Project Name		**Signal Modifications on The Barrier Islands**			
Submitted by:		**Pinellas County Public Works**			
Project Cost:		**$3,500,000**			
Project Description: (The description should include those threats the project is to address and identify a NEED.)		**This project will include the modification of approximately 35 traffic signal control cabinets to increase resilience and mitigate flood impacts during storms. Signal cabinets on the barrier islands are extremely vulnerable to flood damage due to their location in low lying areas. The cabinets house sensitive electronic equipment to operate the traffic signals and include a UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supply) to maintain signal operations to support evacuations and emergency response during a power outage. The estimated cost to modify each signal location is $100,000. The modifications will reduce the costs associated with equipment replacement and traffic disruptions while also providing a shorter response**			
Potential Funding Sources:		Partial funding Penny for Pinellas, HMGP			
Parameter		**Weighting Factor**	**Scoring Criteria**	**Score**	**Points**
Suitability		**30%**	**Rank each project with a score of either a 1 (low), 3 (medium) or 5 (high). Note that in some instances a 5 may be the most desireable score and in some cases it will be the least desireable score.**		
1	Appropriateness of the Project	40%	**5 - High:** Reduces vulnerability and is consistent with Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) goals and plans for future growth. **3 - Medium:** Needed, but does not tie to identified vulnerability. **1 - Low:** Inconsistent with LMS goals or plans.	**5**	180
2	Community Acceptance	15%	**5 - High:** Accepted by most communities. **3 - Medium:** Accepted by most; may create some burdens. **1 - Low:** Not likely to be accepted by any community ("The not in my backyard" theory).	**3**	40.5
3	Environmental Impact	10%	**5 - Positive effect** on the environment. **3 - No effect -** environmentally neutral. **1 - Adverse effect** on the environment.	**3**	27
4	Consistent with Existing Legislation and/or Policies	10%	**5 - High:** Consistent with existing laws and policies. **3 - Medium:** New legislation or policy changes needed, but no conflicts identified. **1 - Low:** Conflicts with existing laws, regulations and/or policies.	**5**	45
5	Consistent with Existing Plans and Priorities	25%	**5 - High -** Consistent with existing plans and priorities. **3 - Medium -** Somewhat consistant with current plans and priorities. **1 - Low -** Conflicts with existing plans and priorities. Does not fit in with identified initiatives.	**5**	112.5
	Parameter Subtotal	100%	**sum of parameter scores; max =**	450	405
Suitability subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		90%
Risk Reduction		**45%**			
1	Scope of Benefits	15%	**5 - High:** Benefits the entire municipalitiy and other jurisdictions directly or indirectly. **3- Medium:** Benefits more than half the municipality or other jurisdictions area. **1- Low**: Benefits less than half the municipality.	**5**	101.25
2	Potential to Save or Protect Human Lives	35%	**5 - High:** More than 1,000 lives. **3 - Medium:** Up to 1,000 lives. **1 - Low:** No lifesaving potential.	**5**	236.25

3	Importance of Benefits	15%	**5 - High:** Needed for essential services. **3 - Medium:** Needed for other services. **1 - Low:** No significant implications.	5	101.25
4	Level of Inconveniece or "Nuisance Factor" Caused by the Project	10%	**5 - None:** Causes few problems. **3 - Moderate:** Most major problems avoided. **1 - Significant:** Causes much inconvenience (e.g., traffic jams, loss of power, delays).	5	67.5
5	Economic Effect or Loss Caused by the Project	10%	**5 - Minimal** economic loss (little effect during project). **3 - Moderate** economic loss (minimum disruption). **1 - Significant** economic loss (businesses closed, jobs affected, etc.).	5	67.5
6	Number of People to Benefit from this Project	15%	**5 - High: M**ore than 100,000 people. **3 - Medium:** 10,000 to 100,000 people. **1 - Low: F**ewer than 10,000 people.	3	60.75
	Parameter Subtotal	100%	**sum of parameter scores; max =**	675	634.5
Risk Reduction Subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		94%
Cost		**25%**			
1	Estimated Costs*	20%			22.5
	i. Initial Cost	*75%*	**5 - Low:** $0 to $100,000. **3 - Moderate:** $100,001 to $1 million. **1 - High:** More than $1 million.	1	11.25
	ii. Maintenance/Operating Costs	*25%*	**5 - Low** costs **3 - Moderate** costs **1 - High** costs	3	11.25
2	Benefit to Cost Ratio	40%	**5 - High:** Ratio is greater than 4 to 1. **3 - Medium:** Ratio is between 1 to 1 and 4 to 1. **1 - Low:** Ratio is less than 1 to 1.	5	150
3	Financing availability	10%	**5 - Good:** Readily available through grants or other funding sources. **3 - Moderate:** Limited grant or matching funds available. **1 - Poor:** No funding sources or matching funds are identified.	3	22.5
4	Affordability	10%	**5 - Good:** Project is easily affordable. **3 - Moderate:** Project is somewhat affordable. **1 - Poor:** Project is very costly for the jurisdiction.	3	22.5
5	Repetitive Damages Corrected (Repetitive Damages and Loss in this case is NOT the same as a Repetitive Loss as in the CRS program)	20%	**5 - High:** Alleviates repetitive loss. Property must have been damaged in the past by a disaster event. **3 - Medium:** Repetitive loss may have occurred but was not documented. **1 - Low:** No effect on repetitive loss.	5	75
	Parameter Subtotal	100%	**sum of parameter scores: max =**	375	292.5
Cost Subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		78%
*Estimated costs are comprised of two secondary parameters: initial and maintenance/operating costs.					
SUITABILITY		**30%**		90%	405
RISK REDUCTION		**45%**		94%	635
COST		**25%**		78%	293
TOTAL		**100%**			**1332**