



STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & PUBLIC FACILITIES
Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) Agenda
FY27 Multi-Use Trails Application Scoring Instructions
November 10, 2026 12:00 PM – 1:00 PM

This meeting of the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) will take place via Zoom:
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85891304219>

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

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

DOT&PF: Alyssa Miller, Angelica Stabs, Rebecca Garrett

Purpose of the Meeting

The primary objectives of this meeting are to:

1. Approve prior meeting minutes
2. Provide scoring instructions to committee members.
3. Review FY27 Multi-Use Trails applications.

The FY27 Multi-Use Trails application list will be distributed as a supplemental meeting material when available and will be posted with the meeting materials prior to the meeting, if practicable.

Agenda					
Time	Item		Speaker	Purpose	Materials
12:00 PM	Item 1	Call to Order/Roll Call	Alyssa Miller, RTP Program Manager	Information	
	Item 2	Introduction/Purpose of the Meeting	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Information	Materials included
	Item 3	Approval of Agenda	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	
12:05 PM	Item 4	Public Comments	Communications	Public Input	
	Item 5	Approval of May 7, 2026 Meeting Minutes	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	Materials included
	Item 6	Approval of July 21, 2026 Meeting Minutes	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	Materials included
	Item 7	Approval of August 11, 2026 Meeting Minutes	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	Materials included
12:15 PM	Item 8	FY27 Multi-Use Trails Application Scoring Instructions and Review Process	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Information	Materials included

12:40 PM	Item 9	Review Multi-Use Trails Applications	Alyssa Miller, RTP Program Manager	Information	Application list to be provided separately
12:55 PM	Item 10	Public Comments	Communications	Public Input	
1:00 PM	Item 11	Adjourn		Action	

Meeting Minutes

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: May 7, 2026

Time: 12:00 PM – 1:30PM

Location: Via Zoom

Meeting called to order by: Shannon McCarthy/Rebecca Garrett/Hazel Cristobal

In Attendance

- ARTAC Members Present: Lisa Agnew, Jeffrey Collins (12:11PM), Craig Compeau, Lee Hart, Allie Sargent (12:05PM), Terry Valentine, and Jennifer Yuhas.
- Agency Staff Present: Andy Mills, Shannon McCarthy, Hazel Cristobal, Rebecca Garrett (Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF)); Natalya Fomina (Department of Natural Resources).

Summary

The Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) held a meeting on May 7th to review and act on prior meeting minutes and recreational trails applications. The meeting began with technical difficulties, and issues with committee members joining as presenters. Rebecca Garrett, Chair of the ARTAC committee, led the meeting. Hazel conducted a roll call, confirming five members present and two absent, allowing the meeting to proceed.

The agenda included approving prior meeting minutes and reviewing recreational trails applications. Public comments were opened, with speakers representing various organizations and projects, including Valdez Adventure Alliance, snowmobile trail programs, Alaska State Parks, Big Lake Trails, Fairbanks North Star Borough, Kachemak Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve, Eagle River Nature Center, Petersville Community Nonprofit, and the City of Kake. Many commenters provided details on their projects, requested funding, and offered to answer questions.

The committee then began reviewing applications, discussing Petersville Community Nonprofit's Tundra Mats project, Chugach National Forest Trail Brushing, Alaska State Parks' Winter Trailhead Site Improvements, and Petersville Trails and Rescue Center. Key discussion points included discrepancies in budget figures, lack of contractor quotes, concerns about the longevity of materials, and clarity on land access and partnership letters. Some committee members, like Ali

Sargent, indicated they scored lower due to lack of detail in budget breakdown or justification for specific items. Several committee members expressed a desire for clearer guidelines and a more streamlined application process, particularly regarding quotes, project timelines, and the applicability of scoring criteria to diverse project types (equipment, safety/education, trail construction). There was also discussion about how to handle conflicts of interest and how to ensure consistent scoring standards across different applicant types.

The meeting included discussions on several specific projects, with some applicants providing clarifications and responses to committee questions during public comments. The meeting involved a detailed review and scoring of several project applications: the City of Bethel's YK Trail, the City of Cake's Cape Community Nature Trail, the Buskin River Safety and Education Project, and the Silver King SRA Groundwater Education Project. Discussions highlighted issues such as missing match information, inconsistencies in project descriptions and budgets, and the need for clarification on specific task details and eligible costs. The group decided to follow up with applicants for clarification on key issues, particularly regarding funding match and budget discrepancies. The educational projects (Buskin River and Silver King) were noted as falling within a special set aside for RTP funds. The meeting concluded with a plan to update score sheets, finalize scores, and make decisions based on a 30/30/40 split for funding. The next meeting will focus on scoring criteria for the upcoming application season.

Technical Difficulties

Initial challenges with meeting access and presenter roles.

