

ArcGIS Survey123 Applications in the DGLVR Program

Morgan Jones – Potter County Conservation District

Pete DiBiase – Potter County GIS

Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant Application Ranking (NEW)

Select type of Application	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paved (Low Volume)

Applicant _____ Date _____

Road #/Name _____ Worksite ID _____

SECTION 1: VALIDATION

Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other body of water?	Circle Choice
Will the proposed project site reduce environmental impacts to a water body?	YES NO
Is someone from the applying entity "ESM" Certified within the Past 5 years?	YES NO
The proposed application meet all SCC requirements	YES NO
The proposed application meets any County QAB Program requirements and policies?	YES NO
Will any and all required permits be obtained before project begins?	YES NO
LVR Only: If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less?	YES NO NA

SECTION 2: RANKING

Dirt and Gravel/Low Volume Road: 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
 - c. Road Surface Condition
LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: Good-0 Fair, some cracking-5 Poor, cracking, unevenness-7 Damaged-10 Severely damaged-15 _____(15)
D&G EVALUATION: Hard Gravel-0 Mixed Stone-5 Soft Stone-7 _____(15)
Mixed Stone/dirt/dust-10 Severe Dust-15 _____(15)
 - 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: None-0 Minimal-3 Some-7 Many-10 _____(10)
 - n. Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:
Warmwater Fishery-10 Coldwater Fishery-20 HQ/EV/drinking water-30 _____(30)
- Modified Assessment Subtotal:** _____ (155)

Stream Crossing: Severity of Problem

1. "Modified" Worksite Assessment:
 - a. Severity of Barrier (NAAC):
None-0 Insignificant-4 Minor-8 Moderate-12 Significant-16 Severe-20 _____(20)
 - b. Structure/Bankfull Ratio: 100%-0 <100%-5 <75%-10 <50%-15 _____(15)

- c. Miles of Stream Reconnected <0.5-0 <0.75-5 <1-10 >1-15 _____(15)
- d. Stream Bank Erosion (downstream): None-0 Present-5 Severe-10 _____(10)
- e. Stream Bank Erosion (upstream) None-0 Present-5 Severe-10 _____(10)
- f. Stream Bed Erosion (downstream) None-0 Present-10 Severe-20 _____(20)
- g. Stream Bed Deposition (upstream) None-0 Present-10 Severe-20 _____(20)
- h. Classification of waterbody impacted: WWF-0 CWF-8 HQ/EV/drinking water-15 _____(15)
- i. PA Fish & Boat Stream Regulated Waters:
None-0 Stocked Trout-10 Nat Re Trout-20 Class A Wild Trout-30 _____(30)

Modified Assessment Subtotal: _____ (155)

Effectiveness of Solution

2. Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:
Slightly-0 Moderately-10 Highly-30 Almost completely-50 _____(50)
3. Degree to which project site improves the road:
Slightly-0 Moderately-5 Highly-10 Extremely high-15 _____(15)

Other Factors

4. In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:
1-10%-5 10-25%-10 over 25%-15 _____(15)
5. Number of applicant employees currently ESM certified:
One-10 Two-20 Three or more-30 _____(30)
6. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project site before submitting application:
Notified of intent to submit-10 Discussed site details with CD-20 Met w/CD on site-30 _____(30)
7. Is applicant maintaining past Program Project sites properly:
No-0 Recent projects still functional-10 Yes (or first project)-30 _____(30)
8. Is the road open all year to the public?
No-0 Yes-5 _____(5)
9. Are there any innovative techniques or products in this project site?
No-0 Yes-5 _____(5)
10. How well will this project site prevent future stream sediment loads and correct existing road conditions?
Not-0 Slightly-5 Good-10 Very good-25 _____(25)

Assessment Total: _____ (360)

***** DISCLAIMER *****

ALL PROJECTS ARE DEPENDENT ON WHEN/IF DIRT & GRAVEL AND LOW VOLUME FUNDS ARE RECEIVED.

