



Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC)

Bylaws

July 2026

Preamble

These Bylaws govern the internal procedures and operations of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC). They are intended to supplement, and not restate or modify, the Committee Charter approved by the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. In the event of a conflict, the Charter and applicable law control.

1.0 Meetings

1.1 Regular Meetings

The Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) shall hold regular meetings to conduct its business and carry out its advisory responsibilities, consistent with the meeting frequency established in the Committee Charter. Dates and times of regular meetings shall be determined by the Committee in coordination with Department staff.

1.2 Annual Meeting

One regular meeting each calendar year shall be designated as the annual meeting. The annual meeting shall include, as applicable, the election of officers, a review of Committee operations, and discussion of upcoming work priorities.

1.3 Special Meetings

Special meetings may be called by the Chair, or if a Vice Chair has been elected, by the Vice Chair in the Chair's absence, or upon request of any two members of the Committee, or by the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities or designee.

1.4 Meeting Format

Meetings may be conducted in person, remotely, or in a hybrid format, consistent with applicable state requirements and practical considerations. Members participating remotely shall be considered present for all purposes, including quorum and voting, unless otherwise restricted by law.

1.5 Cancellation or Rescheduling

Meetings may be canceled or rescheduled by the Chair in coordination with Department staff due to weather, emergencies, lack of quorum, or other circumstances that would

impede the effective conduct of business. Reasonable notice of any cancellation or rescheduling shall be provided to Committee members and the public.

2.0 Notice and Public Participation

2.1 Public Notice

Notice of all meetings of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC), including regular and special meetings, shall be provided in accordance with applicable state public notice and open meetings requirements. Notice shall include the date, time, location, and format of the meeting, as well as information on how the public may attend or participate.

2.2 Agenda

An agenda shall be prepared for each meeting in consultation with the Chair and Department staff and made available to Committee members and the public in advance of the meeting, to the extent practicable. The agenda shall identify items scheduled for discussion, public comment, and any anticipated Committee action.

2.3 Public Participation

Meetings of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) shall be conducted in accordance with the Alaska Open Meetings Act (AS 44.62.310–312) and shall include one or more opportunities for public comment, as determined by the Chair and consistent with applicable law, except as otherwise permitted by law.

Members of the public may provide oral testimony during the meeting or submit written comments in advance. Written comments shall be submitted to the designated Department staff contact identified in the public meeting notice and received by the deadline specified in the notice to ensure distribution to Committee members prior to the meeting. Written comments received in accordance with this section shall be distributed to Committee members and included in the official meeting record.

The Chair may establish reasonable time limits on oral testimony to ensure the orderly and efficient conduct of meetings. Any such limits shall be announced at the beginning of the public comment period.

2.4 Accessibility and Accommodations

ARTAC meetings shall be conducted in a manner that promotes broad public access and participation statewide. Individuals requiring accommodations to participate in a meeting due to a disability may request reasonable accommodations by contacting Department staff in advance of the meeting.

2.5 Meeting Records

Meeting minutes shall be prepared for each ARTAC meeting and made available to Committee members for review prior to approval. Approved minutes shall be maintained as part of the Committee's public record in accordance with applicable records retention requirements.

3.0 Quorum and Voting

3.1 Quorum

A quorum of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) shall consist of a simple majority of the appointed voting members. Members participating in person, remotely, or by telephonic means shall be considered present for purposes of establishing a quorum, unless otherwise restricted by law.

No business shall be conducted at any meeting unless a quorum is present. In the absence of a quorum, the only action the presiding officer may entertain is a motion to adjourn or reschedule the meeting.

3.2 Special Quorum Requirement for RTP Project Review

In accordance with applicable Recreational Trails Program requirements and Administrative Order 361, during meetings at which the Committee reviews, evaluates, or prioritizes RTP project applications, the quorum must include at least one member representing motorized trail user interests and at least one member representing non-motorized trail user interests.

If this condition is not met, the Committee may receive information and conduct discussion but shall not take formal action on RTP project recommendations.

3.3 Voting

Each appointed voting member of ARTAC shall have one vote. Ex officio members shall not vote.

Unless otherwise required by law, the Charter, or these Bylaws, actions of the Committee shall be taken by a simple majority vote of the members present at a meeting at which a quorum is established.

3.4 Abstentions and Conflicts

Members who abstain from voting due to a conflict of interest or other reason shall be counted as present for purposes of establishing a quorum but shall not be counted as voting on the matter.

3.5 Record of Votes

Votes taken by the Committee shall be recorded in the meeting minutes, including the outcome of the vote and any abstentions, in accordance with applicable records requirements.

4.0 Actions Between Meetings and Time Sensitive Matters

4.1 Time-Sensitive Matters

When circumstances arise that require timely advisory input between regularly scheduled meetings, the Chair, in consultation with Department staff, may solicit input from Committee members outside of a regular meeting by providing a written description of the matter, the reason for urgency, and any relevant supporting materials. Any input obtained under this provision shall be advisory only, shall be documented, and shall not replace action taken at a duly noticed public meeting when such a meeting is practicable, nor supersede applicable public notice, open meetings, or other legal requirements.

