

Evaluation Criteria Report



FLORIDA-ALABAMA 2050 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Prepared for

**Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization and
The Florida Department of Transportation, District Three**

Prepared by

**Emerald Coast Regional Council
Staff to the Florida-Alabama
Transportation Planning Organization**



September 2025

This report was financed in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Florida and Alabama Departments of Transportation, and local participating governments, and submitted in partial fulfillment of Task 2 of the FY 2024-2026 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This document does not necessarily reflect the official reviews or policies of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Florida-Alabama
Transportation Planning Organization

Evaluation Criteria Report

Prepared by:

The Emerald Coast Regional Council
Staff to the Florida-Alabama
Transportation Planning Organization

The Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization can be reached at:

Post Office Box 11399
Pensacola, Florida
32524-1399

Phone:
(800) 226-8914
(850) 332-7976

Fax:
(850) 637-1923

Staff contact for this Document:
Gary Kramer, Transportation Planner IV
E-mail: gary.kramer@ecrc.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA -- 2045 LRTP	2
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS.....	3
TPO MEETINGS.....	5
December 10, 2024 Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting.....	5
December 10, 2024 Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting.....	5
December 11, 2024 Transportation Planning Organization Meeting	5
ADOPTED EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
 APPENDIX A – EVALUATION CRITERIA RANKINGS	
APPENDIX B – RESOLUTION 24-27	

INTRODUCTION

The Florida-Alabama 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update began when the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approved the Scope of Services on November 8, 2023. The 2050 LRTP consists of 8 primary tasks that are identified below:

- Public Participation
- Congestion Management Process Update
- Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures
- Evaluation Criteria
- Financial Resources
- Needs Assessment
- Cost Feasible Plan
- Final and Summary Reports

An important element in the development of the Florida-Alabama 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is the adoption of the Evaluation Criteria. The Evaluation Criteria is derived from the adopted Goals and Objectives and is used to rank projects in the 2050 Needs Plan for consideration in development of the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan. This Technical Report describes the development of the Evaluation Criteria and is organized into 5 sections:

- Initial Evaluation Criteria from the 2045 LRTP Update.
- Steering Committee Meetings.
- Committee Meetings.
- Adopted Evaluation Criteria.
- Appendices.

The purpose of the Evaluation Criteria is to rank the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan Needs Plan Projects for consideration in development of the 2050 Long Range Transportation Cost Feasible Plan and Project Priority Rankings. For the rankings of the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan Needs Plan based on the adopted Evaluation Criteria, see Appendix A of this report.

INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA -- 2045 LRTP

Category and Criteria (Description)	Criteria Rating Scale (Lesser Benefit <--> Higher Benefit)		
Safety and Security - 25% [Goal A; Objectives A.1, A.2, A.4]			
Hurricane Evacuation [Project is on or develops Hurricane Evacuation Route] To what extent will the project support movement of people, goods, or services to facilitate evacuation?	0 No		1 Yes
Safety Improvement Strategies [Accident rates based on Signal Four Analytics] Projects ranked from highest to lowest and awarded a graduated point value based on ranking past five years.	0 Lowest	0.5 Mid Range	1 Highest
Intermodal Access [Project on SIS, STRAHNET, military, otherwise regionally significant] Is the project on one of these facilities?	0 No		1 Yes
User's Needs - 15% [Goals B, D, & E; Objectives B.2, B.3, B.4, D.3, D.6, E.1]			
Existing Level of Service (LOS) [Project existing LOS based on Congestion Management System] What is the existing LOS on the project route?	0 A or B	0.5 C or D	1 E or F
Future LOS [Project future LOS 2045 in Needs Assessment] What is the future LOS on the project route?	0 E or F	0.5 C or D	1 E or F
Connectivity [Project improves continuity or connectivity over the network] Is the project on a Principal Arterial, Arterial, or Collector / Other?	0 Collector / Other	0.5 Arterial	1 Principal Arterial
Operational and Integrated - 15% [Goals B, C, & D; Objectives B.5, C.1, C.2, C.4, D.2, D.3, D.6]			
Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) / Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) [Project supports ITS / ATMS implementation] Does the project advance ITS / ATMS implementation?	0 No		1 Yes
Adopted Plans [Project addresses user needs in adopted master, regional, local plans, including Freight or Corridor Management Plans] Is the project listed in an adopted plan?	0 No		1 Yes
Freight Plan [Is the project in an adopted Freight Plan?] To what extent does the project advance an adopted Freight Plan?	0 No		1 Yes
Existing Volume-to-Capacity (V/C) [What is existing Volume-to-Capacity ratio based on Regional Transportation Model?] Is the V/C Ratio less than 1.3?	0 less than 1.3		1 greater than 1.3
Future V/C [What is future Volume-to-Capacity ratio based on Regional Transportation Model?] Is the V/C Ratio less than 1.3?	0 less than 1.3		1 greater than 1.3
Structurally Deficient Upgrades [Project replaces / Improves structurally deficient infrastructure] Is the project identified on the TIP for resurfacing or replacement?	0 No		1 Yes
Multi-Modal - 15% [Goal D & F; Objectives D.2, D.3, D.4, D.5, F.3, F.4]			
Pedestrian, Bicycle, Public [Project included as a Pedestrian project in the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan] Does the project provide for multi-modal connections for bicycle, pedestrian, or public transit, or park-and-ride / ride-share?	0 greater than 2 miles	0.5 within 2 miles	1 Same facility
Complete Streets [Project provides for Complete Streets Implementation] Does the project provide for Complete Streets implementation as determined by the local government(s) having jurisdiction?	0 No		1 Yes
Economic Vitality - 10% [Goals E & F; Objectives E.1, E.3, E.4, E.5, F.5]			
Economic Development [Project provides connection to activity center] Does the project provide direction connection to ports, industrial or tourist centers, military bases, shopping, medical, or education?	0 No		1 Yes
Rural Connectivity [Project provides additional connection / enhancement to rural areas] Does the project provide connection to rural areas?	0 No		1 Yes
Tourism and Recreation [Project provides for tourism, recreation, linkages to water, trails, parks] What is the project proximity to tourist / recreation destination?	0 greater than 2 miles		1 0 to 2 miles
Quality of Life - 10% [Goal F & G; Objectives F.1, F.2, F.5, F.6, G.6]			
Environmental [Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study and/or Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) Review] Does the project have impacts or no impacts?	0 Substantial	0.5 Moderate	1 Low
Community Impact [Project community impacts assessed] To what extent does the project have community support based on PD&E or ETDM input?	0 Low		1 High
Planning Consistency - 10% [Goal G; Objective G.2]			
Status [Project Evaluation and Work Plan] Are one or more phases of the project scheduled in the 5-Year Work Plan?	0 No	0.5 PD&E / Design	1 Right-of-Way or Construction
Local Government Contribution [Project funding includes local government contribution] To what extent does the project include local government funding or other contribution?	0 No		1 Yes

Safety and Security	3*25	75
User Needs	3*15	45
Operational and Integrated	6*15	90
Multi-Modal	2*15	30
Economic Vitality	3*10	30
Quality of Life	2*10	20
Planning Consistency	2*10	20
Maximum points one project can have		310

TPO has final authority to select the projects for inclusion in the Cost Feasible Plan and to rank them in the Project Priorities.

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

A Steering Committee, which consists of members of the Technical Coordinating and Citizens' Advisory Committees as well as other transportation representatives, is the committee that will be overseeing the Long Range Transportation Plan process. For the Evaluation Criteria task, the Steering Committee met three times at Emerald Coast Regional Council. The three meetings were advertised in the Florida Administrative Register to comply with the Sunshine Law. The dates of the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan Steering Committee Meetings are listed below with respect to the Evaluation Criteria discussion.

- March 19, 2024 (Steering Committee Meeting #2).
- May 14, 2024 (Steering Committee Meeting #3).
- June 24, 2024 (Steering Committee Meeting #4).

The Steering Committee members reviewed the previous Long Range Transportation Plan's Evaluation Criteria as well as the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives. The recommended changes are listed below and were further illustrated in the table below on the next page.

- Goal A (Safety and Security): With the 2050 emphasis on resiliency, a new measure was added to look at network within storm surge zones. This category remained at 25% weight.
- Goal B (User Needs): The category of *Public Need* was added. The category remained at 15% weight.
- Goal C (Operational): The category of *Corridor Plan* was changed to *Adopted Plans*. The category changed the weight from 15% to 20%.
- Goal D (Multimodal): Additional emphasis was given to *transit* and *trail* in the first category, and to *rail* in the second category. *Complete Streets* was moved to Goal C. The category remained at 15% weight.
- Goal E (Economic Vitality): Additional emphasis was given to *military connectivity*. The category remained at 10% weight.
- Goal F (Quality of Life): Additional emphasis was given to *affordable housing* and *equity*. The category remained at 10% weight.
- Goal G (Planning): The category was changed from “*Planning*” to “*Consistent, Continuing, Cooperative, Comprehensive*” to reflect the FHWA requirement. The category changed the weight from 10% to 5%.
- Total points changed from 310 to 100 based on weights identified in each category at the recommendation of the Steering Committee.

