metroplan orlando
A REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PARTNERSHIP

2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Chapter 16 | Prioritization Process

August 22, 2025

Draft

WHAT IS IN THIS DOCUMENT?

This chapter describes the prioritization process used to evaluate transportation projects within the 2050 MTP. The prioritization process uses multimodal criteria to identify and select projects which best address MetroPlan Orlando's goals and objectives. This process creates a structured, replicable framework for evaluating projects that is both clear and objective. The results of the prioritization process are applied to the transportation projects and are used as a guide to establish the order in which transportation projects may be cost feasible for implementation, based on estimated funding revenues.

HOW TO GET INVOLVED IN THE 2050 PLAN

Online at MetroPlanOrlando.gov
Learn more about how long range transportation planning works and sign up for our e-newsletter to get updates on comment opportunities

Requested Printed Material
If you don't have digital access and prefer information in paper form, you can make the request by calling the number below

In Person
Invite us to attend your event or present to your group by contacting our community outreach staff. You can find out about our public meetings in the calendar section of our website

Questions?
Contact our community outreach staff at **MTP@MetroPlanOrlando.gov** or **(407) 481-5672**

On Social Media
Connect with us on LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter and YouTube to learn about transportation news and when we'll be out in the community

Legal Information

The preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, under the State Planning and Research Program, Section 505 [or Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f)] of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

CONTENTS

TABLES

16.1 Project Prioritization Process

Consistent with Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) Transportation Performance Management (TPM) guidance, MetroPlan Orlando is using a data-informed and context-based approach to assess candidate transportation projects for prioritization in the 2050 MTP. The intent of this process is to identify, select, and fund projects which best address regional transportation goals, objectives, and targets. The use of comparative criteria and the evaluation process described in the following sections to select projects is not the end of the prioritization process. Rather, the process is intended to be used as a guide to assist MetroPlan Orlando and its partner agencies in establishing the order in which projects may be implemented, based on forecasted funding levels; and ultimately, providing a basis for determining cost feasible projects for the 2050 MTP.

16.1.1APPROACH

In developing a project prioritization framework for the 2050 MTP, a multimodal approach was taken to assist in determining how well each transportation project, regardless of mode, reflects the planning goals and objectives. From the onset of the prioritization process, three fundamentals guided development, ensuring a structured decision-making process: replicable evaluation and assessment, clear and comprehensive criteria, and objective and quantitative scoring.

The following project prioritization process was intended to complement MetroPlan Orlando's regional planning, congestion management, and overall decision-making process. While ultimate discretion is granted to the MPO Board, the quantitative and objective-driven results yielded from the project assessment phase enables decision-makers to make the most informed selection and prioritization decisions consistent with TPM best practices.

The 2050 MTP project evaluation and prioritization process consisted of three key phases:

1. *Multimodal Needs Assessment*
   Utilizing corridor-level needs based on system performance and future impacts caused by socioeconomic and development changes, project solutions were identified and added to the candidate project list as well as existing projects included in previous plans, priority lists, and studies.
2. *Agency Review of Preliminary Needs*
   Following completion of technical needs assessment, MPO staff, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O) Advisory Committee reviewed preliminary findings. Feedback from agency partners and other stakeholders was gathered and considered for incorporation. During this phase, MPO staff also reviewed candidate projects for funding eligibility.
3. *Project Evaluation and Comparative Analysis*
   Utilizing the evaluation criteria documented in the Methodology section of this document, candidate projects were evaluated and ranked using the established process. Rankings and associated project costs for all phases were considered during the development of the 2050 Cost-Feasible Plan.

16.2 Methodology

This evaluation applies comparative criteria to evaluate projects and their alignment with the 2050 MTP goals (Chapter 2). The criteria developed in this process are adaptable, recognizing that priorities set by federal and state agencies, local governments, and the MPO Board may shift over time. These evolving preferences could lead to the introduction of new factors or the removal of outdated ones in future MTP updates. The goal of these project assessment guidelines is to support decision-makers by providing a structured framework to evaluate how each transportation project, regardless of mode, reflects the planning objectives and values articulated in our regional transportation vision.

16.2.1 PROJECT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The 2050 MTP adopted a funding program approach (Chapter 18) which aligns with how to prioritize projects effectively. This approach aligns seamlessly with MetroPlan Orlando's existing Prioritized Project List and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funding categories to maintain project funding eligibility and seamless implementation into FDOT's 5-Year Work Program. This method bridges long-term planning goals with actionable steps, providing a clear roadmap for implementing projects that deliver regional benefits. Project categories are summarized in Table 16-1.

