



STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & PUBLIC FACILITIES
Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) Agenda
FY27 Snowtrails funding and Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric
August 11, 2026 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM

This meeting of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) will take place via Zoom:
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85129302639>

Committee Members: Lisa Agnew, Craig Compeau, Jennifer Yuhas, Lee Hart, Terry Valentine, Allie Sargent, Jeffery Collins

Agency Representatives: Ricky Gease and Natalya Formina, Department of Natural Resources

DOT&PF: Angelica Stabs, Hazel Cristobal, and Rebecca Garrett

Purpose of the Meeting

The primary objectives of this meeting are to:

1. Review and make funding recommendations for FY27 Snowtrails applications.
2. Review and provide recommendations on the Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric.

Notice: The Committee may take action on any agenda item.

Agenda					
Time	Item		Speaker	Purpose	Materials
2:00 PM	Item 1	Call to Order/Roll Call	Hazel Cristobal	Information	
	Item 2	Introduction/Purpose of the Meeting	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Information	Materials included
	Item 3	Approval of Agenda	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	
2:05 PM	Item 4	Public Comments	Communications	Public Input	
2:15 PM	Item 5	Review and Recommend FY27 Snowtrails Funding	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	Materials included
2:30 PM	Item 6	Review and Recommend Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Discussion/Action	Materials included
2:55 PM	Item 7	Public Comments	Communications	Public Input	
2:58 PM	Item 8	Set Date for Next Meeting	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	
3:00 PM	Item 9	Adjourn		Action	

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.

Applicant	Match applied cost per mile	Recognized \$/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%
MCMM		\$ 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

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 Mushers	\$ 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	

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 Mushers	\$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	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	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 exspense, 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 activites 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 moredetail 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 /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	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	

Summary of Changes

Multi-Use Trails Reviewer Instructions, Staff Review, and Score Sheet Revised following the July 21, 2026 ARTAC meeting

DOT&PF revised the draft Multi-Use Trails scoring materials following ARTAC's July 21 discussion. The revisions separate administrative eligibility review from ARTAC's evaluation of project merit, clarify reviewer procedures, and adjust the scoring criteria to reflect the committee's comments regarding readiness, rural community context, public benefit, community support, and budget review.

1. Administrative requirements moved out of ARTAC scoring

A separate **DOT&PF Staff Review** was added for completion before applications are provided to ARTAC. Staff will review administrative and eligibility matters on a pass/fail basis, including:

- Application completeness;
- Applicant and project eligibility;
- SCORP or other qualifying trail-plan alignment;
- Public recreational purpose;
- Land ownership and public access;
- Environmental and permitting information;
- Budget completeness;
- Match compliance; and
- Required maps and location information.

Staff will determine whether an application should proceed to ARTAC scoring, be held for clarification, or not advance.

This change responds to ARTAC's discussion that application completeness and match compliance should be handled as administrative requirements rather than receive points in the competitive score.

2. Reviewer instructions expanded

The reviewer instructions were expanded to provide more consistent direction on:

- Independent scoring and use of the full point range;
- The information reviewers may consider;
- Written explanations for unusually high or low scores;
- Fair evaluation of rural and smaller communities;
- Submission of applicant questions through DOT&PF staff;
- Distribution of the same clarification information to all reviewers;
- Discussion and revision of preliminary scores during the public scoring meeting; and
- The finalization of scores at the conclusion of the meeting.

The revised instructions also clarify that reviewers should evaluate project substance rather than writing style, formatting, or professional presentation.

3. Applicant questions and clarification process formalized

The revised document establishes a consistent process for application questions. ARTAC members will submit questions to DOT&PF staff rather than contacting applicants directly. Staff will obtain written responses and distribute the same information to the entire committee before scoring.

This reflects ARTAC’s discussion about completing clarification before scoring and ensuring that every reviewer receives the same information.