FL-AL 2050 LRTP Evaluation Criteria Update – Comparison from 2045 to 2050 (as approved by Steering Committee Meeting #4)									
2045					2050				
Goal	Objectives	Weight	Max Pts	Tot Pts	Category	Objectives	Weight	Max Pts	Total Points
A. Safety, Security	Hurricane Evacuation	25%	25	75	A. Resiliency, Safety, Security	Hurricane Evacuation [A.3, A.5, A.6, A.7]	25%	6.25	25
	Safety Improvement		Safety Improvement [A.1]			6.25			
	Intermodal Access (SIS, STRAHNET, Military)		Intermodal Access (SIS) [A.8, A.9, D.4]			6.25			
			Storm Surge Zones1 [A.3, A.6, A.8]			6.25			
B. User’s Needs	Existing LOS	15%	15	45	B. User’s Needs	Existing LOS [A.2, B.2, B.3, B.4, F.6]	15%	3.75	15
	Future LOS		Future LOS [A.2, B.2, B.3, B.4, F.6]			3.75			
	Connectivity		Connectivity [B.5]			3.75			
			Public Need [B.1]			3.75			
C. Operational	ITS / ATMS Plans	15%	15	90	C. Operational, Integrated	ITS / ATMS Plans [C.4, D.3, D.6]	20%	3.33	19.99
	Corridor Plan		Adopted Plans [C.3, D.1, D.3, F.1, G.1, G.2, G.5, G.6]			3.33			
	Freight Plan		Corridor / Complete Street [C.4, F.3]			3.33			
	Existing V/C Ratio		Existing V/C Ratio [B.3, B.4, E.1]			3.33			
	Future V/C Ratio		Future V/C Ratio [B.3, B.4, E.1]			3.33			
	Structurally Deficient		Structurally Deficient [C.1, C.2]			3.33			
D. Multimodal	Bicycle, Pedestrian, Public	15%	15	30	D. Multimodal	Transit, Ped, Bike, Trail [A.4, D.3, D.5, F.4, G.2]	15%	7.5	15
	Complete Streets		Freight / Rail [D.2, D.4, D.7]			7.5			
E. Economic Vitality	Economic Development	10%	10	30	E. Economic Vitality	Economic Development [E.2, E.6]	10%	2.5	10
	Rural Connection		Rural Connection [E.5]			2.5			
	Tourism / Recreation		Tourism / Recreation [E.4, F.1, F.5]			2.5			
			Military (STRAHNet or MIRR) [E.3]			2.5			
F. Quality of Life	Environmental	10%	10	20	F. Equity, Quality of Life	Environmental [F.2]	10%	3.33	9.99
	Community Impact		Affordable Housing [F.9]			3.33			
			Equity [F.4, F.7, F.8, G.4]			3.33			
G. Planning	Work Program Status	10%	10	20	G. Consistent, Continuing, Cooperative, Comprehensive	Work Program Status [G.1]	5%	2.5	5
	Local Gov’t Contribution		10			Gov’t Contribution [G.7]		2.5	
Total		100%	310		Total		100%	100	

TPO MEETINGS

The Evaluation Criteria as recommended by the Steering Committees was presented to the TPO and Advisory Committees at their December 2024 Meetings.

December 10, 2024 Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting

The Technical Coordinating Committee approved the Evaluation Criteria as presented.

December 10, 2024 Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting

The Citizens' Advisory Committee approved the Evaluation Criteria as presented.

December 11, 2024 Transportation Planning Organization Meeting

The Transportation Planning Organization approved the Evaluation Criteria as presented.