Table 16-1 | MPO Project/Priority List Categories and Project Eligibility

Project / Priority List Categories	Project Types/Eligibility
State Highway System (SHS)	The State Roads list includes non-interstate projects on the State Highway System, including road widening, complete streets, transportation systems management & operations, and bicycle & pedestrian projects.
Context Sensitive Urban Corridor Improvements	The Urban Corridor Improvements list includes projects off the state highway system that are functionally classified within the Urban Area. Projects can include non-capacity multimodal context-sensitive improvements that use a combination of bicycle & pedestrian, transit, and intersection solutions to improve traffic flow on constrained roadways without adding lanes.
Transportation Systems Management & Operations (Intersections and Corridors)	TSM&O projects are relatively low-cost improvements that alleviate traffic congestion on existing roadways without adding capacity and use such methods as adding turn lanes at intersections, computerized traffic signal systems, and dynamic message signs. The TSM&O category includes projects pertaining to incident management, transportation demand management, and other related activities.
High Injury Network (HIN) Countermeasures	HIN Countermeasure projects focus on cost-effective measures to enhance road safety using safety engineering countermeasures like signal timing modifications, lane narrowing, and roadway lighting. The HIN Countermeasures category also emphasizes projects that support behavioral changes, improved post-crash care, and community engagement to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries.
Active Transportation (Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure)	Active Transportation projects include local and regional trail projects that can be used by cyclists and pedestrians for recreation and/or commuting, on-street bicycle lanes, side paths, sidewalk improvements, and other projects that will improve overall bicycle and pedestrian mobility.
Critical Sidewalks	The Critical Sidewalk Gaps program provides a mechanism to advance "critical" gaps off the state highway system. There are over 4,000 centerline miles of roadway in the region without sidewalk facilities, and over 1,500 centerline miles of roadway with sidewalk facilities on only one side of the roadway. Projects are located within the critical gap bundles established in the critical sidewalk gap analysis.
School Mobility / Hazardous Walking Conditions	The School Mobility / Hazardous Walking Conditions program addresses projects off the state highway system that promote walking and bicycling to school and remediating hazardous walking conditions through infrastructure improvements, enforcement, tools, safety education, and incentives to encourage walking and bicycling.

16.2.2 WEIGHTING

Criteria weighting provides a structured method to represent the overall preference and significance of the 2050 MTP goal areas in relation to one another. Weighting is applied after scores from evaluation criteria are assigned to reflect the relative importance of each goal area in a way that is both systematic and transparent. Weighting enhances the relevance of the scoring process by ensuring higher priority goal areas receive appropriate emphasis.

Goal area weights are based on comprehensive input from stakeholders, collected through targeted surveys and engagement efforts. These weights reflect collective preferences across the five goal areas, ensuring that the final scoring framework is responsive to the needs and priorities of the region and provides a clear direction for project selection and funding. These are depicted in Table 16-2.

Table 16-2 | Goal Area Descriptions and Weighting

Goal Area	Description	Weighting
Safety	A safe and secure transportation system is the most fundamental commitment we can make to Central Florida's residents, businesses, and visitors. MetroPlan Orlando and its partners for many years have committed to a vision of zero deaths and serious injuries on transportation system. This goal expands our view of safety to include better preparing for and responding to emergency events, as well as reducing the potential for harm from environmental, security, and other risks to transportation users and the regional system.	35%
Reliability	The region's transportation system should provide reliable service to all users. This means that roads, bridges, rail corridors, passenger and freight terminals, and transit vehicles are in good condition. It also means that customers can expect reliable travel times between destinations and efficient connections between modes. Finally, it means that the system can adapt to accommodate changing customer expectations and technologies.	20%
Connectivity	The Central Florida region depends on a robust transportation system that connects people to jobs, health care, education, and other essential services (including food, recreation, and other Government services). Individual modes and facilities should be well connected to link the region's diverse communities and support end-to-end trips for residents and visitors.	25%
Community	A mix of communities and unique natural environments make Central Florida a special place to live, work, and visit. MetroPlan Orlando and its partners are committed to advancing transportation solutions that contribute to healthier and more thriving communities and protect and enhance our natural environment.	10%
Prosperity	Transportation is a critical foundation for Central Florida's continued economic development and prosperity. MetroPlan Orlando and its partners will continue to work to enhance access to jobs for all residents, support growth in trade and visitor activity, and strengthen the region's competitiveness as a place to live, work, and do business.	10%
Total		100%

Please note, a project's overall score in the 2050 MTP prioritization process is not a guarantee of funding. Rather, the evaluation process serves as a decision-support tool that:

1. Assist local entities in regional collaboration to identify high impact and priority projects;
2. Align projects with national goals which are used during funding decisions in regional and statewide competitive processes; and
3. Emphasize the use of data collection and performance-based programming as required by Federal regulation.

