



Local Highway Technical Assistance Council

3330 W. Grace Street, Boise, Idaho 83703
(208) 344-0565 FAX (208) 344-0789
1-800-259-6841 – www.lhtac.org

Lan Smith
Chairman

Mac Pooler
Vice Chairman

Dan Schaeffer
Secretary/Treasurer

Lance Holmstrom, M.U.P.
Local Highway Administrator

September 15, 2011

Rural Counties, Highway Districts and Cities of Idaho

RE: LHTAC Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LRHIP)
2013 Application – **Suggested Scoring** Criteria

Dear Applicant:

Please find attached the Suggested Scoring Criteria our Council and staff will use to rate your 2013 LRHIP Federal aid Match, Construction, Transportation Plan, or Sign Application. Our Council approved these point allocations at their June 17, 2011 Council meeting.

We hope it will help you be successful in preparing your 2013 application that is due back by December 2, 2011.

Feel free to contact LHTAC if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Jim Zier

Jim Zier
Asset Manager

Attachments

Council Members

Idaho Association of Counties
Commissioner Lan Smith
Gem County

Commissioner Don Ebert
Clearwater County

Commissioner Lee Staker
Bonneville County

Association of Idaho Cities
Mayor Mac Pooler
City of Kellogg

City Council Member Randall Prescott
City of Soda Springs

Mayor Kevin Poole
City of Lewiston

Idaho Association of Highway Districts
Commissioner Dan Schaeffer
Hillsdale Highway District

Commissioner Clark Kauffman
Filer Highway District

Commissioner Lawrence (Dick) Edinger
East Side Highway District

Ex-Officio Members
Stuart Davis, Executive Director
Idaho Association of Highway Districts

Tony Poinelli, Deputy Director
Idaho Association of Counties

Ken Harward, Executive Director
Association of Idaho Cities

**Local Rural Highway Investment Program
2013 Suggested Scoring Criteria
Federal Aid Match Project**

Question	Suggested Point Allocation
5) Project description. Why can't you meet your match requirements?	Excellent description of project need and agency benefit, 15-20 Adequate description of project need and agency benefit, 6-14 Poor description of project need and agency benefit, 0-5
6) What is your annual unemployment rate for your County this past year?	18-20% 10 16-17% 9 14-15% 8 12-13% 7 10-11% 6 8-9% 5 6-7% 4 4-5% 3 2-3% 2 1% 1
7) What amounts are on your last submitted Annual Road & Street Financial Report? (line 11 thru 24)	Line17/Line24 \leq 70%, 10 70%>Line 17/Line 24 \leq 80%, 5-9 80%>Line 17/Line 24 \leq 90%, 2-4 90%> Line 17/Line 24 \leq 100%, 0-1

Note: If the required documentation is not provided for any question, score that question with zero points.



**Local Rural Highway Investment Program
2013 Suggested Scoring Criteria
Construction Project**

Question	Suggested Point Allocation
1) What type of project is this funding request for?	Rehab Exist Pavement & Bridges, 5 Gravel Stabilization, 4 New Pavement & Bridges, 1-2 Other 1-3
2) Is this project supported by your Transportation Plan?	Supported by Plan & updated w/i 5 years, 4-5 Supported by Plan & older than 5 years, 1-3 Not Supported by Plan, 0
3) Do you have a pavement and sign management program?	Supported by Plan & updated w/i 3 years, 4-5 Supported by Plan & updated over 3 years ago, 1-3 Not Supported by Plan, 0
4) Is this project shown on your 5-year Capital Improvement Plan?	On CIP/supported by both transportation plan & asset management, 4-5 On CIP/supported by either transportation plan & asset management, 2-3 On CIP/supported by neither transportation plan & asset management, 0-1
5) Does your highway maintenance crew include any members who have completed the Idaho T ² Center's "Road Scholar" program?	50% enrolled & 25% complete, 4-5 25% enrolled & 10% complete, 2-3 Less 25% enrolled and less than 10% complete, 1-2
6) Has the project been prioritized and is it supported by your Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Organization?	Top 3 on list w/ support letter attached, 5-10 4 th and 5 th on list w/support letter attached, 1-4
7) Is this a multi-jurisdictional project?	More than two participating jurisdictions, 3-5 Two participating jurisdictions, 1-2 Less than 2 participating jurisdictions, 0
8) What Percentage of your annual revenue (over the past three years) is the cost of the project?	Cost/Rev % over 100%, 10-15 Cost/Rev% 75% to 100%, 7-9 Cost/Rev% 50% to 75%, 5-6 Cost/Rev% 25% to 50%, 3-4 Cost/Rev% less than 25%, 1-2
9) Is this a safety related project and how will this project correct it?	Excellent description showing improvements should correct problem, 4-5 Adequate description showing improvements should correct problem, 1-3 Not safety related, 0
10) How many Total crashes, deaths, injuries. What is the ADT?	20 + Crashes, 5 5-20 Crashes, 4 1-5 Crashes, 1-999 ADT, 3 1-5 Crashes, 1000-2000 ADT, 2 1-5 Crashes >2000 ADT, 1
11) Project Description. Explain the need for the project and the importance.	Excellent description of project need and agency benefit, 10-15 Adequate description of project need and agency benefit, 5-9 Poor description of project need and agency benefit, 0-4
12) What amounts are shown on your last submitted Annual Road & Street Financial Report? (line 64 thru 67)	Line 67 is \$0 & more than 80% of Line 64 is shown on Line 65, 4-5 Line 67 is \$0 & less than 80% of Line 64 is shown on Line 65, 1-3 Line 67 in greater than \$0, 0
13) What amounts are on your last submitted Annual Road & Street Financial Report? (line 11 thru 24)	Line 17/Line 24 ≤ 70%, 10 70% > Line 17/Line 24 < 80%, 5-9 80% > Line 17/Line 24 < 90%, 2-4 90% > Line 17/Line 24 ≤ 100%, 0-1

