If you are reading this, then you are successfully seeing the webinar video. In addition to audio on the webinar, we have opened a phone conference line to allow attendees to listen and ask questions directly: 866-823-7699. Please use either the webinar audio or conference line, but not both (will produce feedback).

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355

Will start at 10am
Webinar, including Q&A, will be recorded and available later. www.dirtandgravelroads.org

Webinars:

In an effort to better communicate the many changes occurring within the Program, the PSU Center for Dirt and Gravel Roads will be scheduling a series of webinars in the coming months. The webinars will be directed at Conservation Districts, although anyone can join and there is no fee. These webinars will be topic-specific, not general program updates as some past webinars have been. The webinars will consist of 20-40 minutes of presentation, followed by 40-60 minutes of Q&A or discussion (90 minute max).

Webinar Link (no registration needed if you sign in as a guest): https://meeting.psu.edu/cdgrs/

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
FY 2014-15 District Allocations

- First batch of 18 Assignment Agreements on way to comptroller this week, advances for those Districts expected in 4-6 weeks.
- The quicker your assignment agreement was received by SCC, the sooner you will get your advance.
- FY 2015-16 should go back to normal schedule with advances in fall 2015.
Application Ranking Criteria

- Background
- Example Template
- Additional Considerations
- Ideas from Other Districts
- Feedback & Discussion

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
DG&LVR Administrative Manual
Approved by SCC 11/12/14
1) Introduction
2) SCC Role
3) Conservation District Role
4) Quality Assurance Board Role
5) Applicant Role
6) Center for Dirt and Gravel Roads
7) Additional Policies
8) Permits and Other Requirements
Appendices (Appendix Q: Proj Ranking Criteria)
Quality Assurance Board

Four member board (2 CD, PAFBC, NRCS) that makes recommendations to District Board.

- Policy Recommendations
- Funding Recommendations

QAB Webinar and presentation available online

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Application Ranking Criteria

• COUNTY SPECIFIC!
• Written criteria is required in each District.
• Should be specific to local priorities.
• Should have environmental focus
• **REQUIRED** – the only way to answer: “why did you fund that project and not my project?”
Application Ranking Criteria

• Has always been required.

• Now is the time to “revamp” and take LVR projects into consideration.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Application Ranking Criteria

• Probably the most important piece of paper in the Program for your county!

• Since the ranking criteria is basically your Districts “priorities” make it available to applicants:
  – Will emphasize environmental focus of program.
  – Will likely get better, more fitting applications.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
How to create or update

• CD staff work with QAB to create/update.
• QAB recommends to District Board for Approval.
• District Board approves and it essentially becomes policy.
Application Ranking Criteria

• Background

• Example Template

• Additional Considerations

• Ideas from Other Districts

• Feedback & Discussion

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
• Center, Program, and “Policy and Planning” advisory workgroup created and distributed example ranking criteria October 2014.

• Online in MS Word format.
  – Use a little!
  – Use a lot!
  – Don’t use at all!

• Make it your own based on LOCAL priorities.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
One ranking sheet or two?

D&G

paved LVR

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Poll Question

Will you have one set of ranking Criteria for both paved LVR and D&G applications, or separate?
One ranking sheet or two?

• Local decision!

• We chose to go with one in our example:
  – Stresses the fact that the focus on LVR projects is the same as the focus of D&G projects
Application Ranking

Example Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant
Application Ranking 8/13/14

SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

Note the validation criteria in Section 1 serve to ensure a project is eligible. Feel free to insert additional county specific criteria.

Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body? YES NO
Will the proposed project reduce environmental impacts to a water body? YES NO
Is someone from the applying entity “ESM Certified” within the past 5 year? YES NO
Does the proposed application meet all SCC requirements (non-pollution, pipe size, etc) YES NO
Does the proposed application meet all policies adopted by the local County QAB? YES NO
Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits? YES NO
LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less? YES NO (note traffic count is required before contract is signed)

If any of the questions above are answered “NO”, the application is currently not eligible for funding.