16.2.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

MetroPlan Orlando's regional goals blended with the planning factors set forth in federal law yielded 15 criteria, or scoring factors, consistent with board funding programs and policies, to serve as the basis for the comparative evaluation. In this way, new projects are proposed, funded, and constructed, with their impacts measured for consistency with the 2050 MTP's goals and objectives. Although there are no "right" or "wrong" evaluation criteria, there are useful and less useful ones.

The characteristics of useful evaluation criteria are:

- **Accurate and Unambiguous**, meaning that a clear and accurate relationship exists between the criteria and the real impacts or consequences of a project;
- **Comprehensive but Concise**, meaning that they cover the range of relevant consequences, but the evaluation framework remains systematic and manageable, with no redundancies;
- **Direct and Ends-Oriented**, meaning they report directly on the consequences of interest and provide enough information that informed value judgments can reasonably be made;
- **Measurable and Consistently Applied** to allow comparisons across alternatives. This means the criteria should distinguish the relative degree of impact across alternatives. It does not exclude qualitative characterizations of impact, or impacts that cannot be physically measured in the field;
- **Understandable**, in that impacts and trade-offs can be understood and communicated by everyone involved in the evaluation process;
- **Practical**, meaning that information can be practically obtained to assess them (i.e. data, models, or expert judgment exist or can be readily developed);
- **Sensitive to Alternatives** under consideration, so that they provide information that is useful in comparing alternatives; and
- **Explicit about Uncertainty** so that they expose differences in the range of possible outcomes (differences in risk) associated with different policy or project alternatives.

16.2.3.1 OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria outlined in Table 16-3 serve as the foundation for assessing and prioritizing transportation projects within the 2050 MTP framework. It should be noted that while priority programming determines the order in which projects are advanced, various factors such as available funding and the need for additional analysis or right-of-way may influence the order in which projects are implemented.

Table 16-3 | Evaluation Criteria by Project Category

Goal Area	Evaluation Criteria	SHS	Complete Streets	TSM&O	Safety / Vision Zero	Active Transportation	Critical Sidewalks	School Mobility
Safety (35%)	Regional Safety Score—Corridors and Intersections	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	High Injury Network Segments	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Safe Speed Management Corridor	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Reliability (20%)	Existing Travel Time Reliability and Relative Change in AADT	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	-	✔
	Fiber Optic Presence	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	-	-
	Evacuation Route Designation	✔	✔	✔	-	-	-	-
Connectivity (25%)	Transit System Headways	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Modal Accessibility Near Existing Population and/or Jobs	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Schools and Essential Services within ½ Mile of Corridor	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Community (10%)	Existing Pedestrian Level of Comfort	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Public Health Indicator Rates	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Areas of Persistent Poverty	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Prosperity (10%)	Percentage Truck Traffic and Statewide Truck Bottleneck	✔	✔	✔	-	-	-	-
	Cost Burdened Households within ½ Mile of Corridor	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Cost of Congestion ($ daily)	✔	✔	✔	-	-	-	-

The following section, including Table 16-4 through Table 16-10, describe the project prioritization process, scoring logic, and data sources. In addition to the criteria listed in Table 16-3, local jurisdiction preference points are added to the total weighted score of the multi-criteria analysis. Additional information about this consideration is provided in Table 16-10.

16.2.3.2 CRITERIA AND SCORING LOGIC

The Criteria and Scoring Logic applied to the region's corridors form the foundation for a data-informed, performance-based evaluation process that ensures projects are assessed systematically and aligned with regional transportation goals. This assessment provides decision-makers with the best information available for qualitative reviews and guides MetroPlan Orlando's investments through a data-informed and performance-based process. By providing consistent and replicable results, this framework helps MetroPlan Orlando allocate resources effectively and transparently.

Each component of the Criteria and Scoring Logic is summarized below:

- **Unit:** Defines the metric which was used to align with the objectives of each goal. This alignment is the basis of the quantitative assessment and will be used to identify needs and prioritize based on the performance.
- **Data Sources:** Provides the source of each indicator used within the data model.
- **Method:** Includes a brief methodology of how each indicator was derived and/or assigned to the corridors within the data model.
- **Logic:** Ties the performance indicator back to the objective and explains the thought process on why the assessment will result in a priority need.
- **Scoring Thresholds:** To distribute the scores within the modeling process, individual buckets were identified per dataset, based on the regional analyses. The identification of these buckets can be done in a variety of ways based on statistical distribution of data, as shown at right. Table 16-4 provides a visual representation for how the Natural Breaks (Jenks) statistical analysis method identifies natural separation or "buckets" of data. These naturally occurring separators were also compared with standard deviation and quantile to verify that the natural breaks were indeed following a normalized approach. The individual values were rounded to the nearest whole number or decimal to present clear and logical buckets for each data set. Lastly, each performance indicator has a maximum value of 1 point.