ADOPTED EVALUATION CRITERIA

Category and Criteria (Weight)	Criteria Rating Scale (Lesser Benefit <=> Higher Benefit)		
Goal A: Resilient, Safe, and Secure (Weight 25%)	25		
Hurricane Evacuation [Project is on or develops Hurricane Evacuation Route] A.3, A.5, A.6, A.7 <i>To what extent will the project support movement of people, goods, or services to facilitate evacuation?</i>	0 No		6.25 Yes
Safety Improvement Strategies [Accident rates based on Signal Four Analytics] A.1 <i>Projects ranked from highest to lowest and awarded a graduated point value based on ranking past five years.</i>	0 Lowest	3.125 Mid Range	6.25 Highest
Intermodal Access [Project on SIS] A.8, A.9, D.4 <i>Is the project on one of these facilities?</i>	0 No		6.25 Yes
Storm Surge [Project in Storm Surge Zone] A.3, A.6, A.8 <i>Is the project within a mapped Storm Surge Zone?</i>	0 Zones 1-5		6.25 Not in 1-5
Goal B: Meets User's Needs (Weight 15%)	15		
Existing Level of Service (LOS) [Project existing LOS based on Congestion Management System] A.2, B.2, B.3, <i>What is the existing LOS on the project route?</i>	0 A or B	1.875 C or D	3.75 E or F
Future LOS [Project future LOS 2050 in Needs Assessment] A.2, B.2, B.3, B.4, F.6 <i>What is the future LOS on the project route?</i>	3.75 A or B	1.875 C or D	0 E or F
Connectivity [Project improves continuity or connectivity over the network] B.5 <i>Is the project on a Principal Arterial, Arterial, or Collector / Other?</i>	0 Collector / Other	1.875 Arterial	3.75 Principal Arterial
Public Need [Project identified as a need by public] B.1 <i>Was the project identified as a specific need through the Public Involvement process?</i>	0 No		3.75 Yes
Goal C: Operational and Integrated (Weight 20%)	19.99		
Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) / Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) [Supports ITS <i>Does the project advance ITS/ ATMS implementation, or included in the SMART Regions Plan, Carbon Reduction Plan, or SS</i>	0 No		3.33 Yes
Adopted Plans [Project in adopted plan] C.3, D.1, D.3, F.1, G.1, G.2, G.3, G.5, G.6 <i>Is the project listed in an adopted plan?</i>	0 No		3.33 Yes
Corridor / Complete Street [Complete Street emphasis] C.4, F.3 <i>Does the project employ corridor management techniques that do not require additional travel lanes, or other Complete</i>	0 No		3.33 Yes
Existing Volume-to-Capacity (V/C) [Ratio based on Regional Transportation Model] B.3, B.4, E.1 <i>Is the Existing V/C Ratio less than 1.3? [Deficient means greater than > 1.3]</i>	0 less than 1.3		3.33 greater than 1.3
Future V/C [Ratio based on Regional Transportation Model] B.3, B.4, E.1 <i>Is the Future V/C Ratio less than 1.3? [Deficient means greater than > 1.3]</i>	0 less than 1.3		3.33 greater than 1.3
Structurally Deficient Upgrades [Project replaces / enhances structurally deficient infrastructure] C.1, C.2 <i>Is the project identified on the TIP for resurfacing or replacement?</i>	0 No		3.33 Yes
Goal D: Multi-Modal (Weight 15%)	15		
Transit, Pedestrian, Bicycle, Trail [Project included in Transit, Bike, Ped, Trail Plan?] A.4, D.3, D.5, F.4, G.2 <i>Is the project in the TDP or does it provide for multi-modal bike, ped, transit, or park-and-ride / ride-share?</i>	0 greater than 2 miles	3.75 within 2 miles	7.5 TDP, on facility
Freight / Rail Plan [Is the project in an adopted Freight or Rail Plan?] D.2, D.4, D.7 <i>Is the project listed in an adopted Freight Plan, or Rail Plan, including passenger rail?</i>	0 No		7.5 Yes
Goal E: Economic Vitality (Weight 10%)	10		
Economic Development [Project provides connection to activity center] E.2, E.6 <i>Is project within 2 mi. of an economic Activity Center (port, industrial/commerce park, military base, shopping, medical, edu</i>	0 No		2.5 Yes
Rural Connectivity [Project provides additional connection / enhancement to rural areas] E.5 <i>Is the project listed in the Regional Rural Transportation Plan?</i>	0 No		2.5 Yes
Tourism and Recreation [Project provides for tourism, recreation, linkages to water, trails, parks] E.4, F.1, F.3 <i>Is project within two miles of a Tourism / Recreation Activity Center (park, blueway trail, land trail, beach, museum, historic d</i>	0 greater than 2 miles		2.5 0 to 2 miles
Military [Project provides for military readiness] E.3 <i>Is the project on the STRAHNET or identified in the MIRR?</i>	0 No		2.5 Yes
Goal F: Equitable, High Quality of Life / Environment (Weight 10%)	9.99		
Environmental [Environmentally Sensitive Area / Resource / Corridor] F.2 <i>Is project within Wildlife Corridor; Critical Habitat; State/Federal Forest, Park, Management Area; National Seashore?</i>	3.333 No		0 Yes
Affordable Housing [Neighborhoods] F.9 <i>Does the project connect with a Community Redevelopment Area (CRA)?</i>	0 No		3.333 Yes
Equity [Project community impacts assessed] F.4, F.7, F.8, G.4 <i>Does project have a high Equity Score (higher score better)? [Equity Score methodology defined in report]</i>	0 0-3 Eq. Score		3.333 4-7 Eq. Score
Goal G: Consistent, Continuing, Cooperative, Comprehensive (Weight 5%)	5		
Status [Project Evaluation and Work Plan] G.1 <i>Are one or more phases of the project scheduled in the 5-Year Work Plan?</i>	0 No	1.25 PD&E / Design	2.5 Right-of-Way or Construction
Government Contribution [Project funding includes local government contribution] G.7 <i>Does project include government funding or other contribution?</i>	0 No		2.5 Yes