4.2 Documentation and Ratification

Any input or action taken pursuant to this Article shall be documented and included in the Committee's records. When practicable, the matter shall be placed on the agenda of the next regular meeting for discussion and ratification or confirmation by the Committee.

5.0 Proxies and Alternate Participation

5.1 Proxies

Members of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) shall not assign a proxy to another member for purposes of voting or establishing a quorum.

5.2 Written Statements

A member who is unable to attend a meeting at which action is anticipated may submit a written statement expressing their views on the matter to the Chair or Department staff in advance of the meeting. Such statements shall be provided to Committee members present at the meeting and included in the official meeting record. Written statements shall not be counted as votes.

5.3 Alternate Members

Alternate members are not permitted. Only appointed voting members may participate in Committee deliberations and voting, except as otherwise provided for ex officio, non-voting members.

6.0 Officers

6.1 Officers

The officers of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) shall consist of a Chair and may include a Vice Chair. No member may hold more than one office at the same time.

6.2 Eligibility

Any appointed voting member of ARTAC may serve as an officer. Ex officio, non-voting members are not eligible to serve as officers.

6.3 Role of Officers

Officers serve to facilitate the orderly conduct of Committee business and meetings. Officers do not possess independent authority beyond that expressly provided in these Bylaws or delegated by the Committee.

7.0 Election, Term, and Removal of Officers

7.1 Election of Officers

Officers of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) shall be elected by a majority vote of the appointed voting members present at the annual meeting, provided a quorum is established.

If an office becomes vacant outside of the annual meeting cycle, the Committee may elect a replacement officer at the next regular or special meeting.

7.2 Term of Office

Public Officers shall serve three-year terms, beginning immediately upon election and continuing until their successors are elected, unless the officer resigns, is removed, or is otherwise unable to serve.

Public Officers may serve no more than three consecutive terms in the same office.

7.3 Removal of Officers

Any officer may be removed from office by a majority vote of the Committee, with or without cause. Notice of intent to consider removal of an officer shall be provided to all Committee members and to the affected officer at least one (1) week in advance of the meeting at which the action will be considered.

Removal from an officer position does not affect the individual's status as a Committee member, unless separately acted upon by the Commissioner.

7.4 Resignation of Officers

An officer may resign at any time by providing written notice to the Chair or, in the case of the Chair, to the Vice Chair or Department staff. A resignation shall take effect upon receipt unless a later effective date is specified.

7.5 Vacancies

If a Vice Chair has been elected, the Vice Chair shall assume the duties of Chair until a successor is elected. If no Vice Chair exists, the Committee shall elect an acting Chair at its next meeting.

Vacancies in any other officer position may be filled by election at the next regular or special meeting.

8.0 Duties of Officers

8.1 Duties of the Chair

The Chair serves as the presiding officer of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) and is responsible for facilitating the effective and orderly conduct of Committee business. Subject to the direction of the Committee and consistent with the Charter and these Bylaws, the Chair shall:

- Preside over all meetings of the Committee;
- Facilitate discussion and ensure meetings are conducted in an orderly, fair, and efficient manner;
- Develop meeting agendas in consultation with Department staff and Committee members;
- Ensure that Committee actions and recommendations are clearly articulated and documented;
- Appoint members to standing committees and task forces, as authorized by these Bylaws and Committee action;
- Serve as the primary point of contact between the Committee and Department staff; and
- Represent the Committee in communications with the Commissioner or designee, when authorized by the Committee.

8.2 Duties of the Vice Chair

The Vice Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair in the absence or inability of the Chair to act and shall have the same authority and limitations when acting in that capacity.

In addition, the Vice Chair shall perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Chair or the Committee.

9.0 Attendance and Member Participation

9.1 Attendance and Recommendation for Removal

Repeated unexcused absences from three (3) regular meetings within a calendar year may constitute grounds for the Committee to recommend removal to the Commissioner. The Chair, with concurrence of the Committee, may notify the Commissioner of attendance concerns. Removal of a member remains solely within the authority of the Commissioner.

10.0 Committees and Task Forces

10.1 Standing Committees

The Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) may establish standing committees as needed to support its work. Standing committees shall be advisory in nature and shall not exercise independent decision-making authority on behalf of ARTAC. Members of standing committees shall be appointed by the Chair, subject to confirmation by the Committee, and shall serve for one-year terms unless otherwise specified by the Committee.

10.2 Special Committees and Task Forces

With concurrence of the Commissioner or designee, ARTAC may establish special committees or task forces for specific, time-limited purposes. Special committees and task forces may include Committee members and, as appropriate, other individuals with relevant expertise, provided that any non-member participants serve in an advisory capacity only.

The purpose, scope, and expected duration of each special committee or task force shall be clearly defined at the time of establishment.

