

Important Information Regarding the Contents of this Document

Please note that the policies and information presented in this document are current through the date given below. The documents made available within the [Center's Conservation Districts web pages](#) are intended to serve as a guide for the policies set by each Conservation District. While these policies may in fact be current at the time of your viewing, it is strongly recommended to contact the relevant Conservation District for the most current version.

Document Current Date: February 10, 2024

JEFFERSON CONSERVATION DISTRICT
DIRT, GRAVEL, AND LOW VOLUME ROAD PROGRAM
APPLICATION RANKING

Date: _____

Project Participant: _____
Road Name: _____
Length of Proposed Project: _____

| Type of Application | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Unpaved (Dirt & Gravel) |
| <input type="radio"/> | 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 years? | YES | NO |
| Does the proposed application meet all SCC requirements (non-pollution, pipe size, ect.)? | YES | NO |
| Does the proposed application meet all policies adopted by the local County QAB? | YES | NO |
| Has the applicant identified & 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 |

(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. 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 : | | | | | | (15) |
| | 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. Road Bank 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) | |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| 2. Classification of stream or waterbody impacted: | warmwater fishery- 10 | coldwater fishery- 20 | HQ/EV/drinking water- 30 | _____ (30) |
| | Subtotal: | | | _____ (140) |

Road Name: _____

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" (cost per linear foot of project)?

>\$30/ft- 0 \$21-\$30/ft- 25 \$11-20/ft- 50 _____ (50)

Subtotal: _____ (115)

PARTICIPATION & OTHER FACTORS

6. In-Kind Contributions from Applicant:

0 to 5%- -2 5% to 10%- 5 11% to 25%- 7 over 25%- 10 _____ (10)

7. Grant History:

poor performance, not maintaining past projects, or applicant has declined previous contracts- 0-4

average performance, previous contracts strayed from work plan, reimbursement required multiple revisions, or requested multiple extensions- 5-9

excellent performance or new applicant- 10 _____ (10)

8. Number of Staff ESM Certified:

1 maintenance person- 0 ≥50% of staff- 5 all maintenance staff- 10 _____ (10)

9. Is the project being funded by a collaboration of other agencies or projects?

No- 0 Yes- 5 _____ (5)

10. Is the project shovel ready (off-ROW permissions, landowner consent, permits in hand or applied for)?

No- 0 Yes- 5 _____ (5)

11. Did applicant contact CD about this specific project before submitting application?

No- 0 Discussed site details with CD- 10 Met with CD on site- 15 _____ (15)

Subtotal: _____ (55)

Other Considerations:

Addressing road hazards

Past working relationship with applicant

Flooding or winter icing issues on the road

Severity of Problem: _____ (140 possible points)

Effectiveness of Solution: _____ (115 possible points)

Participation & Other Factors: _____ (55 possible points)

TOTAL SCORE: (310 possible points)**BONUS POINTS**

Project Phasing: Is this application part of a multi-year phased project on the same section of road?

No- 0 Yes- 10

Is the applying entity's secretary or administrative staff ESM certified?

No- 0 Yes- 1

Bonus Points: _____