Tools

- Survey123 – Point and Click web program for assembling surveys and data entry forms
 - Contact your counties' GIS Department to see if you can get access
- Make – Automation tool allowing for automatic emails, spreadsheet creation and report generation
 - Free versions allow for running two scenarios at once, \$120/year subscription allows for unlimited usage

What we've built in Potter County

- DGLVR Ranking Form – automated all office work involved with ranking projects
- DGLVR Invoice Tracking – streamlined invoice tracking for completed projects
- Other Tools...
 - Chapter 102/105 Inspections
 - Seed Drill Rental Form

DGLVR Ranking Form

| Application Information ▶

| Project Site Photos ▶

| Section 1: Validation ▶

| Section 2: Ranking ▶

Submit

Application Information

Select Application Type

Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)

Low Volume

Applicant

Municipality

-Please select-



Date

Road # and Name

Worksite ID

Requested Funds

10³ 0

In Kind Funds

10³ 0

Total Project Value

10³ 0

In Kind Funds Percent

10³

Project Site

Draw the approximate project site

The screenshot shows a web mapping application interface. At the top, there is a search bar with the placeholder text "Find address or place" and a magnifying glass icon. Below the search bar is a vertical toolbar with five icons: a plus sign for zoom in, a minus sign for zoom out, a house icon for home, a location pin icon for current location, and a square with a plus sign for full screen. The map itself shows a network of roads and water features. A prominent orange line, labeled "Route 6 W", starts at a road marked with a "6" shield and runs generally eastward, curving slightly. Other roads labeled include "Academy Hill Rd", "Dingman Run Rd", "Damascus St", "Vine St", "S West St", "S East St", and "E Maple St". Water features include "Dingman Run" and "Toles Hollow". In the top right corner, there are icons for a grid view and a north arrow. At the bottom of the map area, there is a text string: "data.pa.gov, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USG... Powered by Esri". Below the map area is a grey status bar with a warning icon and the text "No geometry captured yet."

DGLVR Ranking Form

Application Information ▶

Project Site Photos ▼

Include any project photos here

1

Drop image here or select image



Section 1: Validation ▶

Section 2: Ranking ▶

Submit

Section 1: Validation

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

Yes

No

Will the proposed project site 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?

Yes

No

Does the proposed application meet any County QAB Program requirements and polices?

Yes

No

Section 2: Ranking

DGLVR: Severity of 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 (7), Saturated Base (10)

Road Surface Condition (LVR)

Good (0), Fair, some cracking (5), Poor, cracking, unevenness (7), Damaged (10), Severely Damaged (15)

Road Surface Condition (Dirt)

Hard Gravel (0), Mixed Stone (5), Soft Stone (7), Mixed Stone/Dirt/Dust (10), Severe Dust (15)

Road Slope

<5% (0), 5-10%(5), >10%(10)

Section 2: Ranking

DGLVR: Severity of Problem

Stream Crossing: Severity of Problem

Severity of Barrier

None (0), Insignificant (4), Minor (8), Moderate (12), Significant (16), Severe (20)

Structure/Bankfull Ratio

100% (0), <100% (5), <75% (10), <50% (15)

Miles of Stream Reconnected

<0.5 (0), <0.75 (5), <1.0 (10), >1.0 (15)

Stream Bank Erosion (Downstream)

None (0), Present (5), Severe (10)

Stream Bank Erosion (Upstream)

None (0), Present (5), Severe (10)

Combined Scoring

Combined Scoring

Combined Score of Severity of Problem and Stream Crossing. If stream crossing is present this score is an average of the two sections.