10.3 Governance and Reporting

Each standing or special committee shall designate a Chair from among its members. Committees and task forces shall report their findings and recommendations to ARTAC for consideration. No committee or task force may take action or issue recommendations on behalf of ARTAC without explicit authorization by the full Committee.

10.4 Meetings and Notice

Meetings of standing committees and task forces shall be conducted in a manner consistent with applicable public notice and open meetings requirements, as determined by Department staff in coordination with the Committee Chair.

11.0 Ethics and Conflicts of Interest

11.1 Compliance with Ethics Law

Members of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) shall comply with all applicable ethics requirements, including the Alaska Executive Branch Ethics Act (AS 39.52). Nothing in these Bylaws shall be construed to supersede or modify the requirements of applicable law.

11.2 Disclosure of Conflicts

ARTAC members shall disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest related to matters before the Committee, in accordance with AS 39.52. Disclosures shall be made as soon as the conflict is known and, when applicable, prior to participation in discussion or voting on the affected matter.

11.3 Recusal

A member who has a conflict of interest with respect to a particular matter shall refrain from participating in discussion and voting on that matter, except as otherwise permitted by law. Members who recuse themselves shall be counted as present for purposes of establishing a quorum but shall not be counted as voting on the matter.

11.4 Chair's Role and Ethics Guidance

The Chair shall manage conflict-of-interest disclosures and recusals during meetings to ensure compliance with applicable ethics requirements. If a conflict involves the Chair, or if there is disagreement regarding a conflict determination, the matter shall be referred to the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities or designee for guidance or resolution. Department staff may provide ethics-related information to members, and the Committee may seek guidance from appropriate state ethics authorities when necessary.

12.0 Amendment of Bylaws

12.1 Amendment Authority

The Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) may adopt, amend, or repeal these Bylaws by a majority vote of the appointed voting members at a regular or special meeting, provided that a quorum is established.

12.2 Notice of Proposed Amendments

Proposed amendments to these Bylaws shall be provided to Committee members at least thirty (30) days in advance of the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered, unless a shorter notice period is required by law or necessary due to time-sensitive circumstances.

12.3 Consistency with Charter and Law

All amendments to these Bylaws shall be consistent with the ARTAC Charter, Administrative Order 361, and applicable state and federal law. Any amendment determined to be inconsistent with the Charter or applicable law shall be null and void.

12.4 Effective Date

Amendments to these Bylaws shall take effect upon adoption unless otherwise specified by the Committee.

Adoption

These Bylaws are adopted by the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) in accordance with the Committee Charter and applicable law.

ARTAC Chair

Date

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Charter, approved by the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

MULTI-USE TRAILS REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS



Purpose of Scoring

The purpose of this scoring process is to evaluate applications fairly, consistently, and based on demonstrated project value, readiness, and community benefit.

General Guidance

Reviewers must:

- **Score each application independently** using the criteria provided
- **Apply scoring consistently across all applications**
- Base scores on **information provided in the application**, not assumptions
- Provide **written justification** for unusually high or low scores

Community Context and Fairness

- Evaluate projects relative to the **size, location, and capacity of the applicant**
- Do **not penalize smaller or rural communities** for:
 - Lower population
 - Fewer users
 - Less polished applications
- Focus on **whether the project meets local needs**, not how large or complex it is

Application Quality vs. Project Value

- Do not score based on writing style, grammar, or formatting beyond basic clarity
- Focus on:
 - Project feasibility
 - Demonstrated need
 - Operational readiness
 - Community benefit

Use of Scoring Criteria

For each section:

- Use the **full scoring range** (do not default to middle scores)
- Match the application to the **closest scoring description**
- If a score falls between categories, select the **lower score unless clearly justified**

Public / Community Benefit

- Evaluate based on demonstrated benefit, including:
 - Access (subsistence, services, recreation)
 - Connectivity between areas or communities
 - Contribution to health, safety, and quality of life
- Do not rely solely on number of users
- A smaller project serving a critical local need may score highly

Budget Review

- Confirm:
 - Budget is complete and mathematically accurate
 - Costs align with the proposed work

- Minor documentation issues should not outweigh an otherwise strong project

What NOT to Consider

Reviewers should not consider:

- Personal familiarity with the applicant
- External information not included in the application
- Assumptions about community support unless explicitly described
- Preferences for certain types of projects over others

Final Scoring

- Ensure all sections are scored
- Double-check totals
- Confirm justification is provided where required

Reviewers should score each application independently. Committee discussion may inform final scoring, but reviewers should not alter scores solely to align with other reviewers.

DRAFT

Multi-Use Trails (DOT&PF) Trail Project Score Sheet



Applicant	
Project Name	
Reviewer	
Requested total project	\$
Federal/Match	\$
Score	/100

Does the project have the required documentation for land access? Pass/Fail

What type of project is this?

- New Recreational Opportunity
- Missing Link
- Maintenance
- Safety and Education

SECTION I – Conflict of Disclosure (No Points)

Please describe:

SECTION II – Application Completeness (8 points)

Purpose: Measures whether required components are submitted and complete.