Meeting Logistics

Roll call, approval of prior meeting minutes, and establishment of public comment procedures (2-minute limit, hand-raising for unmuting).

Application Review Process: **Scoring Discussion**

Committee members presented and justified their scores for each application.

Common Issues Identified

Lack of detailed contractor quotes or bids.

Discrepancies in budget figures and narratives.

Insufficient justification for specific equipment or material choices.

Inconsistent or missing public notice documentation (e.g., photos of postings, incorrect dates).

Clarity on land access and letters of support from relevant entities (e.g., borough, state parks).

Concerns about the longevity and durability of proposed materials for projects.

Clarity on ADA accessibility implementation.

Questions regarding the categorization of projects (e.g., motorized vs. non-motorized for equipment purchases).

Lack of detail on equipment maintenance plans or disposal.

Inconsistencies in tribal consultation documentation.

Recommendations for Future Application Cycles

Clearer instructions for uploading supporting documents (e.g., quotes, maps).
Dedicated sections for equipment requests in budget workbooks.
Guidance on documenting the efficacy or alternatives considered for project solutions.
Standardized expectations for all applicants (state, non-profit, tribal entities).
Improved clarification on match contributions (volunteer vs. monetary) and documentation.

Application Feedback and Clarification

Need for clarification on funding match for the Kake Community Nature Trail.
Questions about the eligibility of specific costs (e.g., \$40,000 planning study).
Concerns regarding consistency between project descriptions, public notices, and budgets.
Blank Task 3 in an application spreadsheet.

DOT&PF Policy and Procedure

Confirmation that scores must be based on submitted applications, with follow-up questions for applicants handled after the meeting.
Mention of a 5% cap for educational use of Recreational Trails Program (RTP) funds, with two projects falling under this special set aside.
Decision-making for funding will be based on a 30/30/40 split after scores are finalized.

Committee Process & Future Steps

Ability to adjust scores live during the meeting.
Clarification on accessing reviewer comments for applicants (via Submittable).
Discussion on the possibility of continuing the meeting to complete application reviews due to time constraints, and the public notice requirements for such a continuation.
Acknowledgement that some applicants, despite submitting quotes, experienced issues with them appearing in Submittable, indicating system-level improvements are needed.
Acknowledgement of the small trail community leading to familiarity among applicants and reviewers, and the need to clarify conflict of interest guidelines.
Natalia to send instructions for updating score sheets.
Final scores will be made public.
DOT&PF will make final funding decisions.
A follow-up meeting will be scheduled soon to continue working on scoring criteria for the next application season.

Motion to adjourn was made at 2:16 p.m. and was passed.

Meeting Minutes

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: July 21, 2026 (Tuesday)

Time: 2:00 PM – 3:00PM

Location: Via Zoom

Meeting called to order by: Angelica Stabs/Rebecca Garrett/Hazel Cristobal

In Attendance

- ARTAC Members Present: Lisa Agnew (2:14pm), Craig Compeau, Lee Hart, Allie Sargent, Terry Valentine, and Jennifer Yuhas.
- ARTAC Members Absent: Jeffrey Collins
- Agency Staff Present: Angelica Stabs, Hazel Cristobal, Rebecca Garrett (Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF))

Summary

The meeting focused on the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), specifically reviewing and updating committee bylaws, discussing the multi-use trails scoring rubric, and evaluating Snowtrails applications for funding. Key discussions included refining the bylaws for officer vacancies and public comment opportunities, and a significant debate on the multi-use trails scoring rubric, particularly regarding scoring criteria for project readiness, community support, and the numerical value of users. The committee also initiated a discussion on accountability and oversight for Snowtrails funding, prompted by concerns about past project execution.

Key Topics

Bylaws, Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric, and Snowtrails FY27 funding.

Technical Issues:

Initial delays due to incorrect display names for panelists, which were resolved by the host.

Agenda Approval:

The agenda was approved following a motion and a second.

Public Comment:

No public comments were received.

Roll Call:

Conducted to confirm committee member attendance and identify remaining incorrectly named participants.

Members Present: Craig Compau, Lee Hart, Allie Sargent, Terry Valentine, Jennifer Yue, Lisa Agnew (joined at 2:14pm).

Members Absent: Lisa Agnew (initially), Jeffrey Collins (excused).
Five members present allowed the meeting to proceed.

Funding Opportunities:

National Park Service Funding: Two new opportunities were announced:

Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership (ORLP): Supports creation or rehabilitation of outdoor recreation facilities in underserved communities. [ORLP Link](#)

Readiness and Recreation Initiative (RARI): A new Land and Water Conservation Fund program for recreation projects involving land acquisition that promote military readiness, compatible land use, or disaster resilience. [RARI Link](#)

Action: No committee action was requested; information was provided for awareness.

