Reviewer Identification Number:
Applicant:
Project Title:

LRTF Grant Reviewer Scoring Sheet

IOWA DOT
Form 841703 (01-25)

IOWA LIVING ROADWAY TRUST FUND

Scoring Criteria	Excellent - 5	Average - 3	Below Average - 1	Multiplier	Score
Connection to eligible IRVM activities per IC 4.22. (*See list below.*)	☐ Includes 6 or more IRVM objectives.	☐ Includes 3 IRVM objectives.	☐ Includes 1 or 2 IRVM objectives.	2	0
Project description provides a complete and thorough understandung 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.	☐ Project description lacks sufficient detail to understand the basic premise of the request. Justification for the project is missing entirely.	☐ 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.	2	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. Descritptions for each workplan item clearly demonstrates applicability to the project and IRVM. Prices appear to be fair and well thought out.	☐ 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.	☐ 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.	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.	☐ Application is missing some required supporting documents, or documents are included but they don't sufficiently provide the required information.	☐ No supporting documentation or incorrect information attached.	1	0
				REVIEWER TOTAL SCORE	0

Eligible IRVM Activities per IC 314.22.

a) Maintain a safe travel environment.
b) 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.
c) 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.
d) Emphasize the establishment of adaptable and long-lived vegetation, often native species, matched to the unique environment found in and adjacent to the roadside.
e) Incorporate integrated management practices for the long term control of damaging insect populations, weeds, and invasive plant species.
f) Build upon a public education program allowing input from adjacent landowners and the general public.
g) 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.
h) Incorporate integrated roadside vegetation management with other state agency planning and program activities using including the recreation trails program, scenic highways, open space, and tourism development efforts. Agencies annually report their progress in this area to the general assembly.

Please comment on the following: 1) connection to eligible IRVM activities, 2) project description, 3) project budget, 4) supporting documentation, or 5) any other factors that strengthen or weaken the application.
(Comments provided in this section will be shared with the grant applicant if the grant applicant requests feedback.)

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: 0-2 years (additional 10 points), 3-5 years (additional 5 points); 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 scores.

Applications will receive extra points for providing matching funds or in-kind labor higher than the minimum required. For projects that require a match, the minimum match is 20% of the total project costs. Points will be awarded as follows: if no match is required or if the application provides the minimum required match of 20% of total project costs (no additional points); match of 21% - 30% of project costs (additional 1 point); match of 31% - 50% of project costs (additional 2 points); match of 51% or more of project costs (additional 3 points).