SECTION 2: APPLICATION RANKING

SEVERITY OF PROBLEM

1. Modified Worksite Assessment:
   a. Road Drainage to Stream: none-0 Slight-5 Moderate-10 Severe-15
   b. Wet Site Conditions: Dry-0 Saturated Ditches-3 Roadside Springs-5 Flow in Ditches-2 Saturation Base-10
   c. Road Surface Condition
     i. LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: good-0 Fair, some cracking-5 Poor, cracking, unevenness-7 Damaged-10 Severely Damaged-15
   d. Road Slope: <5-10% 5-10% >10% 15
   e. Road Shape (cross-slope/crown): Good-0 Fair-3 Poor-5
   f. Slope to Stream: <30% 30-60% >60% 10
   g. Distance to Stream: >100' 50'-100' <50' <crossing-5
   h. Outlets to Stream: None-0 Near Stream-1 Directly to Stream-5
   i. Outlet/Bleeder Stability: Stable-0 Moderate-3 Unstable-10
   j. Road Ditch Stability: Stable-0 Fair-3 Poor-5 Unstable-10
   k. Road Bank Stability: Stable-0 Fair-3 Poor-5 Unstable-10
   l. Average Canopy Cover: Moderate-4 Minimal-2 Heavy-5
   m. Off-LOW Impacts resolved: None-0 Minimal-2 Some-2 Many-10

Note the assessment above has been modified from the original version. Feel free to use the original version or change the scores to reflect county priorities. Regardless of the method used, scores should be re-evaluated when they are applied for. Modified Assessment Subtotal: ________ (110)

Example Template

2. Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:
   Warmwater Fishery-10 Coldwater Fishery-20 HQ/EV/drinking water-30

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

3. Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:
   Slightly-0 Moderately-10 Highly-20 Almost completely-30

4. Degree to which project improves road:
   Slightly-0 Moderately-10 Highly-15 Extremely high-25

5. Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?
   Low ben/5-0 Moderate ben/5-10 High ben/5-30 Very high ben/5-50

OTHER FACTORS

6. In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:
   11-15 20-25-15 Over 25-15

7. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project before submitting application? YES NO ________ (15)

Point Summary:

Severity of Problem: ________ (140 possible points)
Effectiveness of Solution: ________ (150 possible points)
Other Factors: ________ (45 possible points)
TOTAL SCORE: ________ (335 possible points)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: Some other factors that your local QAB may want to consider:
   - Types of road use (residential, school bus route, timber, agriculture, etc.)
   - Are all necessary permits already in hand or applied for?
   - Addressing road hazards
   - Past working relationship with applicant within Program
   - A required minimum score in order to be eligible for funding
   - Location of project within MS4 or TMDL, or Combined Sewer Overflow regions
   - Presence or absence of “curb and gutter” systems
   - Flooding or winter icing issues on the road
   - Future road use plans (development, drilling, etc.)
   - Collaboration with other agencies or projects

Your QAB is encouraged to customize this evaluation to circumstances in your county. You may develop a joint D&C and LVR ranking sheet such as this, or you may develop separate rankings for D&C and LVR applications. Any ranking criteria used should ensure equal access to all potential applicants and be consistent with state policies. Program and Grant information should be posted on your ranking criteria on request.

Will provide download link at end of presentation.
Application Ranking

This document is provided only as an example. County QARs can use as little or as much of the information here as they desire to establish local priorities in project ranking.

Example Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant
Application Ranking 8/13/14

SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

Note the validation criteria in Section 1 serve to ensure a project is eligible. Feel free to be as strict as possible.

Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body? YES NO

Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits? YES NO

LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less? YES NO

If any of the questions above are answered “NO”, the application is currently not eligible for funding.

SECTION 2: APPLICATION RANKING

SEVERITY OF PROBLEM

1. “Modified” Worksite Assessment:
   a. Road Drainage to Stream: None-0 Near Stream-1 Directly to Stream-5
   b. Wet Site Condition: Dry-0 Saturated Ditches-3 Roadside Springs-5
   c. Flow in Ditches-2 Saturated Base-16
   d. LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: Good-0 Fair-3 Poor-5
   e. Road Ditch Stability: Stable-0 Fair-1 Poor-2 Unstable-10
   f. Road Bank Stability: Stable-0 Fair-1 Poor-2 Unstable-10
   g. Average Canopy Cover: Moderate-0 Minimal-2 Heavy-5
   h. Outlet to Stream: None-0 Near Stream-1 Directly to Stream-5
   i. Outlet/Bleeder Stability: Stable-0 Moderate-3 Unstable-5
   j. Road Ditch Stability: Stable-0 Fair-1 Poor-2 Unstable-10
   k. Road Bank Stability: Stable-0 Fair-1 Poor-2 Unstable-10
   l. Average Canopy Cover: Moderate-0 Minimal-2 Heavy-5
   m. OFF-ROW Impacts resolved: None-0 Minimal-2 Some-5 Many-10