Scoring Criteria

- 8 pts – All required components submitted; no missing elements.
- 5 pts – Minor omissions or minor inconsistencies.
- 2 pts – Multiple missing components.
- 0 pts – Major required components missing.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Explain missing or incomplete elements and how they affected scoring.

Section Score: _____ (8)

SECTION III – Applicant Capacity & Readiness (8 points)

Purpose: Assesses organizational experience, readiness, and long-term maintenance plan.

Scoring Criteria

- 8 pts – Demonstrated relevant experience; clear maintenance plan; evidence of ability to complete project.

- 5 pts – Some experience; maintenance addressed.
- 1 pt – Limited experience or vague maintenance.
- 0 pts – No evidence of capacity.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (8)

SECTION IV – Project Description & Scope (10 points)

Purpose: Evaluates clarity of scope and project feasibility.

Includes:

- Consistency with multi-use trails eligible work
- Access documentation/easements
- Construction details
- Educational/training components (if applicable)
- Ancillary improvements (lighting, signage, etc.)

Scoring Criteria

- 10 pts – Clear, detailed scope; permissions documented.
- 7 pts – Generally clear; minor gaps.
- 3 pts – Scope vague or incomplete.
- 0 pts – Insufficient detail to assess feasibility.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (10)

SECTION V – Project Narrative Completeness (8 points)

Purpose: Evaluates clarity, completeness, and accuracy of written sections.

Note: Applications should be evaluated in relation to community size, capacity, and context.

Smaller or rural communities should not be disadvantaged for proposing appropriately scaled projects.

Scoring Criteria

- 8 pts – Clear, complete, logically organized narrative; project scope understandable.
- 5 pts – Generally clear; minor gaps in explanation.
- 2 pts – Limited clarity; important elements unclear.
- 0 pts – Narrative insufficient to understand proposal.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (8)

SECTION VI – Project Timeline (10 points)

Purpose: Assesses schedule realism and task alignment with budget.

Scoring Criteria

- 10 pts – Tasks broken down; realistic duration; matches budget; feasible end date.
- 6 pts – Generally realistic; minor inconsistencies.
- 2 pts – Significant timeline concerns.
- 0 pts – Timeline unrealistic or missing.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (10)

SECTION VII – Maps and Graphics (5 points)

Purpose: Evaluates quality and completeness of maps and visuals.

Scoring Criteria

- 5 pts – Clear vicinity and site maps; scale and land ownership identified.
- 3 pts – Maps included but limited detail.
- 1 pt – Maps unclear or incomplete.
- 0 pts – Required maps missing.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (5)

SECTION VIII – Public Benefit (16 points)

Purpose: Evaluates public value and recreational impact.

Includes:

- Documented need
- Number and type of users
- New recreational opportunity or missing link
- Accessibility for individuals with disabilities
- Youth development opportunities
- Historical access considerations (including historic trails or RS2477 routes, where applicable)

Scoring Anchors

- 16–12 pts – Clear documented need; broad public access; measurable benefit; inclusive features identified.
- 11–7 pts – General public benefit described, limited documentation.
- 6–1 pts – Need asserted but weakly supported.
- 0 pts – No demonstrated public benefit.

Clarification on Opposition:

Presence of opposition does not automatically reduce score. Reviewers should consider whether concerns were acknowledged and addressed through outreach or mitigation.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (16)

SECTION IX – Community Support & Engagement (15 points)

Purpose: Evaluates quality of public engagement and community backing.

Acceptable documentation may include:

- Letters of support
- Tribal consultation documentation
- Public meeting summaries
- Resolutions
- Public notice postings
- Evidence of meaningful engagement

Scoring Anchors

- 15–12 pts – Strong documented engagement; broad community backing; outreach clearly described.
- 11–7 pts – Moderate support; required documentation present.
- 6–1 pts – Minimal engagement or weak documentation.
- 0 pts – Required documentation missing.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (15)

SECTION X – Budget Quality and Accuracy (10 points)

Purpose: Evaluates format, documentation, and mathematical accuracy.

Scoring Criteria

- 10 pts – Excel budget used; math accurate; backup documentation included; tasks align with schedule.
- 7 pts – Minor math or documentation issues.
- 3 pts – Significant inconsistencies or unclear documentation.
- 0 pts – Budget incomplete or unreliable.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Note specific strengths or deficiencies in documentation and math.

Section Score: _____ (10)

SECTION XI – Budget Reasonableness & Alignment (7 points)

Purpose: Assesses whether budget items align with project scope and are reasonable for project type and location.

Scoring Criteria

- 7 pts – Costs clearly tied to scope; labor and supplies appropriate and justified.
- 4 pts – Generally aligned, minor concerns.
- 1 pt – Weak alignment or questionable allocations.
- 0 pts – Budget does not match project scope.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Explain alignment concerns or strengths.

Section Score: _____ (7)

SECTION XII – Funding & Match Compliance (2 points)

Purpose: Confirms match requirements and funding documentation.