Table 16-4 | Key Statistical Analysis Methods

	**Natural Breaks (Jenks)** Numerical values of ranked data are examines to account for non-uniform distributions, giving an unequal class width varying frequency of observations per class.
	**Quantile** Distributes the observations equally across the class interval, giving unequal class widths but the same frequency of observations per class.
	**Equal Interval** The data range of each class is held constant, giving an equal class width with varying frequency of observations per class.
	**Defined Interval** Specify an interval size to define equal class widths with varying frequency of observations per class.
	**Geometric Interval** Mathematically defined class widths based on a geometric series, giving an approximately equal class width and consistent frequency of observations per class.
	**Standard Deviation** For normally distributed data, class widths are defined using standard deviations from the mean of the data array, giving an equal class width and varying frequency of observations per class.

Source: Microsoft, 2020

Table 16-5 | Safety - Criteria and Scoring Logic

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Description</th><th>Scoring Thresholds</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Safety Score Corridors and Intersections

A measure of crash severity and crash frequency along corridors and intersections.

Source-
MPO Vision Zero Action Plan, 2024</td>
<td>Method — The Safety Score is calculated based on the total number of crashes, the highest level of injury sustained in each crash, and the travel mode of victims. Crashes that result in death or severe injury or include a person outside a vehicle received a higher weight. With the Safety Score, a higher score indicates the location experiences a high crash rate and a lower score indicates as lower crash rate. A Safety Score of zero indicates no history of crashes at the location. Intersection safety scores considered the weighted crash sum within the intersection area and the total roadway length within the intersection area.

Logic — The Regional Safety Score assesses crash severity and frequency on the Federal Aid Network, prioritizing incidents involving vulnerable road users. It accounts for total crashes, injury severity, and victim travel mode, with higher scores indicating higher crash rates. This data is consistently available region wide.

Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr>
<tr><td>> 10,424</td><td>1.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>≥ 8,954 and ≤ 10,424</td><td>0.75</td></tr>
<tr><td>≥ 6,904 and < 8,954</td><td>0.50</td></tr>
<tr><td>≥ 1,410 and < 6,904</td><td>0.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>< 1,410</td><td>0.00</td></tr>
</table>
Units: Regional Safety Score
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Injury Network Segments

The High Injury Network (HIN) represents a collection of streets where a disproportionate number of crashes that result in someone being killed or severely injured (KSI) occur.

Source-
MPO Vision Zero Action Plan, 2024
Orlando Vision Zero Action Plan, 2021</td>
<td>Method — The HIN calculations weight crashes differently depending on the mode of travel involved and the severity of the crash. Crash summaries for each half mile roadway segment were calculated with the segments that receive the highest score comprising the HIN. High injury intersections are identified using a similar process as the HIN, considering all crashes within 250 feet of each intersection.

Logic — High-injury network (HIN) segments and intersections will be prioritized across regional, county, and local road levels. Projects and corridors get credit if partially or entirely located on an HIN segment. Only intersection projects get credit if located at an HIN intersection location.

Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr>
<tr><td>On regional and either county or local HIN</td><td>1.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>On county and local HIN</td><td>0.75</td></tr>
<tr><td>On regional HIN, local HIN or on County HIN</td><td>0.50</td></tr>
<tr><td>Not on HIN</td><td>0.00</td></tr>
</table>
Units: HIN Designation
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Speeds Management Corridor

Roadways with disparities between 85th percentile speed and posted speed.

Source-
Speed Management Network Screening, 2022</td>
<td>Method — Using current traffic speeds to identify corridors with a higher disparity between the current 85th percentile operating speed and the posted speed.

Logic — Greater the difference between current operating and posted speed, the greater the need, greater the point allocation. Weighted average used along corridor or project extent.

Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr>
<tr><td>>19</td><td>1.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>≥ 12 and ≤19</td><td>0.75</td></tr>
<tr><td>≥ 8 and < 12</td><td>0.50</td></tr>
<tr><td>≥ 2 and < 8</td><td>0.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>< 2</td><td>0.00</td></tr>
</table>
Units: Miles per hour differential
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Table 16-6 | Reliability - Criteria and Scoring Logic

Criteria	Description	Scoring Thresholds
Existing Travel Time Reliability and Proportional Change in AADT The consistency or dependability in travel times measured as a ratio of the 80th percentile travel time to the average travel time; and the proportional growth in AADT from the current year through 2050 **Source-** Streetlight Insights data and MPO 2050 Volume Forecast	**Method —** Travel time reliability (TTR) data was obtained from Streetlight for automobiles (non-commercial) and assigned to each corridor within the data model; and AADT for the current year and 2050 was obtained by the MPO 2050 Volume forecast. **Logic —** To improve travel time reliability (TTR), corridors with inconsistent travel times should be prioritized. For instance, a TTR of 1.5 means a 30-minute commute would require 45 minutes to ensure on-time arrival 80% of the time. This criterion also considers the Proportional Change (RC) in AADT when comparing 2025 and 2050 forecasts; as increased AADT in 2050 compared to today indicates a higher need (i.e., more points for corridors with existing reliability issues and a higher degree of future AADT change). AADT: Weighted average along corridor or project extent, intersection projects are given the highest value of each intersection leg. TTR: Weighted average along corridor or project extent. **Evaluation Applicability —** SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, and School Mobility/SRTS.	*Value* / *TTR* / *PC% AADT [1]* Very High: > 3.42 / > 2.10 High: ≥ 1.98 and ≤ 3.42 / ≥ 1.55 and ≤ 2.10 Medium: ≥ 1.41 and < 1.98 / ≥ 1.25 and <1.55 Low: ≥ 1.10 and < 1.41 / ≥ 0.95 and <1.25 Very Low: < 1.1 or null / < 0.95 or null **Units:** TTR Ratio and PC *TTR* / *PC AADT* / *Score* Very High / Medium+ / 1.00 Very High / Very Low or Low / 0.75 High / Medium+ / 0.75 Medium / Medium+ / 0.50 High / Very Low or Low / 0.50 Medium / Very Low or Low / 0.25 Low / Medium + / 0.25 Low / Very Low or Low / 0.00 Very Low / Any / 0.00

[1] Due to the high presence of outliers in the data on the proportional change in AADT, values in the distribution were calculated using the quantile method rather than the Natural Breaks (Jenks) method.

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Description</th><th>Scoring Thresholds</th></tr>
<tr><td>Fiber Optic Presence

Indication of fiber availability along a corridor.

Source-

2050 TSMO Master Plan / Maintaining Agencies</td><td>Method — Data provided by the Maintaining Agencies was used to determine the presence of fiber along a corridor.

Logic — Fiber enables the implementation of active ITS solutions, such as allowing traffic signals to be coordinated and adjusted in real-time along a corridor or the implementation of warning devices at pedestrian crossings. Projects and corridors get credit if partially or entirely located alongside fiber. If fiber is only installed at an intersection, it does not count for the corridor/project.

Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, and Active Transportation.</td><td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>No—Fiber Optic is not present.</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>Yes—Fiber Optic present.</td><td>0.50</td></tr></table>Units: Fiber Optic Presence</td></tr>
<tr><td>Evacuations Route Designation

Indication of whether a roadway is a specified route for an emergency evacuation, aiding in regional resiliency.

Source-

Florida Division of Emergency Management, 2024</td><td>Method — Corridors which serve as a designated evacuation routes were identified within the regional data model.

Logic — Corridors with evacuation route designations provide critical infrastructure to help prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies. Designated evacuation routes will receive full point allocation. Projects and corridors get credit if partially or entirely located on an evacuation route.

Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, and TSM&O.</td><td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>Yes—Designated evacuation route.</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>No—Not a designated evacuation route.</td><td>0.50</td></tr></table>Units: Evacuation Route Designation</td></tr>
</table>