Select type of application
Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)
Paved (Low Volume Road)

Misc

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: Some other factors that your local QAR may want to consider:
- Types of road use (residential, school bus route, timber transportation, etc.)
- Addressing road hazards
- Past working relationship with applicant within Program
- A required minimum score in order to be eligible for funding
- Location of project within MS4 or TMDL or Combined Sewer Overflow project

Point Summary:
Severity of Problem: (140 possible points)
Effectiveness of Solution: (210 possible points)
Other Factors: (45 possible points)
Total Score: 300 possible points

Example Template

2. Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:
   Warmwater Fishery-10 Coldwater Fishery-20 HQ/TV/drinking water-30

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

3. Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:
   Slightly-0 Moderately-10 Highly-30 Almost completely-50

5. Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?
   Low ben/$-5 Moderate ben/$-30 High ben/$-30 Very high ben/$-50

OTHER FACTORS

No-0 Discussed site details with CD-10 Met w/CD on site-15

Other thoughts
Problem

Solution

Misc

Other thoughts
## Section 1: Application Validation

Note the validation criteria in Section 1 serve to ensure a project is eligible. Feel free to insert additional county specific criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)</th>
<th>Paved (Low Volume Road)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Will the proposed project reduce environmental impacts to a water body?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Is someone from the applying entity “ESM Certified” within the past 5 years?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Does the proposed application meet all SCC requirements (non-pollution, pipe size, etc.)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Does the proposed application meet all policies adopted by the local County QAB?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LVR ONLY:** If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less?  

*(Note: traffic count is required before contract is signed)*

If any of the questions above are answered “NO”, the application is currently not eligible for funding.

---

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699  
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body?  
YES  NO

Will the proposed project reduce environmental impacts to a water body?  
YES  NO

Is someone from the applying entity “ESM Certified” within the past 5 years?  
YES  NO

Does the proposed application meet all SCC requirements (non-pollution, pipe size, etc.)?  
YES  NO

Does the proposed application meet all policies adopted by the local County QAB?  
YES  NO

Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits?  
YES  NO

LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less?  
YES  NO

(Note: traffic count is required before contract is signed)

If any of the questions above are answered “NO”, the application is currently not eligible for funding.
“Yes” required for all questions to determine eligibility before actual ranking begins.

### SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed project reduce environmental impacts to a water body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is someone from the applying entity “ESM Certified” within the past 5 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed application meet all SCC requirements (non-pollution, pipe size, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed application meet all policies adopted by the local County QAB?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Note: traffic count is required before contract is signed)*

*If any of the questions above are answered “NO”, the application is currently not eligible for funding.*
### Application Ranking

This document is provided only as an example. County QARs can use as little or as much of the information here as they desire to establish local priorities in project ranking.

---

**Example Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Ranking 8/13/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select type of application</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved (Low Volume Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits? |
| YES | NO |

**LRV ONLY:** If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less? **YES** **NO**

*Note traffic count is required before contract is signed.*

---

**SECTION 2: APPLICATION RANKING**

**SEVERITY OF PROBLEM**

1. **“Modified” Worksites Assessment:**
   - Road Drainage to Stream: None-0, Slight-5, Moderate-10, Severe-15
   - Wet Site Conditions: Dry-0, Saturated Ditches-3, Roadside Springs-5
   - Flow in Ditches-2, Saturation Base-10
   - LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: good-0, fair, some cracking-5
   - Poor, cracking, unevenness-10, Severely Damaged-15
   - D&G EVALUATION: Hard Gravel-9, Mixed Stone-5, Soft Stone-7