Scoring Criteria

- 2 pts – Match met and properly documented.
- 1 pt – Minor documentation issue.
- 0 pts – Match incomplete or non-compliant.

Reviewer Justification (Required):

Section Score: _____ (2)

DRAFT

Snowtrails Application Review Summary Notes

Big Lake Trails

Strengths

- Reduced cost per mile compared to the previous season.
- Supports a multi-use trail system.
- Strong mapping and project area documentation.
- Detailed project planning and specifications information.

Clarifications Requested

- Clarification regarding proposed welder services and their relationship to grant-funded activities.
- Clarification regarding proposed diesel mechanic services and whether those activities are directly attributable to trail operations.
- Additional information regarding budget allocation and funding sources.

General Observations

- Application demonstrated significant community need and trail use.
- Reviewers noted strong project planning elements and mapping information.

Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers

Strengths

- Reduced cost per mile compared to the previous season.
- Strong overall application with good value for proposed work.
- Detailed route information and mapping.

Clarifications Requested

- Explanation of de minimis cost calculations and billing methodology.
- Clarification regarding equipment identified without associated cost information.
- Additional information regarding vegetation management and tree removal activities.

General Observations

- Application demonstrated strong operational planning.
- Additional detail regarding safety mitigation measures would strengthen the proposal.

Curry Ridge Riders

Strengths

- Reduced cost per mile compared to the previous season.
- Detailed project planning, specifications, and risk assessment information.
- Supports a multi-use trail network.

Clarifications Requested

- Explanation of de minimis cost calculations.
- Clarification regarding operator and equipment utilization assumptions.
- Confirmation of trail segments included within the application area.

General Observations

- Application demonstrates strong project planning.
- Additional budget detail would improve transparency.

Denali Highway

Strengths

- Reduced cost per mile compared to the previous season.
- Clear identification of the primary trail corridor.

Clarifications Requested

- Additional detail regarding outreach efforts, project tools, and implementation methods.
- Additional information regarding community benefits and access considerations.

General Observations

- Application would benefit from more detailed narrative descriptions and supporting information.

Eureka Trails**Strengths**

- Comprehensive trail system and extensive project scope.
- Strong project planning and specifications documentation.
- Well-developed risk management procedures.

Clarifications Requested

- Explanation of substantial increases in budget and trail mileage.
- Clarification regarding de minimis calculations.
- Clarification regarding permit status and regulatory requirements.
- Additional detail regarding prior award performance and history.

General Observations

- Application demonstrates significant organizational capacity.
- Budget presentation would benefit from additional detail and supporting documentation.

Hatcher Pass**Strengths**

- Comprehensive project scope.
- Strong overall application package.

Clarifications Requested

- Explanation of increased cost per mile.
- Clarification regarding de minimis calculations.
- Additional information regarding vegetation management contracts and procurement procedures.

General Observations

- Mapping and project area information could be presented more clearly.

Lake Louise Snowmachine Club**Strengths**

- Strong safety documentation and reporting procedures.
- Demonstrated fundraising and matching fund support.
- Comprehensive and well-organized application package.

Clarifications Requested

- Clarification regarding proposed battery purchases and eligibility.

General Observations

- Reviewers consistently noted strong project management and documentation practices.

LSDA**Strengths**

- Detailed and thorough application package.
- Modest budget increase compared to the previous season.

Clarifications Requested

- Additional detail regarding risk management procedures.
- Clarification regarding matching contributions and budget presentation.

General Observations

- Application would benefit from a clearer budget narrative and organization.

Mid-Valley Trails

Strengths

- Cost per mile remains comparatively low despite budget increases.
- Strong safety planning documentation.
- Clear project mapping.

Clarifications Requested

- Clarification regarding de minimis calculations.
- Additional detail regarding specific trail segments included in the application.
- Additional information regarding equipment capacity and operational assumptions.

General Observations

- Application addressed core requirements but would benefit from additional detail.

Montana Creek Motor Musers

Strengths

- Expanded trail system and increased service area.

Clarifications Requested

- Clarification regarding proposed welding services.
- Additional detail regarding operational assumptions and grooming frequency.
- Additional information regarding safety procedures and risk mitigation.

General Observations

- Application would benefit from more detailed narrative support and documentation.

Petersville Nonprofit

Strengths

- Detailed budget presentation.
- Expanded trail network while maintaining a relatively stable cost per mile.
- Strong trail utilization and public access benefits.

Clarifications Requested

- Clarification regarding mechanic labor assumptions and scheduling.
- Additional detail regarding safety procedures.
- Clarification regarding potential overlap with other proposed trail systems.

General Observations

- Application demonstrates significant operational activity and trail use.

Snomads

Strengths

- Strong mapping and mileage documentation.
- Demonstrated need for trail maintenance and grooming activities.

Clarifications Requested

- Clarification regarding operator and equipment hour allocations.
- Additional detail regarding safety procedures and risk management.

General Observations

- Application would benefit from additional narrative detail and supporting documentation.