Table 16-7 | Connectivity - Criteria and Scoring Logic

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Description</th><th>Scoring Thresholds</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit System Headways
The amount of time between transit vehicle arrivals at a stop.
Source-
LYNX, 2024 Q4</td>
<td>Method — GIS data was used to identify the transit headway along a corridor. The lowest headway was used when multiple transit lines were present.
Logic — Higher frequency LYNX service reflects higher demand along a corridor. Therefore, projects along these high-demand corridors should be prioritized. Lowest headway along the corridor is utilized.
Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>30 minute or less headways</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>45 minute headways</td><td>0.75</td></tr><tr><td>60 minute headways</td><td>0.50</td></tr><tr><td>> 60 minute headways</td><td>0.25</td></tr><tr><td>No transit service</td><td>0.00</td></tr></table>Units: Number of minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Accessibility Near Existing Population and/or Jobs
Number of multimodal options near population and jobs.
Source-
LYNX, CFRPM v7, xGeographic Wave data, 2025</td>
<td>Method — Using GIS, the number of multimodal options within ½ mile of a corridor was calculated, subject to meeting jobs or population thresholds.
Logic — To reduce delays and enhance affordability in transportation and housing, corridors with high residential density should have access to various travel modes. The greater the residential or employment density without multimodal options, the higher the point allocation. Multimodal facilities include LYNX transit stops, sidewalks, trails, and bike lanes. . If a corridor has less than 1,200 population and/or 1,400 jobs, it will receive a score of 0.00
Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>0 modes</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>1 mode</td><td>0.75</td></tr><tr><td>2 modes</td><td>0.50</td></tr><tr><td>3+ modes</td><td>0.00</td></tr></table>Units: Number of modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and Essential Services within ½ Mile of Corridor
Proximity of public schools and land uses which provide food, healthcare, cultural, and recreational opportunities.
Source -
Florida Department of Revenue and xGeographic Wave data, 2025</td>
<td>Method — Proximity data for public schools, grocery stores, restaurants, markets, coffee shops, fast food restaurants, hospitals, pharmacies, theme parks, golf courses, libraries, and parks were obtained from xWave database. The number of points of interest with these land uses within ½ mile of the corridor were totaled and scored.
Logic — To connect people to places, across all modes of transportation, corridors near schools, essential services, and other activity centers should be prioritized for improvement.
Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>>15</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>11- 15</td><td>0.75</td></tr><tr><td>6- 10</td><td>0.50</td></tr><tr><td>2–5</td><td>0.25</td></tr><tr><td>0–1</td><td>0.00</td></tr></table>Units: Number of points of interest</td>
</tr>
</table>

Table 16-8 | Community - Criteria and Scoring Logic

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Description</th><th>Scoring Thresholds</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Level of Comfort (PLOC)
The level of comfort for pedestrian travel along roadway facilities.
Source-
MetroPlan Orlando 2050 Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Method — Pedestrian Level of Comfort (PLOC) scores reflect the type of pedestrian facility present, distance between pedestrian facility and vehicular travel way, the speed limit of the roadway, and traffic volumes on the roadway. A PLOC of 1 represents the lowest stress facility, where a PLOC of 5 represents roadways with no pedestrian facilities.
Logic — To improve pedestrian and bicycle user's comfort, corridors with higher pedestrian level of comfort scores should be prioritized for improvement. Higher the PLOC, greater the need, greater the point allocation. Weighted average used along corridor or project extent.
Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>≥ 4</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 3 and < 4</td><td>0.75</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 2 and < 3</td><td>0.50</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 1 and < 2</td><td>0.25</td></tr><tr><td>null</td><td>0.00</td></tr></table>Units: PLOC Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Indicator Rates
Composite average rates of chronic diseases.
Source-
CDC PLACES: ZCTA Data, 2024</td>
<td>Method — Incidence rates of selected chronic diseases (asthma, diabetes, obesity) were averaged across a zip code to create a composite average public health indicator rate.
Logic — To reduce the health impacts associated with physical inactivity, corridors that serve areas with a higher risk for the associated chronic diseases (asthma, diabetes, obesity) should be prioritized. The greater the health risks, greater the need for active transportation facilities, greater the point allocation. Weighted average within ½ mile buffer.
Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>> 22.3</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 19.8 and ≤ 22.3</td><td>0.75</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 17.4 and < 19.8</td><td>0.50</td></tr><tr><td>< 17.4</td><td>0.00</td></tr></table>Units: Average composite incidence rate of land area within ½ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Persistent Poverty
Areas identified as areas of persistent poverty measured at the census tract level using U.S. Census Data.
Source-
Department of Transportation and U.S. Census Bureau, 2023</td>
<td>Method — A GIS assessment was conducted to determine areas of persistent poverty for the area adjacent to the corridor. The score represents the percentage of land area within ½ mile of the project that are within these Census Tracts.
Logic —To provide access to transportation throughout the community, areas with higher economic disadvantages are emphasized for transportation improvements. Weighted average within ½ mile buffer.
Evaluation Applicability — SHS, Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.</td>
<td><table><tr><th>Range</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>> 0.85</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 0.61 and ≤ 0.85</td><td>0.75</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 0.37 and < 0.61</td><td>0.50</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 0.13 and < 0.37</td><td>0.25</td></tr><tr><td>< 0.13</td><td>0.00</td></tr></table>Units: Percentage of land area in zone within ½ mile</td>
</tr>
</table>