2. **Outlets to Stream:** None-0, Near Stream-1, Directly to Stream-5
3. **Outlet/Blender Stability:** Stable-0, Moderate-3, Unstable-5
4. **Road Ditch Stability:** Stable-0, Fair-2, Poor-7, Unstable-10
5. **Road Bank Stability:** Stable-0, Fair-2, Poor-7, Unstable-10
6. **Average Canopy Cover:** Moderate-0, Minimal-2, Heavy-5
7. **Off-ROW Impacts resolved:** None-0, Minimal-2, Some-7, Many-10

**Modified Assessment Subtotal:** (110)

---

**Solution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Degree to which project remedies impact to waterbody:
   - Slightly-0, Moderately-10, Highly-30, Almost completely-50

2. Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?
   - Low ben/S-9, Moderate ben/S-30, High ben/S-50, Very high ben/S-50

---

**Misc**

- **Point Summary:**
  - Severity of Problem: __________ (140 possible points)
  - Effectiveness of Solution: __________ (150 possible points)
  - Other Factors: __________ (45 possible points)
  - **TOTAL SCORE:** __________ (300 possible points)

**Other Considerations:** Some other factors that your local QAR may want to consider:

- Types of road use (residential, school bus route, timber, agriculture, etc.)
- Are all necessary permits already in hand or applied for?
- Addressing road hazards
- Past working relationship with applicant within Program
- A required minimum score in order to be eligible for funding
- Location of project within MS4 or TMDL or Combined Sewer Overflow permits

---

**Other thoughts**

Your QAR is encouraged to customize this evaluation to circumstances in your county. You may develop a joint D&G and LVR ranking sheet such as this, or you may develop separate rankings for D&G and LVR applications. Any ranking criteria used should be consistent across all QARs.
Assessment

• Existing Worksites have been assessed with “dirty dozen” assessment that scores them from 0-100.

• Link to assessment info provided at end.
Poll Question

Does your current application ranking consider “GIS assessment score”? 

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
SEVERITY OF PROBLEM

1. “Modified” Worksite Assessment:
   a. Road Drainage to Stream: none-0 Slight-5 Moderate-10 Severe-15 _________ (15)
   b. Wet Site Conditions: Dry-0 Saturated Ditches-3 Roadside Springs-5 _________ (10)
      Flow in Ditches-7 Saturated Base-10 _________ (10)
   c. Road Surface Condition
      i. LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: good-0 fair, some cracking-5
         Poor, cracking, unevenness-7 Damaged-10 Severely Damaged-15 _________ (15)
          Mixed stone/dirt/dust-10 Severe Dust-15 _________ (10)
   d. Road Slope: <5%-0 5-10%-5 >10%-10 _________ (10)
   e. Road Shape (cross-slope/crown): Good-0 Fair-3 Poor-5 _________ (5)
   f. Slope to Stream: <30%-0 30-60%-3 >60%-5 _________ (5)
   g. Distance to Stream: >100’-0 50’-100’-3 <50’/crossing-5 _________ (5)
   h. Outlets to Stream: None-0 Near Stream-3 Directly to Stream-5 _________ (5)
   i. Outlet/Bleeder Stability: Stable-0 Moderate-3 Unstable-5 _________ (5)
   j. Road Ditch Stability: Stable-0 Fair-3 Poor-7 Unstable-10 _________ (10)
   k. Road Bank Stability: Stable-0 Fair-3 Poor-7 Unstable-10 _________ (10)
   l. Average Canopy Cover: Moderate-0 Minimal-3 Heavy-5 _________ (5)
   m. Off-ROW Impacts resolved: None-0 Minimal-3 Some-7 Many-10 _________ (10)

Note the assessment above has been modified from the original version. Feel free to use the original version or change the scores to reflect county priorities. Regardless of the method used, sites should be re-evaluated when they are applied for. Outdated GIS assessment

Modified Assessment Subtotal:_________ (110)
Why not just use criteria: “GIS Score = _____pts?

You can, but:

• Better to have actual criteria on the form.
• Gives you the ability to customize.
• Score is outdated in most cases (2008?, 2000?).
• Modified assessment makes it necessary to do current evaluation.
2. Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:
   Warmwater Fishery-10   Coldwater Fishery-20   HQ/EV/drinking water-30   __________ (30)
Problem Evaluation Summary

1) Modified Assessment  110

2) Water Classification  30

140 possible points
Problem Evaluation Summary

1) Modified Assessment  
110 300? 50?