4. Scoring categories reorganized

The score remains based on **100 total points**, but the categories and point values were revised as follows:

July 21 draft	Points	Revised ARTAC materials	Points
Application Completeness	8	Moved to DOT&PF staff review	—
Applicant Capacity and Readiness	8	Applicant Capacity and Long-Term Stewardship	8
Project Description and Scope	10	Project Description and Scope	10
Project Narrative Completeness	8	Project Narrative	10
Project Timeline	10	Project Readiness and Timeline	15
Maps and Graphics	5	Maps and Graphics	5
Public Benefit	16	Public Benefit and SCORP Alignment	22
Community Support and Engagement	15	Community Support, Engagement, and Partnerships	20
Budget Quality and Accuracy	10	Budget Quality, Reasonableness, and Alignment	10
Budget Reasonableness and Alignment	7	Combined with budget criterion above	—
Funding and Match Compliance	2	Moved to DOT&PF staff review	—
Total	100	Total	100

The revised scoring summary is contained at the end of the new score sheet.

5. Applicant capacity separated from project readiness

The former **Applicant Capacity and Readiness** category was revised to focus on the applicant’s organizational ability, experience, partnerships, responsibilities, and long-term maintenance or stewardship plan.

Project readiness is now evaluated separately under **Project Readiness and Timeline**, with consideration of land access, environmental review, permitting, design, procurement, match commitments, milestones, and the ability to proceed after award.

This reflects the committee’s discussion about applicant responsibility when contractors are used and the importance of giving greater consideration to project readiness.

6. Project narrative criterion revised

“Completeness” was removed from the title of the narrative criterion to avoid overlap with the administrative completeness review. The revised **Project Narrative** criterion focuses on whether the application clearly connects the identified need, proposed work, and expected results.

The criterion increased from 8 to 10 points.

This change reflects ARTAC’s recommendation to remove “completeness” from the criterion title.

7. Project readiness and timeline strengthened

The former 10-point timeline category was replaced with a 15-point **Project Readiness and Timeline** category. The revised criterion places greater emphasis on whether required land access, environmental review, permitting, design, procurement, match, and partner commitments are complete or on a realistic path to completion.

The scoring guidance uses “shovel-ready” as a program scoring term and clarifies that it is not intended as a statutory definition.

8. Public benefit expanded and combined with plan alignment

The public-benefit category increased from 16 to 22 points and now expressly includes alignment with the Alaska SCORP or another qualifying recreational trail plan.

The revised criterion considers:

- Documented public need;
- Public access and availability;
- Connectivity and missing links;
- Safety, health, social, and recreational benefits;
- Multiple user groups;
- Accessibility and inclusion;
- Historic or traditional access, including historic trails and RS 2477 routes;
- Long-term public value; and
- SCORP or trail-plan goals.

The guidance clarifies that reviewers should not rely solely on population or estimated user totals and should consider the importance of the benefit in the context of the community.

This responds to ARTAC’s concerns that numerical user estimates could disadvantage rural communities and its request to expressly recognize historic access.

9. Community support and partnerships increased

The community-support category increased from 15 to 20 points and was renamed **Community Support, Engagement, and Partnerships**.

The revised criterion considers engagement with communities, tribes, landowners, agencies, user groups, partners, and the public. It also recognizes documented commitments of funds, labor, equipment, materials, and other local resources.

The scoring guidance clarifies that opposition does not automatically reduce a score; reviewers should consider whether concerns were acknowledged and meaningfully addressed. This reflects ARTAC’s discussion regarding the importance of community support while avoiding rigid numerical standards that could disadvantage smaller communities.

10. Budget categories combined

The two former budget categories—**Budget Quality and Accuracy** and **Budget Reasonableness and Alignment**—were combined into one 10-point category.

The revised criterion evaluates mathematical accuracy, documentation, reasonableness, relationship to the scope and schedule, cost effectiveness, and appropriate consideration of rural or remote delivery conditions.

This reflects ARTAC's recommendation to combine the two budget sections.

11. Historic access added throughout the materials

Historic access trails and RS 2477 routes were added as identified project types and are expressly included in the public-benefit scoring guidance where relevant.

