



Washington County Conservation District

Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road

Grant Application Ranking

Municipality:	Date:
Road Name:	
Road Number:	Affected Stream:
Length of Problem Road:	Chapter 93 Des.:

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

SECTION 1: APPLICATION

VALIDATION

QAB Representatives	Scott Rusmiser		Jonathan Stark	
	Rennie Stoy			
WCCD Representatives	Jennifer Dann		Jordan Whitmer	
	Matt Golden			

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 years? 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:

- Road Drainage to Stream: none-0 Slight-5 Moderate-10 Severe-15 _____ (15)
- Wet Site Conditions: Dry-0 Saturated Ditches-3 Roadside Springs-5 _____ (10)
Flow in Ditches-7 Saturated Base-10
- Road Surface Condition _____ (15)
 - LVR EVALUATION: Pavement Condition: good-0 fair, some cracking-5
Poor, cracking, unevenness-7 Damaged-10 Severely Damaged-15
 - D&G EVALUATION: Hard Gravel-0 Mixed Stone-5 Soft Stone-7
Mixed stone/dirt/dust-10 Severe Dust-15
- 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)

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- 50 _____ (50)

4. Degree to which project improves road:

Slightly-0 Moderately-5 Highly-10 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)

1-10%-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)