

QAQC Round 4 Ratings Overview

This document is provided to detail each rating category and provide a few examples of specific items that would meet those ratings. This is not a complete list of items that will guarantee you receive each rating. There are several things that the QAQC takes into consideration when choosing a final rating which may not be listed on this document.

<h2 style="color: #4F81BD;">Exceptional</h2>	<p>Local program is exceeding expectations in every category and on every project. Saved for the best of the best.</p> <p>Districts that are rated exceptional meet the criteria for exceeding expectations plus are doing some of the examples below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District staff helps other Districts in their region/area improve their program. • District visits each potential applicant in person regularly to discuss the program. • All aspects of a project site are addressed properly, and the project shows no need for additional funding. • Projects are superb, effective, use a variety of ESM practices, use “outside the box techniques”, address off right-of-way drainage, and all possible drainage to a stream has been directed to a stable outlet away from a stream and the project site show’s no evidence of pollution to a stream. • Projects show good use of partnering with other funding sources to address other environmental concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One example would be funding a diversion berm with other funding sources to direct drainage away from a road • District inspects projects well after they are completed and holds the project participant accountable to maintaining them appropriately.
<h2 style="color: #4F81BD;">Exceeds Expectations</h2>	<p>Simply stated, the local program goes above and beyond what is required.</p> <p>Examples of items that exceeds expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District financial tracking is over and above what is required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tracks salary expenses on an actual hour spent working on the program ○ Tracks actual mileage of vehicles. ○ Dedicates more than the required 80% of funding to projects • Projects show improvements that are over and above the minimum required in policy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding comprehensive projects that properly address drainage, base, & stream crossing improvements prior to funding final driving surface ○ Stream crossings are implemented to achieve stream continuity above, though, and below the structure. ○ Cross pipes are installed shallow with grade breaks/section fill to divert surface flow ○ Turnouts are outleted separate from cross pipes ○ Underdrain is outleted separate from surface flow in a stable area ○ See “ESM Practice Evaluations” Attachment D for specific ESM practice information • District staff attends more training than required

- Attends webinars and online trainings
- Participates actively during in-person field trainings
- Seeks additional training outside of what's provided by the Program and CDGRS
- District ensures additional eligible entities are ESM certified each year with a goal of all potential applicants being certified.
 - District staff conducts outreach and education to the public about the benefits of the program, not just to eligible entities.
- District staff is doing effective construction inspection and ensuring projects are implemented according to program policy, goals, and objectives.
 - District staff ensure improper ESM practice installation is corrected prior to final payment
 - Onsite regularly and actively assists project participants install ESM practices
- District is doing very good outreach and education that includes several types of events like demo days, workshops, etc.
- District staff actively assists their project participants in all levels of implementing the project and has a good working relationship with the project participants
 - Help participants actually install the project
 - Complete longitudinal profiles for stream crossings and review the information with the designer to help aid in design and structure selection
 - Review bid packages and make recommendations
 - Assist in gaining landowner permission to do necessary improvements off the road right-of-way.
- Local policy includes local factors and requires more than the minimum required in the Program Admin Manual. Examples:
 - Requires or conducts preapplication/preconstruction meetings for all applications/projects
 - Policy mandates stream crossing structures are of adequate width to effectively handle the bankfull width of the stream with appropriate low flow channels and grade controls.
 - requires District approval/verification for installation of ESM practices prior to moving on to next phase of construction
 - For example, District verifies cross pipes are installed properly prior to project participant placing DSA
- District develops their own forms or using Program forms for administration of the program
 - Hard file checklist, narrative, and timeline forms
 - Preapplication meeting
 - Preconstruction meeting
 - Construction Inspection
 - Etc.
- Hard files contain significantly more than just the required info.
 - Not only contain the required documents but also the recommended documents from the hard file checklist
 - Several copies of the Certified Payroll form spanning the length of the project
 - Detailed sketch on the stream crossing evaluation form to show where bankfull measurements were taken

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Good before, during, and after project implementation photos that document the project ○ Utilize the project expense tracker form to show how program funds were utilized ○ Keeps invoices/expenses for the project participants in-kind expense ● QAB goes above and beyond the minimum required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visits all application sites in person in order to rank them properly ○ Appoints alternates for each voting member ○ Attends trainings regularly
<p>Meets Expectations</p>	<p>Meeting the requirements of the program. The District is administering the program well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program policy, goals, and objectives are met. ● District ensures program funding is spent within appropriate deadlines ● District is implementing effective projects. ● Financial records show how program funding was utilized. Itemized administration and education/training spending report accurately reflects the quarterly report figures and uses appropriate cost allocation methods ● District is utilizing program funds responsibly. ● District ensures quarterly report information is accurate ● District staff and QAB work together to develop ranking criteria that addressed local considerations. ● Hard files are organizing properly and contain necessary info. GIS is updated regularly and is accurate. ● Good drainage and base improvements are observed on projects. ● Stream crossings meet program policy. ● District conducts sufficient field visits to ensure projects are constructed to meet the goals and policy of the program. ● District is doing enough outreach and education to meet program goals and objectives. ● District ensures that documentation of project expenses accurately reflects what was implemented on the project site. ● District corrected any required actions from their previous report.
<p>Needs Improvement</p>	<p>Self-explanatory and provides a category between Meets Expectations and Doesn't Meet Expectations for those Districts that are borderline. This is a suggestion from the District QAQC workgroup</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District is generally meeting program policy but show areas where policy wasn't followed ● Not meeting several of the items listed in the Meets Expectations category ● District financial records are incomplete, unorganized, and/or misreported in the GIS system ● Project oversight lacking in areas ● Limited outreach and education ● District staff needs significantly more training ● Seeing a consistent need for project improvements across several projects

Does Not Meet Expectations

Not meeting the requirements of the program.

- District has a history, or shows a pattern of program policies not being followed properly
- Financial tracking does not properly account for program funds
- Abuse/Misuse of program funds
- District funded projects that are not eligible with program funds
 - Projects funded entirely off right-of-way.
 - Funding stream structures under 100% bankfull width and not designed to accommodate AOP.
 - DSA placed on a project prior to implementing effective drainage and base improvements.
 - Etc.
- District ignored required actions and recommendations from previous report
- District is not doing effective construction oversight or final inspections to ensure program funding was actually utilized on the project
- Adequate staff time is not dedicated to the Program to ensure the Program is administered properly