

Project Name		Span Wire Intersection Replacement Program/Traffic Signal Hardening			
Submitted by:		Pinellas County Transportation			
Project Cost:		\$5,850,000			
Project Description: (The description should include those threats the project is to address and identify a NEED.)		<p>Replacement of 9 existing span wire intersections with mast arms made of galvanized steel. Intersections are along major evacuation routes throughout Pinellas County. Approx. \$650k per intersection for construction. Estimated completion time: more than 12 months.</p> <p>This project is a countywide benefit; by having a more robust system in place this will improve the safe, efficient flow of traffic countywide in the event of a storm or flood. Traffic signals hung by span wire are susceptible to damage or falling due to strong wind. The fall of span wire results in traffic signals becoming inoperable and potentially blocking vehicle access on the road. Mast arm signals in place of span wire at these intersections located on evacuation routes will allow for the roads to remain open and for emergency personnel to have better access to support citizen needs.</p>			
Potential Funding Sources:					
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 desirable score and in some cases it will be the least desirable 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).	5	67.5
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 consistent 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	432
Suitability subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		96%
Risk Reduction		45%			
1	Scope of Benefits	15%	5 - High: Benefits the entire municipality 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 Inconvenience 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: More than 100,000 people. 3 - Medium: 10,000 to 100,000 people. 1 - Low: Fewer than 10,000 people.	5	101.25
Parameter Subtotal		100%	sum of parameter scores; max =	675	675
Risk Reduction Subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		100%
Cost		25%			
1	Estimated Costs*	20%			15

LMS Scoring Committee Revisions

Applicant Self Score Scoring Committee Revisions



	<i>i. Initial Cost</i>	75%	5 - Low: \$0 to \$100,000. 3 - Moderate: \$100,001 to \$1 million. 1 - High: More than \$1 million.	1	11.25
	<i>ii. Maintenance/Operating Costs</i>	25%	5 - Low costs 3 - Moderate costs 1 - High costs	1	3.75
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.	3	90
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.	3	45
	Parameter Subtotal	100%	sum of parameter scores: max =	375	195
Cost Subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		52%
*Estimated costs are comprised of two secondary parameters: initial and maintenance/operating costs.					
SUITABILITY		30%		96%	432
RISK REDUCTION		45%		100%	675
COST		25%		52%	195
TOTAL		100%			1302

Cell: E8

Comment: The LMS Goal and accompanying Objective from our LMS plan Appendix 4 will be listed in evaluators comments. If the project doesn't tie to one, best score will be 3.

Cell: E9

Comment: The approach to this question is: "How would another community like this project in their community?"

Cell: E10

Comment: The approach to this question is the environmental impact of the completed project, not during construction.

Cell: E17

Comment: The approach to this is as a countywide initiative. Most projects score 1.

Cell: E18

Comment: For a hardening project, this score reflects the lives potentially saved during the time the hardened facility would be out of service if not hardened. Also, drafting plans and maintaining functioning systems have little potential to save lives.

Cell: E19

Comment: Essential services to the LMS are considered those necessary for response to disaster: police, fire, medical, EOC, emergency communications.

Cell: E20

Comment: This is the inconvenience during construction or implementation.

Cell: E21

Comment: This is the economic effect during construction or implementation.

Cell: E22

Comment: For a hardening project, score a 1 unless you can show that more than 10,000 people would benefit until the services that would be interrupted without the hardening project would be restored.

Cell: E30

Comment: If you don't have a BCR that documents a value greater than 4, this should be a score of 3.

Cell: E31

Comment: If you aren't planning to fund this yourself, the score should be 3 or lower.

Cell: E32

Comment: Normal score is 1 or 3. To rate a 5, you should be planning to fund this yourself.

Cell: E33

Comment: Normal score is 1. For a 3, you should be able to document the storm surge/flooding events that could have caused losses and the losses that occurred elsewhere in the area as proof of the severity of the events. For a 5, you'll need to have documentation of the repetitive losses due to disaster events.