Table 16-9 | Prosperity - Criteria and Scoring Logic

Criteria	Description	Scoring Thresholds
Percentage of Truck Traffic and Statewide Truck Bottlenecks The number of cargo-carrying vehicles compared to the total traffic along a corridor; and corridors identified as statewide freight/truck bottlenecks. **Source-** FDOT RCI Data and Florida Freight Mobility and Trade Plan	**Method —** The truck volume was divided by the total volume to derive the percentage of truck traffic on each corridor; and the top statewide truck bottlenecks within the MetroPlan Orlando region were reviewed and coded into the regional data model network. **Logic —** To promote transportation projects that expand and enhance economic prosperity, corridors which serve higher percentages of commercial freight vehicles should be prioritized for improvement. Improving bottlenecks on these routes will facilitate the efficient movement of goods and services across the region and state, with higher-ranking bottlenecks receiving greater point allocation based on need. Weighted average along corridor or project extent. **Evaluation Applicability —** SHS, Complete Streets, and TSM&O.	*Range* / *Score* > 20.3 or Top 10 State Bottleneck — 1.00 ≥ 11.7 and ≤ 20.3 or Top 100 State Bottleneck — 0.75 ≥ 6.3 and < 11.7 — 0.50 < 6.3 or null — 0.00 **Units:** Percentage
Cost Burdened Households within ½ Mile of Corridor The percentage of families which pay more than 30-percent of their income for housing. **Source-** U.S. Census Data / American Community Survey, 2022	**Method —** Corridors were evaluated to determine the percentage of cost burdened households within ½ mile of the corridor. **Logic —** To ensure that transportation decisions do not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on cost burdened households, corridors with higher percentages of cost burdened households will be prioritized for improvements. Greater the density of cost burdened households, greater the need, greater the point allocation. Weighted average within ½ mile buffer. **Evaluation Applicability —** SHS, Complete Streets, TSMO, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.	*Range* / *Score* > 0.66 — 1.00 ≥ 0.51 and ≤ 0.66 — 0.75 ≥ 0.29 and < 0.51 — 0.50 < 0.29 or null — 0.25 **Units:** Average cost burdened percentage of land area within ½ mile
Cost of Congestion Measure of a corridor's existing cost of congestion. **Source-** Streetlight Insights data and U.S. Census Data, 2022	**Method —** The cost of congestion uses average delay along a corridor and multiplies by the estimated hourly income per county (average household income / average household occupancy / 2080 hours per year). **Logic —** To reduce per capita delay for residents, visitors, and businesses, corridors with the highest cost per congestion should be prioritized for improvement. Vehicle hours of delay metrics are used to identify cost of congestion. For example, if a 30-minute work commute takes one hour, the additional 30-minutes spent in congestion was measured as a cost. Greater the cost of congestion, greater the need, greater the point allocation. Sum of daily average along corridor or project extent. **Evaluation Applicability —** SHS, Complete Streets, and TSM&O.	*Range* / *Score* > 10,310 — 1.00 ≥ 4,975 and ≤ 10,310 — 0.75 ≥ 1,222 and < 4,975 — 0.50 ≥ 365 and < 1,222 — 0.25 < 365 or null — 0.00 **Units:** Daily cost ($) of congestion

Table 16-10 | Local Jurisdiction Preference - Scoring Logic

Criteria	Description	Scoring Thresholds
Local Jurisdiction Preference Measure of a project's local significance as assessed by jurisdiction. **Source-** Local Governments / Maintaining Agencies.	**Method —** Rankings provided directly from local jurisdictions. **Logic —** Qualitative low/medium/high ranking by local jurisdiction on the proposed project's local significance. Qualitative score to incorporate local preferences, utilizing local agency feedback from the 2050 MTP Needs Assessment Coordination Process. **Evaluation Applicability —** Complete Streets, TSM&O, Safety/Vision Zero, Active Transportation, Critical Sidewalks, and School Mobility/SRTS.	***Range*** / ***Score*** High Local Priority — 10.00 Medium Local Priority — 7.50 Low Local Priority — 5.00 No Local Preference — 0.00 **Units:** Local Priority

16.2.3.3 SCORE CALCULATION APPROACH

The scoring process normalizes the criteria score for each goal area. This means that each applicable criterion is given a score out of a maximum possible value and then converted to a normalized score (e.g., 3 out of 3 equals a normalized score of 1). Next, the goal weighting is applied to these normalized scores. Each goal has a specific weight that reflects its importance relative to the other goals. The weighted score for each goal is calculated by multiplying the normalized score by the goal weight. For example, the Safety goal has a proposed weight of 35%, and with a maximum possible score of 1, its weighted score is 35 (0.35 x 1 = 35).