This responds to the committee's request to recognize projects that preserve or reopen historic access.

Requested ARTAC action

DOT&PF requests that ARTAC review the revised Multi-Use Trails Reviewer Instructions, Staff Review, and Score Sheet and provide a recommendation regarding their use for the upcoming Multi-Use Trails application cycle.

MULTI-USE TRAILS

ARTAC Reviewer Instructions, Staff Review, and Score Sheet

Draft for Review

REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

Purpose of Scoring

The purpose of this scoring process is to evaluate applications fairly, consistently, and based on demonstrated project value, readiness, community support, public benefit, and alignment with the Alaska Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).

General Guidance

- Score each application independently before the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) scoring meeting using the criteria provided.
- Apply scoring consistently across all applications.
- Base scores on information provided in the application and on written applicant responses distributed by DOT&PF program staff. Do not rely on outside information, assumptions, or personal knowledge that is not available to the full committee.
- Use the full scoring range. A strong response may receive all available points, while a weak or unaddressed response may receive few or no points. Do not default to a middle score merely because it feels safer.
- Match the application to the closest scoring description. When a response falls between two scoring levels, select the lower score unless the higher score is clearly supported.
- Provide written justification for unusually high or low scores and identify material concerns that should be discussed by the committee.
- Written justification and evaluation notes may be subject to public disclosure and should remain factual, objective, and professional.

Examples of Using the Full Point Range

Level	Typical percentage	General example
Highest	90–100%	The criterion is fully addressed, well supported, and presents little or no uncertainty. For a 10-point item, a score of 9 or 10 may be appropriate.
Strong	70–89%	The criterion is addressed well, with only minor gaps or concerns. For a 10-point item, a score of 7 or 8 may be appropriate.
Adequate	40–69%	The minimum information is present, but important detail, documentation, or clarity is limited. For a 10-point item, a score of 4 to 6 may be appropriate.
Weak	1–39%	The response is incomplete, poorly supported, or raises significant concerns. For a 10-point item, a score of 1 to 3 may be appropriate.
Not addressed	0%	The application does not address the criterion, or the information provided does not demonstrate any creditable response.

Community Context and Fairness

- Evaluate projects considering size of community, project's location, available resources and workforce capacity of the applicant and community.

- Do not disregard proposals from smaller or rural communities solely because they have a lower population, fewer users, fewer staff, or a less polished application.
- Do not score writing style, grammar, formatting, or professional graphic design beyond what is needed to understand and evaluate the project.
- Focus on whether the project is feasible, addresses a demonstrated need, is appropriately scaled, and provides meaningful public benefit.
- Do not rely solely on the number of people served. A project serving a small community or resolving critical regional access need may score highly when its benefit is well demonstrated.

Applicant Questions and Communications

- ARTAC members must submit questions for applicants to DOT&PF program staff at least **two weeks** before the scheduled scoring meeting.
- Committee members may not contact applicants directly about an application during the review and scoring process.
- DOT&PF program staff will compile questions, obtain applicant responses, and distribute all questions and responses to the entire committee so that every reviewer has access to the same information.
- Only information in the application or in official written responses distributed by DOT&PF may be used to revise a score.

Public Scoring Meeting and Final Scores

- The ARTAC scoring meeting will include public discussion of the applications and preliminary scores.
- Committee members may revise their scores during the meeting based on the committee discussion and official information available to all reviewers.
- Reviewers should not change a score solely to match another reviewer; any revision should reflect the reviewer's own judgment after discussion.
- Scores submitted at the conclusion of the public scoring meeting will be considered final.

What Reviewers Should Not Consider

- Personal knowledge with or opinions regarding the applicant.
- External information not included in the application or distributed by DOT&PF.
- Assumptions about community support, opposition, land access, or readiness that are not supported by the record.
- A preference for one project type, geographic area, user group, or organization over another.
- Whether the application was professionally written, except where the lack of clarity prevents evaluation of the project.

