

Applicant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Mifflin County Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant Application Ranking, open enrollment**

<b>Score:</b>	
<b>Type of application</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unpaved (Dirt and Gravel)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Paved (Low Volume Road)</b>

**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 must be verified 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. Worksite Assessment:**

- a. **Road Sediment in 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** \_\_\_\_\_ (10)
  - i. **LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition:** good-0 fair, some cracking-2  
Poor, cracking, unevenness-6 Damaged-8 Severely Damaged-10
  - ii. **D&G EVALUATION:** Hard Gravel-0 Mixed Stone-2 Soft Stone-4  
Mixed stone/dirt/dust-8 Severe Dust-10
- d. **Road Slope:** <5%-0 5-10%-3 >10%-5 \_\_\_\_\_ (5)
- 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<sup>1</sup>:** None-0 Minimal-3 Some-7 Many-10 \_\_\_\_\_ (10)

**2. Classification of stream or waterbody impacted:**

- WWF Fishery-10 CWF/ TSF-20 HQ/EV/Wild Trout/ drinking water-30 \_\_\_\_\_ (30)

**Modified Assessment Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_ (130)

Applicant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**EFFECTIVENESS OF SOLUTION**

**3. Degree to which project remediates impact to waterbody:**

Slightly-0 Moderately-10 Highly-30 Almost completely- 45 \_\_\_\_\_ (45)

**4. Degree to which project improves road:**

Slightly-0 Moderately-5 Highly-10 \_\_\_\_\_ (10)

**5. Cost effectiveness: How much "environmental benefit per dollar" (benefit per cost)?**

Cost per linear foot of project? \$ \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ foot (\$ /ft.)  
>\$30/ ft-0 \$21-\$30/ ft-10 \$11-\$20/ ft-30 <\$10/ ft-45 \_\_\_\_\_ (45)

**OTHER FACTORS**

**6. In-Kind Contributions from Applicant ( \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_ %):** \_\_\_\_\_ (30)

0-9%, 0 10-19%, 10 20-29%, 20 30-39%, 25 40%+, 30

**7. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project before submitting application:** \_\_\_\_\_ (10)

No-0 Discussed site details with CD-5 Met w/CD on site-10

**8. Number of participant staff members ESM certified?** \_\_\_\_\_ (10)

1 maintenance person - 0 over 50% of staff - 5 all maintenance staff members\* - 10

\*20 points additional will be awarded if administrative person(s) are ESM certified in addition to maintenance staff.

**9. Is applicant maintaining recently funded Program projects properly?** \_\_\_\_\_ (20)

No- 20 Recent projects still functional- 0 Yes (or first project)-20

**Point Summary:**

Severity of Problem: \_\_\_\_\_ (130 possible points)

Effectiveness of Solution: \_\_\_\_\_ (100 possible points)

Other Factors: \_\_\_\_\_ (70 possible points)

**TOTAL SCORE:**  (300 possible points)



Prepared for QAB By: \_\_\_\_\_

Floyd A. Ciccolini Jr., Resource Conservation Specialist

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Footnotes:**

1. **Off ROW Impacts:** can include off site pollutant loading other than sediment.
2. **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.
3. **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.