0

Effectiveness of Solution

Degree to which Project Remediates Impact to Waterbody

Slightly (0), Moderately (10), Highly (30), Almost Completely (50)

0

Degree to which Project Site Improves the Road

Slightly (0), Moderately (5), Highly (10), Extremely High (15)

0

Other Factors

In-Kind Contributions from Applicant

1-10% (5), 10-25% (10), over 25% (15)

0

Application Information

Project Site Photos

Section 1: Validation

Section 2: Ranking

DGLVR: Severity of Problem

Stream Crossing: Severity of Problem

Combined Scoring

Effectiveness of Solution

Other Factors

Assessment Total

Total Assessment Score

0

Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant Application Ranking (NEW)

Applicant: Hebron Township
Date: 4/5
Municipality: Hebron Twp
Road #/Name: Castle Hollow Road/T344
Worksite ID:

Select type of Application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)
<input type="checkbox"/> Low Volume

SECTION 1: VALIDATION

- Does this road site negatively impact a stream, lake, wetland, or other body of water? YES NO
- Will the proposed project site reduce environmental impacts to a water body? YES NO
- Is someone from the applying entity "ESM" Certified within the Past 5 years? YES NO
- The proposed application meet all SCC requirements YES NO
- The proposed application meets any County QAB Program requirements and policies? YES NO
- Will any and all required permits be obtained before project begins? YES NO
- LVR Only:** If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less? YES NO NA

SECTION 2: RANKING

Dirt and Gravel/Low Volume Road: Severity of Problem

1. "Modified" Worksite Assessment:
 - a. Road Drainage to stream: None-0 Slight-5 Moderate-10 Severe-15 15 / 15
 - b. Wet Site Conditions: Dry-0 Saturated Ditches-3 Roadside Springs-5 8 / 10
Flow in Ditches-7 Saturated Base-10
 - c. Road Surface Condition
LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: Good-0 Fair, some cracking-5 Poor, cracking, unevenness-7 Damaged-10 Severely damaged-15

0 / 15
D&G EVALUATION: Hard Gravel-0 Mixed Stone-5 Soft Stone-7
Mixed Stone/dirt/dust-10 Severe Dust-15 13 / 15
 - d. Road Slope: <5%-0 5-10%-5 >10%-10 8 / 10
 - e. Road Shape (cross-slope/crown): Good-0 Fair-3 Poor-5 5 / 5
 - f. Slope to Stream: <30%-0 30-60%-3 >60%-5 2 / 5
 - g. Distance to Stream: >100'-0 50'-100'-3 <50'/Crossing-5 5 / 5
 - h. Outlets to Stream: None-0 Near Stream-3 Directly to Stream-5 5 / 5
 - i. Outlet/Bleeder Stability: Stable-0 Moderate-3 Unstable-5 2 / (5)
 - j. Road Ditch Stability: Stable-0 Fair-3 Poor-7 Unstable-10 10 / 10
 - k. Road Bank Stability: Stable-0 Fair-3 Poor-7 Unstable-10 3 / 10
 - l. Average canopy cover: Moderate-0 Minimal-3 Heavy-5 4 / 5
 - m. Off-ROW Impacts: None-0 Minimal-3 Some-7 Many-10 3 / 10
 - n. Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:
Warmwater Fishery-10 Coldwater Fishery-20 HQ/EV/drinking water-30 30 / 30

Modified Assessment Subtotal: 113 / 155

Stream Crossing: Severity of Problem

1. "Modified" Worksite Assessment:

***** DISCLAIMER *****

ALL PROJECTS ARE DEPENDENT ON WHEN/IF DIRT & GRAVEL AND LOW VOLUME FUNDS ARE RECEIVED.