2) Water Classification  
30 20? 45? 0?

140 ??? possible points

These are example only. Please use as much or as little as you would like in creating your local criteria!

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Example Ranking

Application Ranking

This document is provided only as an example. County QARs can use as little or as much of the information here as they desire to establish local priorities in project ranking.

Example Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant

Application Ranking 8/13/14

Select type of application

Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)
Paved (Low Volume Road)

SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body? YES NO

Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits? YES NO

LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less? YES NO (note traffic count is required before contract is signed)

Any of the questions above answered “NO”, the application is currently not eligible for funding.

SECTION 2: APPLICATION RANKING

SEVERITY OF PROBLEM

1. "Modified” Worksite Assessment:
   a. Road Drainage to Stream: none 0  Slight-5 Moderate-10 Severe-15 _______ (15)
   b. Wet Site Conditions: Dry-0  Saturated Ditches-3 Roadside Springs-5 _______ (10)
   c. Road Surface Condition: Failed-0 Poor-5 Fair-10 Good-15 _______ (15)
   d. LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: good-0 Fair-5 Poor-10 Damaged-15 _______ (15)
   f. Outlets to Stream: None-0 Near Stream-1 Directly to Stream-5 _______ (5)
   g. Outlet/Bleeder Stability: Stable-0 Moderate-5 Unstable-10 _______ (5)
   h. Road Ditch Stability: Stable-0 Fair-5 Poor-10 Unstable-15 _______ (10)
   i. Road Bank Stability: Stable-0 FAIR-5 Poor-10 Unstable-15 _______ (10)
   j. Average Canopy Cover: None-0 Minimal-5 Moderate-10 Heavy-15 _______ (10)
   k. Off-ROW Impacts resolved: None-0 Minimal-5 Some-10 Many-10 _______ (10)

Note: above criteria have been modified from the original version. Feel free to use the original or change the criteria to reflect county priorities. Regardless of the method used, scores should be re-evaluated when they are applied.

Modified Assessment Subtotal: _______ (110)

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

3. Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:
   Slightly-0  Moderately-10  Highly-30  Almost completely-50 _______ (50)

5. Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost):
   Low ben/$-0  Moderate ben/$-30  High ben/$-50  Very high ben/$-50 _______ (50)

OTHER FACTORS

6. No-0 Discussed site details with CD-10 Met w/CD on site-15

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: Some other factors your local QAR may want to consider:

- Types of road use (residential, school bus route, timber, agriculture, etc.)
- All necessary permits already in-hand or applied for?
- Addressing road hazards
- Nepal working relationship with applicant within Program
- A required minimum score is required to be eligible for funding
- Location of project within MS4 or TMDL or Combined Sewer Outflow permit

Miscellaneous

Solution

- The sample ranking criteria is weighted toward applications that have moderate to severe environmental problems, and high to very high benefit solutions. Your QAR is encouraged to customize this to best fit in your county's needs.

Your QAR is encouraged to customize this evaluation to circumstances in your county. You may develop a joint D&G and LVR ranking sheet such as this, or you may develop separate rankings for D&G and LVR applications. Any ranking criteria used should be applied to all applications of this type.

Other thoughts
Evaluation of Solution

• Many existing criteria evaluate the problem.

• What about the other half of the equation?

• Criteria should also look at the degree to which the project will resolve the problem.
Evaluation of Solution

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

3. Degree to which project remedies impact to waterbody:
   Slightly- 0   Moderately-10   Highly-30   Almost completely- 50
   __________  (50)

4. Degree to which project improves road:
   Slightly- 0   Moderately-5   Highly-10   Extremely high- 15
   __________  (15)

5. Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?
   Low ben/-$0   Moderate ben/-$10   High ben/-$30   Very high ben/-$50
   __________  (50)
Evaluation of Solution

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

3. Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:
   Slightly-0   Moderately-10   Highly-30   Almost completely-50   _________ (50)

- **Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:** How much of the identified environmental problem will be remediated as a result of the project? For example, an application for pavement or DSA that ignores drainage may only provide marginal environmental benefit, while a comprehensive drainage improvement project may all but eliminate road impacts on the stream.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Evaluation of Solution

