

LRTF Grant Reviewer Scoring Sheet

Reviewer Identification Number:

Applicant:

Project Title:

Scoring Criteria	Excellent - 5	Good - 4 pts	Average - 3	Below Average - 2	Inadequate - 0	Mult.	Score
Connection to eligible IRVM activities per IC 314.22. (See list below.)	Includes 6 or more IRVM objectives. <input type="checkbox"/>	Includes 4 to 5 IRVM objectives. <input type="checkbox"/>	Includes 3 IRVM objectives. <input type="checkbox"/>	Includes 1 or 2 IRVM objectives. <input type="checkbox"/>	No IRVM objectives. Ineligible for funding. <input type="checkbox"/>	2	0
Project description provides a complete and thorough understanding of what the applicant wants to accomplish through this grant; justification for the request; and all required information for the project type. (See project type descriptions in the Funding Guidelines.)	Clearly states what will be accomplished with the proposed project/equipment request. Includes very clear and logical justification for the request. Specific information requested for the project type is included. <input type="checkbox"/>	Gives some detail about what will be accomplished with the proposed project/equipment request. Includes justification for the request. Specific information requested for the project type is included. <input type="checkbox"/>	Gives a basic description of what will be accomplished but lacks relevant details. Justification for request is not very strong; or justification is implied but not clearly stated. Specific information requested for the project type is included. <input type="checkbox"/>	A very basic description that does not explain well what will be accomplished or lacks critical details. Justification is weak or missing entirely. Specific information requested for the project type is either partially included or missing from the project description. <input type="checkbox"/>	Project description is missing, incorrect, or lacks sufficient detail to understand the basic premise of the request. <input type="checkbox"/>	1.5	0
Project budget adequately itemizes project costs, matching funds, and in-kind match so that it is clear what the LRTF funding will be used for.	Budget is thoroughly itemized so that it is clear how money is being spent. Descriptions for each workplan item clearly demonstrate applicability to the project and IRVM. Prices appear to be fair and well thought out. <input type="checkbox"/>	Budget is itemized so that it is clear how money is being spent. Descriptions are included for each item that demonstrate applicability to the project and IRVM. Prices appear to be fair and well thought out. <input type="checkbox"/>	Budget is itemized so that it is generally clear how money is being spent, but could be broken out further. Prices may be higher than average. Descriptions are included for each workplan item that demonstrate applicability to the project and IRVM. <input type="checkbox"/>	Budget is somewhat itemized, but not enough to sufficiently understand how money is being spent. Descriptions are vague so it is not clear how they apply to the project or IRVM. Prices may be considerably higher than average. <input type="checkbox"/>	Budget not itemized. Workplan descriptions so vague it is unclear what is being done. <input type="checkbox"/>	1.5	0
Supporting documentation clarifies and strengthens the project application (maps, plans, photos, species lists, etc.). All required supporting documents are included. (See project type descriptions in the funding guidelines.)	All required supporting documents are included for the project type. Additional supporting documents are included and very useful in clarifying and enhancing the understanding of the proposed project or the justification for the project. <input type="checkbox"/>	All required supporting documents are included for the project type. Some additional supporting documents are included that marginally help clarify and enhance the understanding of the proposed project or the justification for the project. <input type="checkbox"/>	All required supporting documents are included for the project type, but nothing additional is included that might help clarify. OR: no supporting documents are required for the project type and no additional supporting documents are included with the application. <input type="checkbox"/>	Application is missing some required supporting documents, or documents are included but they don't sufficiently provide the required information. <input type="checkbox"/>	The Project Type requires supporting documents but they are lacking entirely. <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
REVIEWER TOTAL SCORE							0

Eligible IRVM Activities per IC 314.22:

- Maintain a safe travel environment.
- Serve a variety of public purposes including erosion control, wildlife habitat, climate control, scenic qualities, weed control, utility easements, recreation uses, and sustenance of water quality.
- Be based on a systematic assessment of conditions existing in roadsides; preservation of valuable vegetation and habitats in the area, and the adoption of a comprehensive plan and strategies for cost-effective maintenance and vegetation planting.
- Emphasize the establishment of adaptable and long-lived vegetation, often native species, matched to the unique environment found in and adjacent to the roadside.
- Incorporate integrated management practices for the long-term control of damaging insect populations, weeds, and invasive plant species.
- Build up on a public education program allowing input from adjacent landowners and the general public.
- Accelerate efforts toward increasing and expanding the effectiveness of plantings to reduce wind-induced and water-induced soil erosion and to increase deposition of snow in desired locations.
- Incorporate integrated roadside vegetation management with other state agency planning and program activities including the recreation trails program, scenic highways, open space, and tourism development efforts. Agencies should annually report their progress in this area to the general assembly.

Comments on connection to eligible IRVM activities and priorities of the program:

Comments on project description and understanding of what the applicant wants to accomplish:

Comments on project budget, matching funds, and in-kind match:

Comments on supporting documentation and whether it strengthens the application:

General comments that either strengthen or weaken the applicant's case for funding the project (e.g., positive or negative history with LRTF, reporting competency, etc.):

Please list any missing required information or provisions that would be needed for approval:

Constructive comments for applicant:

Note to Reviewer:

Applications will first be reviewed against other applications of the same funding category (State, County, City).

The reviewer should give each criterion a score between 0 and 5. The document will automatically apply the multiplier and calculate the total score.

The final score for applications will incorporate additional criteria: 1) whether the applicant is a newly established program that would benefit from the grant 1-3 years (additional 10 points), 3-5 years (additional 5 points) if brand new program; and 2) whether the applicant has received recent LRTF grant funding for same/similar requests (max 5 points if no recent requests within 5 years). LRTF will review this information and add to the reviewer score.