- a. Severity of Barrier (NAAC):
None-0 Insignificant-4 Minor-8 Moderate-12 Significant-16 Severe-20 / 20
- b. Structure/Bankfull Ratio: 100%-0 <100%-5 <75%-10 <50%-15 0 / 15
- c. Miles of Stream Reconnected <0.5-0 <0.75-5 <1-10 >1-15 0 / 15
- d. Stream Bank Erosion (downstream): None-0 Present-5 Severe-10 0 / 10
- e. Stream Bank Erosion (upstream) None-0 Present-5 Severe-10 0 / 10
- f. Stream Bed Erosion (downstream) None-0 Present- 10 Severe-20 0 / 20
- g. Stream Bed Deposition (upstream) None-0 Present- 10 Severe-20 0 / 20
- h. Classification of waterbody impacted: WWF-0 CWF-8 HQ/EV/drinking water-15 0 / 15
- i. PA Fish & Boat Stream Regulated Waters:
None-0 Stocked Trout- 10 Nat Re Trout- 20 Class A Wild Trout- 30 0 / 30

Modified Assessment Subtotal: / 155

Effectiveness of Solution

2. Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:
Slightly-0 Moderately-10 Highly-30 Almost completely-50 46 / 50
3. Degree to which project site improves the road:
Slightly-0 Moderately-5 Highly-10 Extremely high-15 12 / 15

Other Factors

4. In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:
1-10%-5 10-25%-10 over 25%-15 15 / 15
5. Number of applicant employees currently ESM certified:
One-10 Two-20 Three or more-30 30 / 30
6. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project site before submitting application:
Notified of intent to submit-10 Discussed site details with CD-20 Met w/CD on site-30 28 / 30
7. Is applicant maintaining past Program Project sites properly:
No-0 Recent projects still functional-10 Yes (or first project)-30 28 / 30
8. Is the road open all year to the public?
No-0 Yes-5 5 / 5
9. Are there any innovative techniques or products in this project site?
No-0 Yes-5 1 / 5
10. How well will this project site prevent future stream sediment loads and correct existing road conditions?
Not-0 Slightly-5 Good-10 Very good-25 22 / 25

Assessment Total: 300 / 360

***** DISCLAIMER *****

ALL PROJECTS ARE DEPENDENT ON WHEN/IF DIRT & GRAVEL AND LOW VOLUME FUNDS ARE RECEIVED.



***** DISCLAIMER *****

ALL PROJECTS ARE DEPENDENT ON WHEN/IF DIRT & GRAVEL AND LOW VOLUME FUNDS ARE RECEIVED.



***** DISCLAIMER *****

ALL PROJECTS ARE DEPENDENT ON WHEN/IF DIRT & GRAVEL AND LOW VOLUME FUNDS ARE RECEIVED.

Insights from Gemini

Folder highlights

Dirt/Gravel Grant Applications detail various municipalities' submissions, validation, and severity scores from April 2024 for environmental impact.