4. **Degree to which project improves road:** How much of the problems with the road itself will be remediated as a result of the project? For example, a base-stabilization project on a road that is cracking, rutting, or potholed would rank high. A project that focuses solely on environmental benefits (streambank stabilization, Off ROW issues, etc.) may not provide much road improvement.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Evaluation of Solution

5. Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?
   Low ben/$-0  Moderate ben/$-10  High ben/$-30  Very high ben/$-50

• **Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?**: Examples of high “benefit per dollar” projects may include: projects that focus on low-cost drainage improvements (new pipes, underdrain, French mattress, etc.) over road surface improvements; projects that replace stream crossing structures to stabilize a stream channel and avoid gravel bar formation. Examples of low “benefit per dollar” project may include projects that focus on base stabilization and road surface over drainage improvements; or projects focusing on expensive engineered BMPs.
Evaluation of Solution

3) Environmental improvement  50

4) Road improvement       15

5) Cost effectiveness      50

115 possible points
Evaluation of Solution

3) Environmental improvement  50-300?  20?

4) Road improvement  15 10?  60?

5) Cost effectiveness  50-100?  25?

115 ??? possible points

These are example only. Please use as much or as little as you would like in creating your local criteria!
Application Ranking

Example Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant
Application Ranking 8/13/14

SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body? YES NO

Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits? YES NO

LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less? YES NO

Note the validation criteria in Section 1 serve to insure a project is eligible. Feel free to insert additional county specific criteria.

SECTION 2: SEVERITY OF PROBLEM

1. "Modified" Worksite Assessment:
   a. Road Drainage to Stream: none 0, Slight 5, Moderate 10, Severe 15
   b. Wet Site Conditions: Dry 0, Saturated Ditches 3, Roadside Springs 5
   c. Road Surface Condition
      i. LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: good 0, Fair, some cracking 5
      ii. DGR EVALUATION: Hard Gravel 0, Mixed Stone 5, Soft Stone 10

   h. Outlets to Stream: None 0, Near Stream 1, Directly to Stream 5
   i. Outlet/Bleeder Stability: Stable 0, Moderate 3, Unstable 5
   j. Road Ditch Stability: Stable 0, Poor 5, Unstable 10
   k. Road Bank Stability: Stable 0, Poor 5, Unstable 10
   l. Average Canopy Cover: Moderate 0, Minimal 3, Heavy 5
   m. Off-ROW Impacts resolved: None 0, Minimal 3, Some 7, Many 10

Note the assessment above has been modified from the original version. Feel free to use the original version or change the scores to reflect county priorities. Regardless of the method used, data should be re-evaluated when the criteria for Modified GIS assessment are met.

Modified Assessment Subtotal: __________ (110)

Solution 110

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

3. Degree to which project remedies impact to waterbody:
   Slightly 0, Moderately 10, Highly 30, Almost completely 50

5. Cost effectiveness: How much "environmental benefit per dollar" (benefit per cost)?
   Low ben/$30, Moderate ben/$30, High ben/$30, Very high ben/$50

OTHER FACTORS

No 0, Discussed site details with CD 10, Met with CD on site 15

Misc

Point Summary:

Severity of Problem: _____ (40 possible points)
Effectiveness of Solution: _____ (20 possible points)
Other Factors: _____ (45 possible points)

TOTAL SCORE: _____ (105 possible points)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: Some other factors that your local QAB may want to consider:

Types of road use (residential, school bus route, timber, agriculture, etc.)
Are all necessary permits already obtained or is more applied for?
Addressing existing hazards
Past working relationship with applicant within Program
A required minimum score in order to be eligible for funding
Location of project within MS4 or TMDL or Combined Sewer Outflow project

Other thoughts

Your QAB is encouraged to customize this evaluation to circumstances in your county. You may develop a joint DGR and LVR ranking sheet such as this, or you may develop separate rankings for DGR and LVR applications. Any ranking criteria used against a project for all local criteria may be used.
Miscellaneous

OTHER FACTORS

6. In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:  
   1 to 10% - 5   10-25% - 10   Over 25% - 15
   __________ (15)

7. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project before submitting application: __________ (15)
   No - 0   Discussed site details with CD - 10   Met w/CD on site - 15

8. Is applicant maintaining recently funded Program projects properly:
   No - 0   Recent projects still functional - 10   Yes (or first project) - 15
   __________ (15)
Miscellaneous

OTHER FACTORS

6. **In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:** Total in kind contributions from applicant, divided by total grant requested. Note that there are no statewide in-kind requirements. While in-kind should be encouraged, assigning too much value to in-kind in an application ranking process would work against poorer townships that may need grant funding the most.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
7. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project before submitting application: __________ (15)
   No-0
   Discussed site details with CD-10
   Met w/CD on site-15

• **Did applicant contact district before submitting application**: Pre-applications meetings and site visits are highly encouraged in order to implement a project that is beneficial to all parties.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Miscellaneous

8. Is applicant maintaining recently funded Program projects properly:  
   No-0  Recent projects still functional-10  Yes (or first project)-15

- **Is applicant maintaining past Program projects properly:** The extent to which applicants have maintained past funded projects within a reasonable project life expectancy. For example, are pipes and headwalls still functional; have they graded DSA to maintain road shape; etc. Districts can adopt their own policies and procedures for evaluation past projects.

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Miscellaneous

6) In-kind contributions 15

7) Pre application contact 15

8) Maintenance of past projects 15

45 possible points
Miscellaneous

6) In-kind contributions 15 25? 0?

7) Pre application contact 15 5? 40?

8) Maintenance of past projects 15 50? 75?

45 ??? possible points

These are example only. Please use as much or as little as you would like in creating your local criteria!
Example Point Totals

1-2) Problem      140
3-6) Solution      115
7-9) Misc          45

300 possible points

Yours should be different!!!
Overall 300 points

Yours should be different!!!
Application Ranking Criteria

• Background

• Example Template

• Additional Considerations

• Ideas from Other Districts

• Feedback & Discussion

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
**Application Ranking**

Example Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant

**Application Ranking 8/13/14**

**SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION**

Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other water body? **YES** **NO**

Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits? **YES** **NO**

LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less? **YES** **NO** (note traffic count is required before contract is signed)

**Application Validation**

**Problem**

- Road Drainage to Stream: none-0, Slight-5, Moderate-10, Severe-15
- Wet Site Conditions: Dry-0, Saturated Ditches-3, Roadside Springs-5
- Flow in Ditches-2, Saturated Basal-16
- Road Surface Condition: LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: good-0, fair, some cracking-5, Poor, cracking, unevenness-7, Damaged-10, Severely Damaged-15
- D&B EVALUATION: Hard Gravel-9, Mixed Stone-5, Soft Stone-7
- Outlets to Stream: None-0, Near Stream-1, Directly to Stream-5
- Outlet/Bleeder Stability: Stable-0, Moderate-3, Unstable-5
- Road Ditch Stability: Stable-0, Fair-2, Poor-7, Unstable-10
- Road Bank Stability: Stable-0, Fair-2, Poor-7, Unstable-10
- Average Canopy Cover: Moderate-0, Minimal-3, Heavy-5
- Off-ROW Impacts resolved: None-0, Minimal-3, Some-7, Many-10

Other thoughts

**Other Considerations**

**Solution 110**

Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:
- Warmwater Fishery-10
- Coldwater Fishery-20
- HQ/EV/drinking water-30

**EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION**

Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:
- Slightly-0
- Moderately-10
- Highly-30
- Almost completely-50

Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?
- Low ben/S-10
- Moderate ben/S-30
- High ben/S-30
- Very high ben/S-50

**Misc**

- Discussed site details with CD-10
- Met w/CD on site-15

**Other considerations**:
- Some other factors that your local QAB may want to consider:
  - Types of road use (residential, school bus route, timber, agriculture, etc.)
  - Are all necessary permits already in-hand or applied for?
  - Addressing road hazards
  - Past working relationship with applicant within Program
  - A required minimum score in order to be eligible for funding
  - Location of project within MS4 or TMDL or Combined Sewer Overflow permits