Note: If the required documentation is not provided for any question, score that question with zero points.



**Local Rural Highway Investment Program
2013 Suggested Scoring Criteria
Transportation Plan**

Question	Suggested Point Allocation
1) Is this a multi-jurisdictional project?	More than two participating jurisdictions, 3-5 Two participating jurisdictions, 1-2 Less than 2 participating jurisdictions, 0
2) Has the project been prioritized and is it supported by your Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Organization?	Top 3 on list w/ support letter attached, 5-10 4 th and 5 th on list w/support letter attached, 1-4
3) The planning process should be multi-jurisdictional; list those included. _____	Most number of Local, State, Federal Stakeholders included, 10-15 Fair number of Local, State, Federal Stakeholders included, 5-9 Least number of Local, State, Federal Stakeholders included, 0-4
4) Have you applied for a LRHIP Transportation Plan Grant in the past? _____ If so, what year(s) did you apply? _____	Once before 10 Twice before 15 More than twice 20
5) Do you have a pavement and sign management program?	Up to 5 points.
6) What percentage of your annual revenue (over the past three years) is the cost of the project?	Cost/Rev % over 100%, 10-15 Cost/Rev% 75% to 100%, 7-9 Cost/Rev% 50% to 75%, 5-6 Cost/Rev% 25% to 50%, 3-4 Cost/Rev% less than 25%, 1-2
7) What amounts are shown on your last submitted Annual Road & Street Financial Report? (line 64 thru 67)	Line 67 is \$0 & more than 80% of Line 64 is shown on Line 65, 4-5 Line 67 is \$0 & less than 80% of Line 64 is shown on Line 65, 1-3 Line 67 in greater than \$0, 0
8) What amounts are on your last submitted Annual Road & Street Financial Report? (line 11 thru 24)	Line 17/Line 24 \leq 70%, 10 70% > Line 17/Line 24 \leq 80%, 5-9 80% > Line 17/Line 24 \leq 90%, 2-4 90% > Line 17/Line 24 \leq 100%, 0-1

Note: If the required documentation is not provided for any question, score that question with zero points.



**Local Rural Highway Investment Program
2013 Suggested Scoring Criteria
Sign Project**

Question	Suggested Point Allocation
1) Do you have a pavement and sign management program?	Supported by Plan & updated within 1-3 years, 4-5 Supported by Plan & updated over 3 years ago, 1-3 Not Supported by Plan, 0
2) Is this project supported by your Transportation Plan?	Supported by Plan & updated w/i 5 years, 4-5 Supported by Plan & older than 5 years, 1-3 Not Supported by Plan, 0
3) Is this project shown on your 5-year Capital Improvement Plan?	On CIP/supported by both transportation plan & asset management, 5 On CIP/supported by either transportation plan & asset management, 4 On CIP/supported by neither transportation plan & asset management, 1-3
4) Is this a project to replace warning signs?	Prorated by percent of grant used on other than warning signs, 20
5) Is this a project to replace regulatory signs?	Prorated by percent of grant used on other than warning signs: Same rating scale as above.
6) Has the project been prioritized and is it supported by your Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Organization?	Top 3 on list w/ support letter attached, 5-10 4 th and 5 th on list w/support letter attached, 1-4
7) Is this a multi-jurisdictional project?	More than two participating jurisdictions, 3-5 Two participating jurisdictions, 1-2
8) Does your sign project include any other aspects?	Up to 5 additional points if safety related or project will clearly do more than just meet MUTCD sign update requirements.
9) What amounts are shown on your last submitted Annual Road & Street Financial Report? (line 64 thru 67)	Line 67 is \$0 & more than 80% of Line 64 is shown on Line 65, 4-5 Line 67 is \$0 & less than 80% of Line 64 is shown on Line 65, 1-3 Line 67 in greater than \$0, 0
10) Explain your method of phasing in new signs and your replacement schedule?	Has a plan to meet January 2012, 2015 and 2018 Compliance Dates, 5 Lists which maintenance method fits their agency needs & resources, 2 Has an inventory of signs and costs, 2 % complete they are up through 2018, 1 All of the above 10
11) What amounts are on your last submitted Annual Road & Street Financial Report? (line 11 thru 24)	Line 17/Line 24 \leq 70%, 10 70% > Line 17/Line 24 \leq 80%, 5-9 80% > Line 17/Line 24 \leq 90%, 2-4 90% > Line 17/Line 24 \leq 100%, 0-1

Note: If the required documentation is not provided for any question, score that question with zero points.