The maximum total score is calculated based on the applicable evaluation criteria for each goal area. For example, if a critical sidewalk project gets a score of 1 on cost burdened households criteria, then its prosperity score will be a 10 because that would be the maximum possible score for a critical sidewalk project under prosperity. This is because other evaluation criteria under prosperity are not applicable for this project type, as detailed in Table 1-3.

The subtotal of these weighted scores is 100, which represents the total possible score from the goal weighting process. After calculating the subtotal, the local preference score is added. This score is determined separately and is added to the subtotal to get the final total score. In this case, the local preference score is 10, which is added to the subtotal of 100, resulting in a total score of 110 points. Table 16-11 provides a summary scoring rubric, and Table 16-12 provides a hypothetical example.

The final scoring process can be summarized as follows:

1. Normalize the applicable criteria scores within each goal area
2. Apply the goal weighting to the normalized scores to get the weighted scores.
3. Sum the weighted scores to get the subtotal; and
4. Add the local preference score to the subtotal to get the total score.

Table 16-11 | Sample Summary Scoring Rubric (Maximum Score)

Goal	Goal Weight	Max. Possible Score	Weighted Score (Goal Weight x Criteria Score)
Safety	35 %	3 / 3 = 1	35
Reliability	20 %	3 / 3 = 1	20
Connectivity	25 %	3 / 3 = 1	25
Community	10 %	3 / 3 = 1	10
Prosperity	10 %	3 / 3 = 1	10
Sub Total	100 %	15 / 15	100
Local Preference	n/a	10	10
Total Score	100 %	110 points	110

Table 16-12 | Sample Summary Scoring Rubric (Hypothetical Example)

Goal	Goal Weight	Score	Weighted Score (Goal Weight x Criteria Score)
Safety	35 %	1.5 / 3 = 0.50	17.5
Reliability	20 %	1 / 3 = 0.33	6.6
Connectivity	25 %	3 / 3 = 1	25
Community	10 %	3 / 3 = 1	10
Prosperity	10 %	2 / 3 = 0.66	6.6
Sub Total	100 %	10.5 / 15	65.7
Local Preference	n/a	10	10
Total Score	100 %	110 points	75.7

16.3 Analysis Tools

The prioritization process used several different tools for analysis, including an in-depth data model, to append multiple data, information, and performance measures onto a roadway; and the CFRPM model for envisioning what future impacts may include. For more information on the data sources used for the prioritization methodology, please reference the 2050 MTP Data Source Guide.

16.3.1 DATA MODEL

The development of the geographic information system (GIS) data model included combining multiple data sources and information into a singular base segmented roadway file that included the roads in the MetroPlan Orlando area. This roadway file served as the basis for the creation and combination of all data and information used for analysis. The file was prepared by MPO staff and contained a common segmentation or breakdown between corridors, allowing for roadways to be compared along logical breaks.

A major aspect of the analysis performed along these roadways included conflation of the various data sources, a process to combine data sources which do not perfectly align. This conflation was achieved by using the roadway file as a base and then through various spatial and tabular processes appending the other data sets and information to the roadway network. The datasets then were compiled in a centralized file geodatabase (fGDB) and then processed as required for prioritization. These various sources included:

- Primary Network with Reliability and Accessibility Performance Measures
- Streetlight Insights
- CFRPM v7
- Census
- Additional partner or other provided data sources

After completing the conflation of the various data sets, GIS models were used to deliver automated and adjustable scoring mechanisms. These GIS models programmatically evaluate each performance measure and deliver a score and value which corresponds to occurrence of the measure in relation to other roadway segments and the weight that performance measure has been given.

The results of the prioritization process are summarized in a geo-database containing all roadway segments with descriptions and prioritization scores/results by goal area. The results are visualized in an interactive map depicting segment scores by goal area as well as the composite score. Segment-level information and attributes can also be accessed using MetroPlan Orlando's Online Maps & Tools: 2050 MTP - Multimodal Needs Dashboard.

16.4 Next Steps

The prioritization process is a multimodal and multifaceted approach to identify and select transportation projects which best address regional transportation goals and objectives. This process creates a structured framework for decision-making which is replicable for evaluation and assessment, includes clear and comprehensive criteria, and results in objective and quantitative scoring. The results of this process are intended to be used as a guide to assist in establishing the order in which transportation projects may be implemented, based on forecasted funding levels (Chapter 11) and providing a basis for determining project cost feasibility (Chapter 19).

MetroPlanOrlando.gov
250 S. Orange Ave., Suite 200
Orlando, FL 32801

MTP@MetroPlanOrlando.gov

(407) 481-5672