Willow Trail Committee

Strengths

- Strong project planning and specifications information.
- Demonstrated value relative to project scope.
- Modest budget increase compared to the previous season.

Clarifications Requested

- Clarification regarding volunteer labor assumptions and de minimis calculations.
- Clarification regarding parking lot maintenance costs.
- Clarification regarding software subscription expenses.

General Observations

- Application would benefit from additional detail regarding organizational experience and safety procedures.

Snowtrails Program - FY26 Scoring Summary

Application	Applicant	Requested \$	Trail	Cost per Mile	Eligibility Status	Reviewer1	Reviewer2	Reviewer3	Average Score	Rank
Application 1	Big Lake Trails	\$252,316	66	\$3,823	Pass	66.00	72.00	75.00	71.00	4
Application 2	Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers	\$199,788	132.45	\$1,508	Pass	72.00	70.00	72.00	71.33	3
Application 3	Curry Ridge Riders	\$578,657	130	\$4,451	Pass	66.00	67.00	73.00	68.67	6
Application 4	Denali Hwy Trail Club	\$564,158	186	\$3,033	Pass	69.00	68.00	56.00	64.33	9
Application 5	Eureka Trails	\$936,731	407.39	\$2,299	Pass	69.00	69.00	72.00	70.00	5
Application 6	Hatcher Pass	\$127,046	13	\$9,773	Pass	72.00	71.00	75.00	72.67	2
Application 7	Lake Louise Snowmachine Club	\$219,079	460	\$476	Pass	75.00	74.00	75.00	74.67	1
Application 8	Lower Susitna Drainage Association	\$215,868	60	\$3,598	Pass	49.00	68.00	75.00	64.00	10
Application 9	Mid-Valley Trails	\$41,170	75	\$549	Pass	69.00	68.00	53.00	63.33	11
Application 10	Montana Creek Motor Musers	\$64,324	24	\$2,680	Pass	54.00	55.00	36.00	48.33	13
Application 11	Petersville Non-Profit	\$1,055,289	252	\$4,188	Pass	62.00	68.00	75.00	68.33	7
Application 12	Snomads	\$158,477	101	\$1,569	Pass	57.00	61.00	64.00	60.67	12
Application 13	Willow Trail Committee	\$400,028	350	\$1,143	Pass	59.00	70.00	72.00	67.00	8

Summary	Value
Applications	13
Reviewers	3
Max Score	75
Average of all review	66.48717949
Failing eligibility count	0

Snowtrails Program - FY26 Scoring Kaycee

Applicant	Requested	Miles of Trail	Cost per Mile	Eligibility	Completeness /8					Community /20					Total /75	Comments
					8.00	Narrative /2	Maps /5	Budget /8	Funding /2	PS&E /10	Safety /10	/20	Capacity /10			
Big Lake Trails	\$252,316	66	\$3,823	Pass	8.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	1.00	7.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	66.00	lots of need for grooming high traffic	
Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers	\$199,788	132.45	\$1,508	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	72.00	Good value	
Curry Ridge Riders	\$578,657	130	\$4,451	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	7.00	10.00	20.00	7.00	66.00	Cost per mile high/it is remote area	
Denali Hwy Trail Club	\$564,158	186	\$3,033	Pass	5.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	7.00	69.00	Very much needed for winter access	
Eureka Trails	\$936,731	407.39	\$2,299	Pass	5.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	69.00	Complicated system of trails. Good map	
Hatcher Pass	\$127,046	13	\$9,773	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	72.00	high cost per mile difficult terrain	
Lake Louise Snowmachine Club	\$219,079	460	\$476	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	75.00	Well done Value / impressive safety forms	
Lower Susitna Drainage Association	\$215,868	60	\$3,598	Pass	4.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	20.00	7.00	49.00	Application lacking high cost per mile	
Mid-Valley Trails	\$41,170	75	\$549	Pass	5.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	69.00	Good safety plan and value per mile	
Montana Creek Motor Musers	\$64,324	24	\$2,680	Pass	4.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	20.00	7.00	54.00	No mention of safety / community needs	
Petersville Non-Profit	\$1,055,289	252	\$4,188	Pass	6.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	7.00	5.00	20.00	10.00	62.00	Huge expense, equip and contract cost?	
Snomads	\$158,477	101	\$1,569	Pass	7.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	7.00	3.00	20.00	7.00	57.00	safety weak/good value/ need is there	
Willow Trail Committee	\$400,028	350	\$1,143	Pass	7.00	2.00	5.00	6.00	2.00	10.00	0.00	20.00	7.00	59.00	no safety/ good value/ good narative	

