Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	Max. Points
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate	Check only one in each row	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
PE (Design)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Environmental		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Right-of-Way Acquisition		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Permitting		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
<b>Subtotal</b>						<b>15</b>

<sup>1</sup> Since XU funding is Federal funding, all activities or work, including that which is done in advance of applying for Federal funds, must comply with all applicable Federal statutes, rules and regulations.

**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.

In the space provides below for commentary, describe the operational benefits of the proposed project. When putting your application together please include a copy of any approved signal warrant or street lighting studies.

Mobility and Operational Benefits			Maximum Points	
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity)	Select only one	< 0.75	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		0.75 to 0.99	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
		1.00 to 1.25	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
		>1.25	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	- None	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		- Bike, Ped. or Transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
		- Access Mgmt, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification <sup>2</sup> , access management or ITS improvements <sup>3</sup>	Select only one	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade of critical traffic signal to mast arm	Select only one	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>30</b>

<sup>1</sup> Attach Traffic Signal Timing Study.

<sup>2</sup> Attach Warrant Study to application; otherwise VTPO staff will assume that a Warrant Study justifying the improvement has not been completed.

<sup>3</sup> Access management and ITS improvements include, but are not limited to, addition of non-traversable median greater than 50% project length, addition of curb/gutter at intersection or greater than 50% project length, closure of minor intersections or crossovers, reduction of the number of access points (driveways or driveway widths), elimination of existing at-grade RR crossing, elimination of existing on-street parking, provision of traffic signal preemption for emergency vehicles, connection of three or more traffic signals, and new connection of traffic signal system to computerized signal control.

**Commentary:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

This criterion looks at the extent 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).

In the space provides below for commentary, describe the safety benefits expected from the proposed project, and explain how the proposed project will help to achieve those benefits. VTPO staff will work with the appropriate agencies to determine the intersection and corridor crash rates.

Safety Benefits <sup>1</sup>			Max. Points
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Intersection Crash Rate ≥ 2 per million entering vehicles		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Corridor Crash Rate ≥ 2 per vehicle million miles		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate ≥ 2)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>20</b>

<sup>1</sup> If an application scores very high in this criterion, the VTPO may submit application to either the East or West Volusia CTST for Safety Fund consideration.

**Commentary:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria #5 – Comprehensive Plan and Economic Development (10 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will contribute to the satisfaction of one or more of the local government's adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic development. 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.

Comprehensive Plan Compliance and Economic Development			Max. Points
Directly contributes to the satisfaction of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/>	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)		<input type="checkbox"/>	5
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>10</b>

**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.

In the space provided below for commentary, describe the infrastructure impacts that will occur as a result of constructing the proposed project. When completing your application, please consider the drainage issues that may be involved (see notes below for a more detailed explanation).

Infrastructure Impacts			Max. Points
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 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		<input type="checkbox"/>	2
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required <sup>2</sup>	Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required <sup>2</sup>		<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required <sup>3</sup>		<input type="checkbox"/>	3
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed		<input type="checkbox"/>	3
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>20</b>

<sup>1</sup> ADA pedestrian crossings at intersections may impact drainage significantly. Attached Traffic Study should address drainage impacts.

<sup>2</sup> Typically, these are underground utilities that can only be determined by a complete set of plans. Attach plans showing no impacts; otherwise, assumption is in urban area utilities will be affected.

<sup>3</sup> Typically, above ground utilities are not affected except for widening and turn lane projects.

**Commentary:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Volusia TPO  
2011 XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**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	
<b>Total (excluding Value-Added Tie Breaker)</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>Total (including Value Added Tie Breaker)</b>		

**Project Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Sponsor:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Priority (relative to other applications submitted by the Project Sponsor):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Definitions**

**(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 ...		Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	5
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(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.

Project located on a ...			Max. Points	Points Awarded
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0	
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0	
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	5	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>5</b>	

**(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.

Mobility and Operational Benefits			Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity)	Select only one	< 0.75	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		0.75 to 0.99	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
		1.00 to 1.25	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
		>1.25	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	- None	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		- Bike, Ped. or Transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
		- Access Mgmt, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification <sup>2</sup> , access management or ITS improvements <sup>3</sup>	Select only one	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Hurricane evacuation or secondary evacuation route upgrade of critical traffic signal to mast arm	Select only one	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>30</b>

**(4) Safety Benefits (20 points max.)**

This criterion looks at the extent 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).

Safety Benefits <sup>1</sup>			Max. Points	Points Awarded
On Florida DOT's High Crash List?	Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
Intersection Crash Rate $\geq$ 2 per million entering vehicles		<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
Corridor Crash Rate $\geq$ 2 per vehicle million miles		<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
Street lights needed (Nighttime to Daytime Crash Rate $\geq$ 2)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
Provides pedestrian safety features (e.g., RR crossing or intersection crossing)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>20</b>	

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

This criterion looks at the degree to which the proposed project will contribute to the satisfaction of one or more of the local government's adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic development. 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.

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	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)		<input type="checkbox"/>	5	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>10</b>	

**(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			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 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required <sup>2</sup>	Select all that apply		3	
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required <sup>2</sup>		<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required <sup>3</sup>		<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
No specimen or historic trees $\geq$ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed		<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
No new railroad crossing or alteration of existing crossing is required		<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>20</b>	



**Volusia TPO  
2011 Transportation Enhancement  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

Priority (relative to other applications submitted by the Project Sponsor): \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**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	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	

**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.