DOT&PF STAFF REVIEW

DOT&PF program staff complete this review before ARTAC scoring. Pass/fail determinations should be supported by staff notes. Applications that do not pass a required eligibility item should not proceed to ARTAC scoring unless the deficiency is resolved in accordance with the solicitation and program procedures.

Project and Community Information

Applicant	
Project name	
Reviewer	
Community or service area	
Community population	
Estimated number of people served	
Federal funds requested	
Required match	
Total project cost	

Project Type

Select all that apply: ☐ New recreational opportunity ☐ Missing link ☐ Maintenance or rehabilitation
☐ Safety and education ☐ Historic access trail ☐ RS 2477 route ☐ Other: _____

Administrative Review Checklist

Review item	Pass	Fail	Staff findings / required follow-up
Application completeness All required forms, responses, attachments, maps, and certifications are present and sufficiently complete for review.	☐	☐	
Eligible applicant Applicant meets the eligibility requirements stated in the solicitation and 23 U.S.C. 206.	☐	☐	
Eligible project and costs Proposed activities and major cost categories are eligible under the Recreational Trails Program and are not prohibited uses.	☐	☐	
SCORP alignment Application identifies and demonstrates how the project is included in, or furthers a specific goal of, the current Alaska SCORP or other qualifying recreational trail plan.	☐	☐	

Review item	Pass	Fail	Staff findings / required follow-up
Public recreational purpose Project primarily enhances a public recreational trail opportunity and is not principally for transportation, private access, or another non-RTP purpose.	☐	☐	
Land ownership and public access Ownership is identified and required permissions, easements, agreements, or written assurances are provided or can reasonably be completed before authorization. Improvements on private land must include legally binding public access.	☐	☐	
Environmental and permitting information Application identifies likely environmental reviews, permits, consultations, and approvals. No known issue makes the proposed schedule clearly infeasible.	☐	☐	
Budget completeness Required budget form is complete, mathematically accurate, and supported by appropriate estimates or documentation. Budgeted expenditures are consistent with the proposed scope of work and reasonable	☐	☐	
Match compliance Required match amount and source are identified, eligible, adequately documented, and available within the proposed project period.	☐	☐	
Maps and location information Required vicinity and project maps are included and sufficiently identify the project location, trail limits, land ownership, and proposed work.	☐	☐	
Recommend for ARTAC review No unresolved eligibility or completeness issue prevents merit scoring by ARTAC.	☐	☐	

Staff Determination

☐ Proceed to ARTAC scoring ☐ Hold for clarification ☐ Do not advance

Staff reviewer: _____

Date completed: _____

Summary of unresolved issues or conditions:

Alaska Recreational Trail Advisory Committee (ARTAC) SCORE SHEET

Applicant	
Project name	
Reviewer	
Community population	
Final Score	

Project type:

- ☐ New opportunity
- ☐ Missing link
- ☐ Maintenance/rehabilitation
- ☐ Safety/education
- ☐ Historic access trail
- ☐ RS 2477 route

☐ Other: _____

Enter a score for every criterion. Use the full point range and provide comments that explain the basis for the score, particularly when the score is very high, very low, or identifies a material concern.

Applicant Capacity and Long-Term Stewardship (8 points)

Purpose: Assesses whether the applicant has the organizational ability, relevant experience, partnerships, and long-term maintenance approach needed to complete and sustain the project.

Consider:

- Relevant experience or qualified partners
- Clear roles and responsibilities
- Ability to administer the award and complete the work
- Realistic long-term maintenance or stewardship plan

Score	Scoring guidance
8	Strong evidence of relevant capacity, clear responsibilities, and a credible long-term maintenance plan.
6–7	Good capacity and maintenance planning with only minor gaps.
3–5	Basic capacity is demonstrated, but experience, responsibilities, or long-term maintenance is only partly addressed.
1–2	Limited evidence of capacity or a vague maintenance approach.
0	No meaningful evidence that the applicant can complete or sustain the project.