Snowtrails Program - FY26 Scoring Erica

Applicant	Requested	Miles of Trail	Cost per Mile	Eligibility	Completeness /8	Narrative /2	Maps /5	Budget /8	Funding /2	PS&E /10	Safety /10	Community /20	Capacity /10	Total /75	Comments
Big Lake Trails	\$252,316	66	\$3,823	Pass	8.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	18.00	10.00	72.00	I liked that they described the different grooming for the different trails for narrative, budget was thorough, maps included all different segments but color coordination could have made reading it easier. Work plan includes rough date estimates and how activities change with time.
Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers	\$199,788	132.45	\$1,508	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	7.00	2.00	10.00	8.00	18.00	10.00	70.00	Seems like we are counting "backtrack" in our totals, do any other applicants do this? They also list cutting trees, is that eligible under this funding? For in kind match they are estimating \$98/hr for donation time... Identified safety issue with groomers on blind corners but no plan for this year.
Curry Ridge Riders	\$578,657	130	\$4,451	Pass	8.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	1.00	10.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	67.00	Listed first aid under risk management training. Vegetation management listed. Map missing Safari Lake Trail, math only listed at 9.03% while others have it at 10%. Safety plan with signs and for workers if there is an issue. Good community benefit, nothing for subsistence or health listed.
Denali Hwy Trail Club	\$564,158	186	\$3,033	Pass	8.00	2.00	3.00	7.00	1.00	10.00	10.00	19.00	8.00	68.00	map missing maclaren and seven mile trail. used 9.03 again in budget, snow machine operator hours and operation hours don't align. They don't account for backtrack on their trails. Good community benefit. 8 for readiness because they marked they have no experienced staff.
Eureka Trails	\$936,731	407.39	\$2,299	Pass	8.00	2.00	4.50	7.50	2.00	10.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	69.00	Budget seemed accurate but hard to read or check. Map complete but difficult to decipher. Good community benefits, but not listed as essential for subsistence.
Hatcher Pass	\$127,046	13	\$9,773	Pass	8.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	18.00	10.00	71.00	Map is confusing and doesn't align with names in application.
Lake Louise Snowmachine Club	\$219,079	460	\$476	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	7.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	74.00	What items are eligible under commodities? They have dewalt batteries listed.
Lower Susitna Drainage Association	\$215,868	60	\$3,598	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	7.00	68.00	no risk policy, included hazard markings and also operator safety plan, match policy seemed iffy and they had machines listed under labor types.
Mid-Valley Trails	\$41,170	75	\$549	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	6.00	2.00	7.00	10.00	20.00	8.00	68.00	They have a lot of activities listed under safety that are not included in labor budget. PS&E doesn't have detailed timeline/triggers as other applicants do. capcity with equipment seems limited.
Montana Creek Motor Musers	\$64,324	24	\$2,680	Pass	5.00	1.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	5.00	7.00	15.00	7.00	55.00	not much detail in application, very limited PS&E No experienced staff, no risk management
Petersville Non-Profit	\$1,055,289	252	\$4,188	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	10.00	8.00	18.00	10.00	68.00	684 hours of mechanic??? Could be a bit more detail on safety and how conditions will be responded to
Snomads	\$158,477	101	\$1,569	Pass	5.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	15.00	7.00	61.00	No risk policy and no risk management. insurance expires in december. missing costs in the budget under equipment
Willow Trail Committee	\$400,028	350	\$1,143	Pass	7.00	2.00	5.00	6.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	18.00	10.00	70.00	Did not share staff experience with program, included adobe acrobat in commodities??

Snowtrails Program - FY26 Scoring Randi

Applicant	Requested	Miles of Trail	Cost per Mile	Eligibility	Completeness				Community				Total /75	Comments	
					8	2	5	8	2	10	10	20			10
Big Lake Trails	\$252,316	66	\$3,823	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	75.00	*Map boxes, PS&E Section is very thorough
Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers	\$199,788	132.45	\$1,508	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	72.00	*GPS Location Pins, Operations wasn't as detailed as others (phases, specific months), cost per mile has lowered, deminimis?
Curry Ridge Riders	\$578,657	130	\$4,451	Pass	8.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	73.00	PSE and Risk Assessment were very detailed. Missing trail on map.
Denali Hwy Trail Club	\$564,158	186	\$3,033	Pass	5.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	7.00	12.00	7.00	56.00	Need more specific safety efforts and tools. Does not mention access to subsistence, cost of living. Out and back. Map is missing trail that branches off.
Eureka Trails	\$936,731	407.39	\$2,299	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	7.00	72.00	Great PSE, No DeMinimis included. Will need to re-work budget.
Hatcher Pass	\$127,046	13	\$9,773	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	75.00	Cost per mileage is high (mountains)
Lake Louise Snowmachine Club	\$219,079	460	\$476	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	75.00	Included Risk Mgmt Policy, Incident Report, Volunteer Waiver.
Lower Susitna Drainage Association	\$215,868	60	\$3,598	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	75.00	Very detailed application, no risk policy
Mid-Valley Trails	\$41,170	75	\$549	Pass	5.00	1.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	3.00	10.00	12.00	7.00	53.00	Nice safety Plan, too brief of descriptions, no timeline. Efficient cost per mile.
Montana Creek Motor Musers	\$64,324	24	\$2,680	Pass	5.00	1.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	36.00	Not enough information, minimal time and effort on this application
Petersville Non-Profit	\$1,055,289	252	\$4,188	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	75.00	Nice budget spreadsheet and PSE
Snomads	\$158,477	101	\$1,569	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	7.00	12.00	10.00	64.00	Map showing miles is nice, minimal info for safety and community , no risk policy
Willow Trail Committee	\$400,028	350	\$1,143	Pass	8.00	2.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	7.00	20.00	10.00	72.00	

