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

Lancaster Dirt & Gravel/Low-Volume Road Grant Application Ranking revised 12/7/16

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

SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

	circle choice	
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 unavailable

(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** Moderate-**5** Severe-**10** _____ (10)
   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 EVALUATION: Pavement Condition:** good-**0** fair, some cracking-**5**
         Poor, cracking, unevenness-**7** Damaged-**10** Severely Damaged-**15**
      ii. **D&G EVALUATION**: 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'-**5** <50'/crossing-**10** _____ (10)
   h. **Outlets to Stream:** None-**0** Near Stream-**5** Directly to Stream-**10** _____ (10)
   i. **Outlet Ditch Stability:** Stable-**0** Fair-**5** Unstable-**10** _____ (10)
   j. **Road Bank Stability:** Stable-**0** Fair-**5** Unstable-**10** _____ (10)
   k. **Average Canopy Cover:** Minimal-**0** Moderate-**5** Heavy-10 _____ (10)
   l. **Off-ROW Impacts:** 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 scores should not be used for project ranking.

Modified Assessment Subtotal: 0 **(115)**

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

2. **Classification of stream or waterbody impacted (Chapter 93 Classification):**
   Warm water Fishery-**5** Coldwater Fishery-**10** HQ/EV/drinking water-**20** _____ (20)

3. **Trout classification of stream or waterbody impacted:**
   Not PAFBC stocked-**5** PAFBC Stocked-**10** Wild Trout Area*-**20** _____ (20)
   **based on PAFBC wild trout list*

4. **Impairment states:**
   Non-impaired-5 Other than sediment-10 Impaired by sediment- 20 _____ (20)

EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION

5. **Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:**
   Slightly-**0** Moderately-**15** Highly-**30** _____ (30)

6. **Degree to which project improves road:**
   Slightly-**0** Moderately-**5** Highly-**10** _____ (10)

7. **Cost effectiveness: How much "environmental benefit per dollar" (benefit per cost)?**
   Low ben/$-**0** Moderate ben/$-**15** High ben/$-**30** _____ (30)

OTHER FACTORS

8. **In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:** _____ (15)
   1to 10%-**5** 10-25%-**10** Over 25%-**15**

9. **Degree in which the project serves the public & other initiatives in the watershed:**
   Slightly-**5** Moderately- **7** Highly-**10** _____ (10)

10. **Did applicant contact CD about this specific project before submitting application:** _____ (20)
    No-**0** Discussed site details with CD-**10** Met w/CD on site-**20**

11. **Is applicant maintaining recently funded Program projects properly:** _____ (10)
    No-**0** Yes (or first project) - **10**

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

Point Summary:

Severity of Problem: 0 *(175 possible points)*
Effectiveness of Solution: 0 *(70 possible points)*
Other Factors: 0 *(55 possible points)*
TOTAL SCORE: 0 *(300 possible points)*

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

Notes and descriptions for ranking criteria.

This page attempts to describe the reasoning behind some of the factors used in the evaluation.

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.