Goal A: Resilient, Safe, Secure	25
Goal B: User Needs	15
Goal C: Operational and Integrated	19.99
Goal D: Multi-Modal	15
Goal E: Economic Vitality	10
Goal F: Quality of Life	9.99
Goal G: Consistent, Continuing, Cooperative, Comprehensive	5
Weighted maximum points	100

TPO has final authority to select the projects for inclusion in the Cost Feasible Plan and to rank them in the Project Priorities.
Tie Breaker: Total Cost of Project (Less Cost, Higher Priority)

APPENDIX A – EVALUATION CRITERIA RANKINGS

FLORIDA-ALABAMA LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN EVALUATION CRITERIA RANKINGS

Florida-Alabama 2050 LRTP Evaluation Criteria Report

Florida-Alabama 2050 LRTP Evaluation Criteria Report

[illegible]

Florida-Alabama 2050 LRTP Evaluation Criteria Report

Florida-Alabama 2050 LRTP Evaluation Criteria Report

[illegible]

2050 Long Range Transportation Plan Evaluation Criteria Rankings Needs Plan Roadway Projects																																																	
Needs #	Corridor	From	To	County	Project Description	Safety and Security (Weight 25)				Users Needs (Weight 15)										Operational and Integrated (Weight 10)						Multimodal (Weight 5)				Economic Vitality (Weight 10)				Quality of Life (Weight 10)				Planning Consistency (Weight 5)				Total Pts.							
						Hurricane Evac.	Accidents	SIS	Storm Surge	Existing LOS (2020)	Future LOS (2050)	Connectivity	Public Need	ITS	Adopted Plans	Corridor/Complete St	2020 V/C	2050 V/C	Structr. Def.	Tmts/Bike/Ped/Trl.	Freight/Rail	Econ. Dev.	Rural	Tourism/Rec.	Military	Equitable	Qty/Life	Env.	Project Status	Govt. Contribution																			
63	Hamilton Bridge Road	East Spencer Field Rd	Jim Dandy Ln	Santa Rosa	Hamilton Bridge Road	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	29.17					
656	F Street	F Street	F Street	Escambia	EV Charging Station at Fricke Community Center [Smart Regions Master Plan]	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	29.17					
278	CR 749 (Chemstrand Road)	Nine Mile Road	Ten Mile Road	Escambia	Provide 4 Lanes of Capacity on Chemstrand Road	0.0	0	0.5	3.125	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.96			
32	Kingsfield Rd	297A	Tate Road 61	Escambia	Kingsfield Road Sidewalks	0.0	0	0.5	3.125	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.96					
38	E Kingsfield Rd	95A	Chemstrand Rd	Escambia	E. Kingsfield Rd Sidewalks	0.0	0	0.5	3.125	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.96					
247	Watkins Street Extension	US 90 (SR 10)	Sterling Way	Santa Rosa	Provide Improved and Extended New 2 Lane Capacity on Watkins Street	0.0	0	0.5	3.125	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.96					
61	East Spencer Field Rd	Norris Rd	US 90	Santa Rosa	East Spencer Field Rd	0.0	0	0.5	3.125	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.96					
64	Godwin Trail Connector	Soundside Dr	Madura Rd	Santa Rosa	Godwin Trail Connector	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.0	6.25	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
82	Off Road	Previous Segment	Fairfield Dr	Escambia	Segment connects Escambia and Santa Rosa counties with Alabama. Part of the Great NW Coastal Trail Corridor. Also connects to the Bluffline Trail.	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.0	6.25	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
143	Williamsburg Multi-Use Trail	Multiple	Multiple	Santa Rosa	Williamsburg Multi-Use Trail	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.0	6.25	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
144	McClure / Andrew Jackson	multiple	Multiple	Santa Rosa	McClure and Andrew Jackson Sidewalk	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.0	6.25	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
110	multiple	US 90	US 90	Santa Rosa	Connects the US 90 Trail Corridor to the Longleaf Trail Corridor and northern Santa Rosa County. Provides access to the Florida National Scenic Trail.	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.0	6.25	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