Applicant	Updated	Miles	Funding Request/per mile	DMV Match	Local Match	Percent for Local Match
Big Lake Trails	\$ 252,316	66	\$ 3,823	\$5,214	\$ 20,109	8%
Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers	\$ 199,549	132.45	\$ 1,507	\$7,904	\$ 12,051	6%
Curry Ridge Riders	\$ 558,979	130	\$ 4,300	\$10,271	\$ 45,627	8%
Denali Highway Trail Club	\$ 398,684	186	\$ 2,143	\$14,695	\$ 25,173	6%
Eureka Trails	\$ 619,440	220	\$ 2,816	\$17,381	\$ 44,563	7%
Hatcher Pass	\$ 127,046	13	\$ 9,773	\$1,027	\$ 11,678	9%
Lake Louise Snowmachine Club	\$ 218,242	460	\$ 474	\$8,634	\$ 11,073	6%
Lower Susitna Drainage Association	\$ 215,868	60	\$ 3,598	\$4,740	\$ 16,847	8%
Mid-Valley Trails	\$ 41,170	75	\$ 549	\$1,631	\$ 2,486	6%
Montana Creek Motor Musers	\$ 57,664	24	\$ 2,403	\$1,896	\$ 3,870	7%
Petersville Non-Profit	\$ 997,408	310	\$ 3,217	\$24,492	\$ 75,249	8%
Snomads	\$ 158,330	101	\$ 1,568	\$6,271	\$ 9,562	6%
Willowtrail Committee	\$ 399,728	350	\$ 1,142	\$15,828	\$ 24,145	6%
TOTAL	\$ 4,244,425	2127.45	\$2,870.17	\$119,984.00	\$ 302,433	
		efficiency	\$1,995.08			

FY27 Updated Request

Federal Request	\$ 3,822,099
Match 10%	\$ 422,417
Total	\$ 4,244,516
DMV receipts	

Applicant	Match applied cost per mile	Recognize d \$/mile (capped)	Capped 10% Match Required	Total Capped Match	Pro-Rata Factor	Final DMV Match Awarded	% of Original Match Received
BLT	Cap	\$ 1,995	\$ 13,168		39.6	\$5,214	21%
CHCH	1995.08	\$ 1,507	\$ 19,960		39.6	\$7,904	40%
CRR		\$ 1,995	\$ 25,936		39.6	\$10,271	18%
Denali		\$ 1,995	\$ 37,108		39.6	\$14,695	37%
Eureka		\$ 1,995	\$ 43,892		39.6	\$17,381	28%
Hatcher		\$ 1,995	\$ 2,594		39.6	\$1,027	8%
LLSMC		\$ 474	\$ 21,804		39.6	\$8,634	44%
LSDA		\$ 1,995	\$ 11,970		39.6	\$4,740	22%
MVTC		\$ 549	\$ 4,118		39.6	\$1,631	40%
MCOMM		\$ 1,995	\$ 4,788		39.6	\$1,896	33%
PCNPC		\$ 1,995	\$ 61,847		39.6	\$24,492	25%
Snomads		\$ 1,568	\$ 15,837		39.6	\$6,271	40%
WTC		\$ 1,142	\$ 39,970		39.6	\$15,828	40%
TOTALS			\$ 302,992		39.60%	\$119,985	

(STEP 1) Set a reasonable efficiency cap. In this example, we calculated the average program-wide \$/mile (excluding match at this step) which gives us \$1995.08 per mile (\$4,244,425 ÷ 2127.45 miles)
(STEP 2) Calculation of "capped required match" for each club as follows: capped required match =
(STEP 3) Sum all capped required match as new denominator to calculate final distribution (\$120k pro-OUTCOME: This method is fair, transparent, and automatically rewards efficiency.

Why this is the most equitable and defensible method:

- Final pro-rata factor = $120,000 / 302,992 \approx 39.6\%$ of each club's capped required match. So each club gets 67.48% of their capped match amount (clubs under \$1,995.08/mile get 39.60% of their actual required match — a big reward; clubs over \$1,995.08/mile get much less than they asked for). Why this is the most equitable and defensible method Every club gets something (no zeros)
- Easy to explain: "We cap the recognized cost-per-mile at the current program average of \$1,995.08. Match is calculated on the lower of your actual rate or the cap, then pro-rated so the total equals available funds."
- Efficient clubs (low \$/mile) are completely unaffected — they get ~39.60% of their full required match
- Inefficient clubs are not rewarded with outsized match utilization based on larger grant requests in a transparent, formula-driven way
- Strongly incentivizes clubs to lower their cost-per-mile in future years