

Township:		Date:
Road Name:		

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

Lebanon County Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Grant Application Ranking
LEBANON COUNTY QUALITY ASSURANCE BOARD STATEMENT OF POLICY
(6/21/18)

“The Quality Assurance Board wishes to address the most severe LVR & DGR related water quality concerns as completely and as cost effectively as possible. The QAB has developed the following policy and ranking system to evaluate and prioritize project proposals for financial assistance.”

PROJECT EVALUATION POLICY AND RANKING

Pursuant to Section 9106 of the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code, projects must meet the following criteria to be considered eligible for funding:

- The host municipality must successfully complete the required section 9106 training.
- Projects must be submitted on the one page “Dirt and Gravel Roads/Low Volume Roads Grant Application”.
- Projects must be associated with the maintenance of dirt, gravel, and low volume paved roads.
- Projects must benefit both the road **and** the environmental systems.

Environmental standards for products and practices:

- Materials purchased with section 9106 funds must meet the “non-polluting” criteria as define by section 9106.
- Projects must recognize and adhere to all applicable local, state and federal environmental laws and regulations (such as the Commonwealth’s Clean Streams Law, Chapter 102 Erosion Control and Chapter 105 Dam Safety, Waterways Management and Wetlands regulations).

Pursuant to Lebanon County Quality Assurance Board policy:

- Engineering costs related to Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Roads projects are not funded. Engineering costs may be used as “in kind” contributions to the project.
- Paving costs related to LVR projects will only be funded for areas that have been disturbed as part of the LVR project. Additional paving as part of an overall project will be at the participant’s cost.
- Eligibility for LVR funding requires an existing paved (including chip sealed) surface, and must have a verified average daily traffic count of less than 500 vehicles per day.

SECTION 1: APPLICATION VALIDATION

**Note the validation criteria in Section 1 serve to insure a project is eligible.*

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
<u>LVR ONLY:</u> If the traffic count is known at this point, is it 500 vehicles per day or less?	YES	NO <small>unavailable</small>

*(*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	Slight-5	Moderate-10	Severe-15			_____ (15)
b. Wet Site Conditions:						
Dry-0	Saturated Ditches-3	Roadside Springs-5	Flow in Ditches-7	Saturated Base-10		_____ (10)
c. Road Surface Condition						
i. LVR EVALUATION (pavement condition):						
Pavement Condition:	Good-0	Fair, Some Cracking-5	Poor, Cracking, Unevenness-7	Damaged-10	Severely Damaged-15	_____ (15)
ii. D&G EVALUATION:						
Road Condition:	Durable Stone-0	Mixed Stone-5	Soft Stone-7	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 Resolved:						
	None-0	Minimal-3	Some-7	Many-10		_____ (10)
Modified Assessment Subtotal:						_____ (110)
CLASSIFICATION OF STREAM OR WATERBODY IMPACTED:						
	Warmwater Fishery-10	Coldwater Fishery-20	HQ/EV/Drinking Water-30			_____ (30)
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 improves road:						
	Slightly-0	Moderately-5	Highly-10	Extremely high- 15		_____ (15)
4. Cost effectiveness: How much "environmental benefit per dollar" (benefit per cost)?						
	Low benefit/\$-0	Moderate benefit/\$-10	High benefit/\$-30	Very high benefit/\$-50		_____ (50)
Effectiveness of Solution Subtotal:						_____ (115)

OTHER FACTORS				
5. In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:				
	1 to 10%-5	10-25%-10	Over 25%-15	_____ (15)
6. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project before submitting application:				
	No-0	Discussed site details with CD-10	Met w/CD on site-15	_____ (15)
7. Is applicant maintaining recently funded program projects properly:				
	No-0	Recent projects still functional-10	Yes (or first project)-15	_____ (15)
Other Factors Subtotal:				_____ (45)

Point Summary:

Severity of Problem: _____ (110 possible points)
Stream Classification: _____ (30 possible points)
Effectiveness of Solution: _____ (115 possible points)
Other Factors: _____ (45 possible points)
TOTAL SCORE: (300 possible points)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: other factors that the QAB may take into consideration include:

- Types of road use (residential, school bus route, timber, agriculture, etc.)
- Are all necessary permits already in-hand or applied for?
- Addressing road hazards.
- Past working relationship with applicant within Program.
- Location of project within MS4 or TMDL or Combined Sewer Overflow regions.
- Presence or absence of “curb and gutter” systems.
- Flooding or winter icing issues on the road.
- Future road use plans (developments, drilling, etc).
- Collaboration with other agencies or projects.

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.