Reviewer comments (*Identify strengths, capacity concerns, and maintenance issues.*)

Score: _____ / 8

Project Description and Scope (10 points)

Purpose: Evaluates whether the proposed scope of work is clear, eligible, feasible, and sufficiently defined to understand what will be constructed, maintained, acquired, or delivered.

Consider:

- Project location and limits (geographical, environmental, or related to access?)
- Feasibility of specific tasks, quantities, and deliverables
- Consistency with eligible RTP work
- Land access and ownership considerations
- Detailed plan for construction, rehabilitation, maintenance, equipment, or education as applicable

Score	Scoring guidance
9–10	Scope is clear, detailed, eligible, internally consistent, and feasible.
7–8	Scope is generally clear and feasible, with minor gaps that should not prevent implementation.
4–6	The general project is understandable, but important scope details, quantities, or feasibility information are limited.
1–3	Scope is vague, incomplete, or raises significant eligibility or feasibility concerns.
0	Insufficient information to understand or evaluate the proposed work.

Reviewer comments *(Note any unclear, unsupported, or potentially ineligible scope elements.)*

Score: _____ / 10

Project Narrative (10 points)

Purpose: Evaluates how clearly the application explains the connection between the project activities and the identified problem, clearly highlighting the need, proposed solution, and expected results.

Consider:

- Demonstrated problem or opportunity
- Clear project goals and expected outcomes
- Logical connection between need, scope, and results
- Relevant local or regional context
- Consistency between narrative, maps, schedule, and budget

Score	Scoring guidance
9–10	Compelling and complete narrative that clearly connects the need, proposed work, and expected results.
7–8	Strong narrative with minor gaps or limited supporting detail.

Score	Scoring guidance
4–6	Adequate explanation of the project, but key connections, evidence, or outcomes are not fully developed.
1–3	Narrative is difficult to follow, incomplete, or weakly supported.
0	Narrative does not provide enough information to understand the need or intended result.

Reviewer comments *(Focus on project substance rather than writing style or grammar.)*

Score: _____ / 10

Project Readiness and Timeline (15 points)

Purpose: Assesses whether the project can proceed promptly after award and whether the schedule is realistic for completing required reviews, design, procurement, construction, and closeout.

Consider:

- Land access and ownership status
- Environmental review and permitting status
- Design or work-plan development
- Procurement readiness
- Committed match and partner commitments
- Realistic milestones and completion date

Score	Scoring guidance
14–15	Shovel-ready or nearly shovel-ready. Land access is secured; environmental, permitting, and design needs are complete or clearly on a short path to completion; match is committed; and the project can move promptly toward authorization and implementation.
10–13	Strong readiness. Most prerequisites are complete or well advanced, and the remaining steps are clearly identified and realistically scheduled.
6–9	Moderate readiness. The project appears feasible, but several important prerequisites remain unresolved, or the schedule is uncertain.
1–5	Low readiness. Major land, environmental, design, permitting, funding, or schedule issues remain unresolved.
0	The project is not ready to proceed or the application does not provide enough information to assess readiness.

Reviewer comments *(For this rubric, “shovel ready” is a program scoring term, not a statutory definition. Explain which prerequisites are complete and what remains.)*

Score: _____ / 15

Maps and Graphics (5 points)

Purpose: Evaluates whether maps and supporting visuals allow reviewers to understand the location, ownership, existing conditions, and proposed work.

Consider:

- Vicinity and project site maps
- Trail boundaries and project features
- Land ownership or management
- Scale, labels, legend, and orientation
- Photos, diagrams, or other visuals when useful

Score	Scoring guidance
5	Maps and visuals are clear, complete, and make the project easy to understand.
3–4	Required maps are present and generally useful, with minor omissions or readability issues.
1–2	Maps are included but lack important detail, clarity, or consistency with the narrative.
0	Required maps are missing or unusable.

Reviewer comments *(Identify any missing location, ownership, or project-detail information.)*

Score: _____ / 5

Public Benefit and SCORP Alignment (22 points)

Purpose: Evaluates the significance, reach, and durability of the public recreational benefit and how well the project advances a specific goal or priority of the current Alaska SCORP or another qualifying recreational trail plan.

