Important Information Regarding the Contents of this Document

Please note that the policies and information presented in this document are current through the date given below. The documents made available within the Center's Conservation Districts web pages are intended to serve as a guide for the policies set by each Conservation District. While these policies may in fact be current at the time of your viewing, it is strongly recommended to contact the relevant Conservation District for the most current version.

Document Current Date: July 25, 2017

Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road Grant Application Ranking

7/25/2017

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
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 Schuylkill County QAB?	YES	NO
Are all previous contracts with applicant in good standing?	YES	NO
Has the applicant identified and agreed to obtain all necessary permits?	YES	NO
Has the applicant included prevailing wage rates if total project exceeds $25,000?	YES	NO
LVR ONLY: If the traffic count is known, is it 500 vehicles per day or less?	YES	NO Unavailable

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. **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** _____ (15)
      i. **LVR Pavement Condition:** good-**0** fair, some cracking-**5**
         Poor, cracking, unevenness-**7** Damaged-**10** Severely Damaged-**15**
      ii. **D&G**: Hard Gravel-**0** Mixed Stone-**5** Soft Stone-**7**
         Mixed stone/dirt/dust-**10** Severe Dust-**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:** Minimal-**0** Moderate-**3** Heavy-**5** _____ (5)
   m. **Off-ROW impacts resolved:** None-**0** Minimal-**3** Some-**7** Many-**10** _____ (10)

Assessment Subtotal: _____ **(110)**

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

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

3. **Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:**
   Slightly-**0** Moderately-**10** Highly-**30** Almost completely- 5**0** _____ (50)

4. **Degree to which project improves road:**
   Slightly-**0** Moderately-**5** Highly-1**0** 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)

OTHER FACTORS

6. **In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:** _____ (15)
   1to 10%-**5** 10-25%-**10** Over 25%-**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:** _____ (15)
   No-**0** Recent projects still functional-**10** Yes (or first project)-**15**

Point Summary:

Severity of Problem: _____ *(140 possible points)*

Effectiveness of Solution: _____ *(115 possible points)*

Other Factors: _____ *(45 possible points)*

TOTAL SCORE: _____ *(300 possible points)*

Notes and descriptions for ranking criteria:

1. **"Modified" Worksite Assessment:** Detailed description of assessment criteria is available online at: http://www.dirtandgravel.psu.edu/pa_program/gis/gis_help/Assessment_Guide_2007-08.pdf
2. **Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:** self-explanatory.
3. **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.
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.
5. **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.
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.
7. **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.
8. **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.