

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: August 5, 2021

Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road QAB Scoring System

Updated August 5, 2021

The following numerical scoring system was used to rank all projects. 215 Possible Points awarded in nine sections:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Impact - 150 points 2. Watershed Quality - 30 points 3. Trout Streams – 10 points 4. Aquatic Organism Passage – 10 points 5. Effectiveness of Solution – 30 points | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Project Phasing – 30 points 7. Past Project Maintenance – 10 points 8. Matching Funds - 10 points 9. History/Cooperation - 10 points |
|---|--|

1. Environmental Impact (150 points)

Road name											Municipality										
Assessment date											DGR or LVR										
<i>Road Drainage to stream</i>	None	0	Slight	5	Moderate	10	Severe	15													
<i>Wet Site conditions</i>	Dry	0	Saturated Ditches	3	Roadside Springs	5	Flow in ditches	7	Saturated Base	10											
<i>Pavement Condition – LVR</i>	Good	0	Fair, some cracking	3	Poor, cracking, unevenness	5	Damaged	7	Severely Damaged	10											
<i>OR Road Surface Condition – D&G</i>	Hard Gravel	0	Mixed Stone	3	Soft Stone	5	Mixed Stone/dirt/dust	7	Severe Dust	10											
<i>Road Slope</i>	<5%	0	5-10%	5	>10%	10															
<i>Road Shape (cross-slope/crown)</i>	Good	0	Fair	3	Poor	5															
<i>Slope to Stream</i>	<30%	0	30-60%	3	>60%	5															
<i>Distance to Stream</i>	>100'	0	50'-100'	3	<50'/crossing	5															
<i>Outlets to Stream</i>	None	0	Near Stream	3	Directly to Stream	5															
<i>Outlet/Bleeder Stability</i>	Stable	0	Fair	1	Poor	3	Unstable	5													
<i>Road Ditch Stability</i>	Stable	0	Fair	3	Poor	7	Unstable	10													
<i>Road Bank Stability</i>	Stable	0	Fair	3	Poor	7	Unstable	10													
<i>Average Canopy Cover</i>	Moderate	0	Minimal	3	Heavy	5															
<i>Off-ROW Impacts Resolved</i>	None	0	Minimal	1	Some	3	Many	5													
<i>Stream bank erosion (from road impacts)</i>	None	0	Slight	3	Some	5	Severe	7	Bank failure	10											
<i>Stream bed erosion (from road impacts)</i>	None	0	Slight	3	Some	5	Severe	7	Complete Instability	10											
<i>Stream bed aggradation (from road impacts)</i>	None	0	Slight	3	Some	5	Severe	7	Channel blocked	10											
<i>Frequency of flooding (from road impacts)</i>	Never	0	Rarely	5	Sometimes	7	Often	10													

Environmental Impact Score: _____

2. **Watershed Quality** (30 points) – Based on PA Code Water Quality Standards

HQ-CWF/EV/Drinking Water Source = 30 points

CWF = 24 points

TSF = 18 points

WWF = 12 points

Impaired watershed = add 6 points

Watershed Quality Score: _____

3. **Trout Streams** (10 points) – Based on PA Fish and Boat Commission data

Class A Trout Stream = 10 points

Natural Reproduction Trout Stream = 7 points

Trout Stocked Stream = 5 points

Non-trout streams = 0 points

Trout Score: _____

4. **Aquatic Organism Passage (from NAACC)** (10 points) – Ability of fish, aquatic insects, etc. to pass through road-stream crossings using North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative ranking

Severe barrier = 10

Significant barrier = 7

Moderate barrier = 5

Minor barrier = 3 points

Insignificant barrier/No = 0 points

barrier (including no stream crossing)

AOP Score: _____

5. **Effectiveness of Solution** (30 points)

3a. Degree to which project remediates impact to water body:

Slightly = 0

Moderately = 5

Highly = 10

Almost completely = 15

3b. Cost effectiveness: How much “environmental benefit per dollar” (benefit per cost)?

Low ben/\$ = 0

Moderate ben/\$ = 5

High ben/\$ = 10

Very high ben/\$ = 15

Effectiveness of Solution Score: _____

6. **Project Phasing** (30 points) – Is this project a continuation of a project funded in the last 2 years on the same section of road?

Yes = 30 points

No = 0 points

Phasing Score: _____

7. **Past Project Maintenance** (10 points) – Are the applicant’s past DGLVR projects maintained?

Yes/no past projects = 10 points

Somewhat = 5 points

No = 0 points

Maintenance Score: _____

8. **Matching Funds** (10 points) – % of Applicant’s matching funds compared to the requested funds
i.e.: \$10,000 grant requested and in-kind is \$5,000 = 50% matching funds = 10 points

1-10% = 2.5 points

11-25% = 5 points

>25% = 10 points

Matching Funds Score: _____

9. **History/Cooperation Status** (10 points) – Applicant involvement in the process and their willingness to comply with the Program Standards.

First DGLVR Project = 10 points

Applicant has completed DGLVR project(s) with good history = 5 points

Non-cooperation = 0 points

History/Cooperation Score: _____

Bonus Points (7 points maximum) – applicants will receive 1 bonus point for each official/employee involved in the DGLVR Program (includes, but is not limited to: township supervisors, borough council members and managers, secretaries, roadmasters, and road crew members) who:

- are ESM Certified (excludes the first ESM Certified individual who makes the applicant eligible to apply)
- have attended an ESM training more frequently than the requirement of every 5 years.
- attend HCCD DGLVR outreach events within 1 calendar year of the application due date.

Bonus Points: _____

Total Application Score = _____

Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road QAB Scoring System Scoring Verification Signatures

Date: _____

_____ Russell Kyper (HCCD)

_____ James Steward (NRCS)

_____ Ryan Erdman (PFBC)

_____ Sherri Law (HCCD)