See more

- Type
- People
- Modified
- Source

Name	Owner	Date modified	File size	Sort
_Clara Township_Clara Twp.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 4, 2024	522 KB	
_Roulette Township_Roulette Twp.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 4, 2024	505 KB	
_Clara Township_Clara Twp.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	495 KB	
_Eulalia Township_Eulalia Twp.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	570 KB	
_Hebron Township_Hebron Twp.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	713 KB	
Raven Hill Road_T334_Clara Twp_docx.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	495 KB	
West Branch Fishing Creek_Clara Twp.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	522 KB	
Castle Hollow Road_T344_Hebron Twp_docx.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	713 KB	
Trout Brook Road_T324_Roulette Twp_docx.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	505 KB	
Deering Hollow Road_T340_Hebron Twp_docx.docx.docx	potterplanninggis	Apr 5, 2024	290 KB	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Rank	Municipality	Road	Funds Requested	In-Kind	Total Project Value	% In-Kind	Funding Available	Comments
2	270.5	Homer Twp	Big Moores Run Road/T304	\$988,730.25	\$31,590.00	\$1,020,320.25	3.2		
3	208	Homer Twp	Heth Road/T306	\$210,522.00	\$45,557.60	\$256,079.60	21.64		
4	235	Keating Twp	Odin Road Section 2/T311	\$230,964.00	\$60,476.00	\$291,440.00	26.18		
5	250	Keating Twp	Odin Road Section 1/T311	\$214,694.00	\$48,032.60	\$262,726.60	22.37		
6	255	Roulette Twp	Trout Brook Road/T324	\$155,480.00	\$16,950.40	\$172,430.40	10.9		
7	239	Roulette Twp	Lanninger Creek Road/T316	\$144,690.00	\$15,539.60	\$160,229.60	10.74		
8	263	Clara Twp	Raven Hill Road/T334	\$164,568.00	\$23,790.00	\$188,358.00	14.46		
9	195	Clara Twp	Clara Road/T531	\$205,269.00	\$45,777.20	\$251,046.20	22.3		
10	260	Sharon Twp	Wapsena Road/T366	\$72,187.00	\$76,110.45	\$148,297.45	105.44		
11	248	Pleasant Valley	Tinker Stevens Road/T344	\$56,447.00	\$21,808.40	\$78,255.40	38.64		
12	268	Sharon Twp	Wild Cat Road/T372	\$200,887.50	\$70,511.60	\$271,399.10	35.1		
13	258	Genesee Twp	Corcoran Road/T416	\$187,994.81	\$39,106.93	\$227,101.74	20.8		
14	224	Genesee Twp	Rag Hill Road/T558	\$207,134.52	\$40,600.48	\$247,735.00	19.6		
15	240	Bingham Twp	Whitney Hill Road/T407	\$166,692.00	\$92,271.40	\$258,963.40	55.35		
16	245	Bingham Twp	Hill Crest Road/T479	\$185,902.00	\$83,029.40	\$268,931.40	44.66		
17	174	Ulysses Twp	Cushing Hollow Road/T458	\$180,320.00	\$97,253.80	\$277,573.80	53.93		
18	196.5	Sweden Twp	A Frame/T303	\$45,800.00	\$169,400.00	\$215,200.00	369.87		
19	242	Summit Twp	Cochran Hill Road/T395	\$53,120.00	\$12,232.40	\$65,352.40	23.03		
20	209.5	Abbott Twp	Hoppe Hollow Road/T422	\$178,950.00	\$8,230.60	\$187,180.60	4.6		
21	280	West Branch Twp	Germania Street Ext/T433	\$95,237.00	\$18,706.80	\$113,943.80	19.64		
22	260	Pike Twp	Hoppe Road/T445	\$58,395.50	\$9,760.00	\$68,155.50	16.71		
23	259	Hector Twp	Stiles Hill Road/T460	\$175,355.00	\$26,929.20	\$202,284.20	15.36		
24	199	Pike Twp	Hardscrabble Road/T436	\$329,376.00	\$1,011.00	\$330,387.00	0.31		
25	114	Ulysses Twp	Telescope Road/T439	\$177,590.00	\$89,163.80	\$266,753.80	50.21		
26	270	Homer Twp	T304 / Big Moores Run	\$988,730.25	\$31,590.00	\$1,020,320.25	3.2		
27	225	Keating Twp	T311 / Odin Road Section 2	\$230,964.00	\$60,476.00	\$291,440.00	26.18		

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Rank	Municipality	Road	Funds Requested	In-Kind	Total Project Value	% In-Kind	Funding Available	Comments
2	177	Clara Twp	West Branch Fishing Creek/T530	\$54,497.50	\$18,416.30	\$72,913.80	33.79		
3	205	West Branch Twp	Crippen Run Road/T536	\$101,728.00	\$43,588.20	\$145,316.20	42.85		
4	139	Clara Twp	T530 / West Branch Fishing Creek	\$54,497.50	\$18,416.30	\$72,913.80	33.79		
5	232	West Branch Twp	T536 / Crippen Road	\$101,728.00	\$43,588.20	\$145,316.20	42.85		
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
29									
30									
31									
32									

Contact Information

- **Pete DiBiase – Potter County GIS Technician**
 - 814-274-8290 x228
 - pdibiase@pottercountypa.gov
- **Morgan Jones – Potter County Conservation District
DGLVR Tech**
 - 814-320-4011
 - m.jones@pottercd.com