Your QAB is encouraged to customize this evaluation to circumstances in your county. You may develop a joint DRC and LVR ranking sheet such as this, or you may develop separate rankings for DRC and LVR applications. Key ranking criteria used on project assessment and score.
• Are all necessary permits already in-hand or applied for?
• Addressing road hazards.
• A required minimum score in order to be eligible for funding.
• Location of project within MS4 or TMDL or Combined Sewer Overflow regions.
• Presence or absence of “curb and gutter” systems.
• Flooding or winter icing issues on the road.
• Future road use plans (developments, drilling, etc).
• Collaboration with other agencies or projects.
Two potential complications:

1) Stream crossing replacements

2) Urban LVRs
Stream crossing replacements

- How to compare standalone crossing replacement with “traditional” project.
Stream crossing replacements

- Replace “Road Assmt” with “Stream Xing assmt”?

Stream Crossing: Severity of Problem

1. Vertical drop at outlet of stream crossing:
   None-0  <6”- 5  >6”-20
   ________ (20)

2. Stream Bank Erosion (downstream)
   None-0  Present- 5  Severe-15
   ________ (15)

3. Stream Bank Erosion (upstream)
   None-0  Present- 5  Severe-15
   ________ (15)

4. Stream Bed Erosion (downstream)
   None-0  Present- 5  Severe-10
   ________ (10)

5. Stream Bed Erosion (upstream)
   None-0  Present- 5  Severe-10
   ________ (10)

6. Stream Bed Deposition (downstream)
   None-0  Present- 5  Severe-10
   ________ (10)

7. Stream Bed Deposition (upstream)
   None-0  Present- 5  Severe-10
   ________ (10)

8. Classification of stream or water body impacted:
   WW Fishery-0  CW Fishery-10  HQ/EV/drinking water/TNP-20
   ________ (20)

Subtotal: ________ (110)
Urban LVRs

• How to compare more costly urban projects with “traditional” rural projects project.
Application Ranking Criteria

• Background

• Example Template

• Additional Considerations

• Ideas from Other Districts

• Feedback & Discussion
A sampling of topics found on application rankings from Conservation Districts

Unless noted, we are not agreeing or disagreeing with these, just providing them as examples of potential local factors.
Additional Stream Classifications

• HQ
• EV
• Trout Stocked
• Wild Trout
• CWF
• WWF

OK: Local Priorities
Use of road

- Higher priority to higher use roads.
- Avoiding heavy hauling activities.

OK:

Local Priorities
Who is applicant

- Municipal: 20pts
- PennDOT: 10pts
- Other: 0pts

NO!

Must provide equal access!

Audio also available via phone: 866-823-7699
For assistance, call: 814-865-5355
Extra points for first time applicants

- First application 10pts
- Second application 5pts
- Third or greater 0pts

OK:
Local Priorities
Points for MS4 or CSO areas?

• May be important question for LVR projects in some more urban counties.
• Try to tie it to environmental benefit, how you do that is up to you!

OK:
Local Priorities
Application Ranking

Final Thoughts

• You can make it as simple or complex as you like, but the important thing is to have a ranking criteria!
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Final Thoughts

• You can make it as simple or complex as you like, but the important thing is to have a ranking criteria!
• Make sure it is still applicable and will work for LVRs.
• Take your “draft” ranking criterial out to rank some projects to see how it performs before implementing.
• Ask neighboring CDs for input.
• Ask Center/SCC for input.
• **Share you ranking criteria with potential applicants.**
Final Thoughts

Application Ranking

• You can make it as simple or complex as you like, but the important thing is to have a ranking criteria!
• Make sure it is still applicable and will work for LVRs.
• Take your “draft” ranking criterial out to rank some projects to see how it performs before implementing.
• Ask neighboring CDs for input.
• Ask Center/SCC for input.
• Share you ranking criteria with potential applicants.
• Your Ranking Criteria is not permanent. If something is not working, now or a year from now, change it!
NEXT WEBINAR: December 17th 10AM

New Program Forms

Many new forms approved in November with Admin Manual. Grant application, contract, performance report, etc...
Application Ranking Criteria

- Background
- Example Template
- Additional Considerations
- Ideas from Other Districts
- Feedback & Discussion
File Download

Link to ranking criteria example.
Assessment information.
Past Webinars and presentations.
Administrative Manual.