215	US 29 Connector West Bypass [Segment 2]	US 29 (SR 95)	Muscogee Road	Escambia	Provide 4 Lanes of New Road Capacity as US 29 Connector West Bypass [Segment 2]	1.0	6.25	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
216	US 29 Connector West Bypass [Segment 1]	Muscogee Road	I-10 New Interchange	Escambia	Provide 4 Lanes of New Road Capacity as US 29 Connector West Bypass [Segment 1]	1.0	6.25	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
280	Beulah Rd	I-10	Muscogee Road	Escambia	Provide 4 Lanes of Capacity on Beulah and Kingsfield Road	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.0	6.25	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	28.75					
904	Clarinda Lane	Clarinda Lane	Clarinda Lane	Escambia	New ECAT Transfer Facility	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	28.33			
308	AL SR 180	AL SR 59	Beaver Creek Lane	Baldwin	Multiple	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.5	1.88	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	1.0	2.5	1.0	2.5	27.71					
271	Berryhill Road (CR 184A)	Chumuckla Highway	SR 89 (Dogwood Drive)	Santa Rosa	Provide 4 Lane Capacity and Shared-Use Path on Berryhill Road	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.5	1.88	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	27.71					
231	SR 292 (Gulf Beach Highway) at NAS West Gate	SR 292 (Gulf Beach Highway) at NAS West Gate	SR 292 (Gulf Beach Highway) at NAS West Gate	Escambia	Provide Dedicated Truck Lane at Blue Angel Parkway and Gulf Beach Highway to NAS West Gate	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	27.71							
150	AL SR 182 (Perdido Beach Blvd)	Orange Beach City Limits	MP 13-75	Baldwin	Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Upgrades on SR 182 (Perdido Beach Boulevard) from Orange Beach City Limits to MP 13-75.	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.0	3.75	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	1.0	2.5	1.0	2.5	26.25					
201	US 98 (SR 30) [AL]	AL CR 91	Florida / Alabama Line (over Perdido Bay)	Baldwin	Provide 4 Lanes of Capacity on US 98 (AL)	1.0	6.25	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.0	3.75	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	26.25					
53	Glover Ln	Hamilton Bridge Rd	Hobbs Middle School	Santa Rosa	Glover Lane	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.75	0.0	0.00	1.0	3.33	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	1.0	3.33	0.0	0	0.0	0	25.83					
50	Byrom, King, Rosasco St	multiple	multiple	Santa Rosa	King Middle School Connection	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.																																					

APPENDIX B – RESOLUTION 24-27

RESOLUTION FL-AL 24-27

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION APPROVING THE 2050 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE EVALUATION CRITERIA

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama TPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2050 Update is being developed pursuant to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act / Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, and Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the FL-AL TPO approved the 2050 LRTP Scope of Services on November 8, 2023 which includes development of evaluation criteria; and

WHEREAS, the evaluation criteria are derived from the adopted goals and objectives and are used to rank projects in the 2050 Needs Plan for consideration in development of the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan; and

WHEREAS, three Steering Committee meetings consisting of members of the TPO's Technical Coordinating Committee, Citizens' Advisory Committee, and other members of the Transportation Industry were completed between March and June 2024 to develop the 2050 LRTP Evaluation Criteria;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:

The Florida-Alabama TPO approves the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan Evaluation Criteria.

Passed and duly adopted by the Florida-Alabama TPO on this 11th day of December 2024.

**FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

BY: 
Steven Barry, Chair

ATTEST: 