

Project Name		Span Wire Intersection Replacement Program/Traffic Signal Hardening			
Submitted by:		Pinellas County Public Works			
Project Cost:		\$7,472,000			
Project Description: (The description should include those threats the project is to address and identify a NEED.)		Replacement of existing span wire intersections with mast arms made of galvanized steel. Intersections are along major evacuation routes throughout Pinellas County. 5 intersections in need of funding, at approximately \$2.06M per intersection for construction. Estimated completion time: more than 12 months.			
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 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).	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 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	405
Suitability subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		90%
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.	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>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	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