Consider:

- Documented public need
- Impact to community based on potential groups of users
- Public access and availability
- Connectivity, missing links, or access to destinations
- Safety, health benefits, social connections, and recreation opportunities
- Benefits to multiple user groups or diverse trail use, where appropriate
- Historic or traditional access, including historic trails or RS 2477 routes, where relevant
- Accessibility and inclusion
- Consistency with identified SCORP goals or priorities
- Long-term public value relative to project cost

Score	Scoring guidance
20–22	Exceptional and well-documented public benefit. The project addresses a significant need, provides broad or critical access, has durable value, and clearly advances identified SCORP or trail-plan goals.

Score	Scoring guidance
15–19	Strong public benefit with good documentation and clear alignment with one or more SCORP or trail-plan goals.
9–14	Meaningful public benefit is described, but evidence, reach, durability, or plan alignment is only moderately developed.
1–8	Public benefit is limited, weakly documented, narrowly available, or only loosely connected to SCORP or trail-plan goals.
0	No demonstrated public recreational benefit or plan alignment.

Reviewer comments *(Do not rely solely on population or total users; explain the importance of the benefit in context.)*

Score: _____ / 22

Community Support, Engagement, and Partnerships (20 points)

Purpose: Evaluates whether affected communities, landowners, tribes, user groups, partners, and the public have been meaningfully engaged and whether support is documented.

Consider:

- Letters of support and partner commitments
- Tribal consultation or coordination, when applicable
- Public meetings, notices, surveys, or other outreach
- Landowner and agency coordination
- Evidence that concerns or opposition were acknowledged and addressed
- Local contributions of funds, labor, materials, equipment, or other resources

Score	Scoring guidance
18–20	Extensive, meaningful, and well-documented engagement with broad support, strong partnerships, and clear commitments.
13–17	Strong support and engagement are demonstrated, with only minor gaps in documentation or representation.
7–12	Moderate support is shown, but engagement is limited, uneven, or not well documented.
1–6	Minimal outreach or support; important affected parties are missing or concerns are not meaningfully addressed.
0	No evidence of community support or engagement.

Reviewer comments *(Opposition does not automatically reduce the score; consider the quality of outreach and response.)*

Score: _____ / 20

Budget Quality, Reasonableness, and Alignment (10 points)

Purpose: Evaluates whether the budget is accurate, adequately supported, reasonable for the project type and location, and aligned with the proposed scope and schedule.

Consider:

- Mathematical accuracy and complete cost categories
- Reasonable labor, equipment, materials, contract, travel, and other costs
- Estimates, quotes, or other support
- Clear relationship between costs, tasks, and timeline
- Appropriate consideration of rural or remote delivery conditions
- Cost effectiveness and absence of unsupported or unrelated costs

Score	Scoring guidance
9–10	Budget is complete, accurate, well supported, reasonable, and closely aligned with the scope and schedule.
7–8	Budget is generally strong, with minor documentation, math, or reasonableness concerns.
4–6	Budget is adequate but contains notable gaps, weak support, or questionable allocations that require clarification.
1–3	Budget contains significant inconsistencies, unsupported costs, or poor alignment with the project.
0	Budget is incomplete or unreliable and cannot be meaningfully evaluated.

Reviewer comments (*Identify specific cost concerns rather than reducing the score for minor clerical issues alone.*)

Score: _____ / 10

SCORING SUMMARY

Criterion	Maximum	Score
Applicant Capacity and Long-Term Stewardship	8	
Project Description and Scope	10	
Project Narrative	10	
Project Readiness and Timeline	15	
Maps and Graphics	5	
Public Benefit and SCORP Alignment	22	
Community Support, Engagement, and Partnerships	20	

Criterion	Maximum	Score
Budget Quality, Reasonableness, and Alignment	10	
TOTAL	100	

Final Reviewer Comments

Final score submitted at the conclusion of the ARTAC public scoring meeting: _____ / 100

DRAFT