Contact: Members were advised to contact the presenter or the Department of Natural Resources for more information.

Bylaws Review:

Changes Discussed:

Section 1.3 (Special Meetings): Changed "in the chair's absence" to "if a vice chair has been elected, then by the vice chair in the chair's absence," to allow flexibility as no vice chair has been elected.

Section 2.3 (Public Comment): Changed from "an opportunity for public comment at the beginning and end of each meeting" to "one or more opportunities for public comment as determined by the chair and consistent with the applicable law" for greater flexibility.

Grammar Clean-up: Minor grammatical corrections.

Section 6.0 (Officers): Clarified that officers "may include a vice chair."

Section 7.5 (Vacancy): Rewritten to state: "If a vice chair has been elected, the vice chair shall assume the duties of the chair until a successor is elected. If no vice chair exists, the committee shall elect an acting chair at the next meeting."

Section 9.0 (Unexcused Absences): Changed the number of unexcused absences from two to three for removal from the committee.

Discussion on Absences: Debate on whether absence criteria should remain in the bylaws or be handled as policy. Consensus to retain it for accountability.

Bylaws Approval: Motion to approve the bylaws with the discussed changes was made, seconded, and approved without objection.

Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric Review

Timeline:

Applications aim to open in August and close by end of October to align with previous RTP solicitations.

Historic Access:

A suggestion was made to add "preserving or reopening historic access" as a scoring criterion, particularly for Alaska's historic trails.

Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric Discussion:

Clarification Process: A method was proposed for applicants to submit questions to staff, who would then disseminate answers to the entire committee, ensuring consistency and fairness.

Pre-Scoring Q&A: A strong recommendation for staff to host a webinar early in the application period to explain changes to the scoring rubric, allowing applicants to tailor their submissions.

Single Scoring Round: Committee members expressed a desire to avoid multiple rounds of scoring, preferring that all clarifications and additional information be provided before initial scoring.

Application Completeness (Section 2): Suggested to be a "pass/fail" criterion, rather than a scored item, as incomplete applications should not proceed.

Applicant Capacity and Readiness: Discussion centered on how to score projects where a contractor is hired versus the applicant's direct experience. Clarification that the applicant remains responsible for oversight.

Project Description and Scope: No significant comments.

Project Narrative Completeness: Suggested to remove "completeness" from the title as it overlaps with general application completeness.

Timeline (Section 5):

Weighting: Concerns raised that the 10-point weighting for timeline is too high.

Shovel-Readiness: Discussion about incorporating "shovel-readiness" (projects ready for immediate implementation) into the scoring. Federal guidelines were checked, confirming states can use this as a scoring factor. Proposed to either give it high point value or a bonus.

Maps and Graphics: Emphasized the need for professionally drawn, scaled maps.

Public Benefit (Section 7) and Community Support and Engagement (Section 8):

Number of Users: Proposal to remove "number of users" as a scoring criterion due to potential bias against rural communities and difficulty in accurate estimation. Suggested it could be a data point rather than a scoring factor.

Types of Users: Reaffirmed the importance of considering diverse user types (e.g., disabled, elderly) and broad public access.

Proportionality: Discussion on how to score projects fairly in small communities where the number of users is lower but the impact is significant.

Historical Access: Reiteration to ensure historical access considerations are clearly incorporated.

Community Support Weighting: Suggestion to increase the point value for community support and engagement due to its critical importance.

State Parks Applications: Frustration expressed regarding State Parks applications potentially lacking sufficient community support documentation in previous rounds, suggesting stricter requirements for all applicants.

Quantifying Support: Discussion on how to objectively quantify community support, considering diversity of groups (e.g., multiple agencies, tribes, non-profits, businesses, varying outreach

methods). Avoid strict numerical requirements due to community size differences.

Budget Quality and Accuracy (Section 10) and Budget Reasonableness and Alignment (Section 11): Suggested combining these two sections.

Leveraging Funds: Interest in knowing if applicants are securing other grants for related projects, suggesting a more comprehensive plan.

Funding and Match Compliance (Section 12): Proposed that staff handle this as a pass/fail compliance check during initial application review.

Snowtrails Application Review FY27:

Overview: A list of snow trail applicants and their requested funding was presented. No full applications were reviewed, only summary notes and scores. Reduced budgets for some applicants were noted.

Accountability and Progress Reports:

Terry Valentine's Concern: Raised concerns about project execution quality for some past recipients and requested progress reports for all funded Snowtrails projects.

Rationale: To ensure taxpayer money is well-utilized, projects are executed effectively, and to inform future funding decisions.

Proposed Solutions:

Monthly Reports: Staff (Rebecca) can pull monthly reports including financial data and pictures for snow trail grooming.

Public Survey/Member Surveys: Suggested implementing a public or member survey (e.g., QR codes at trailheads, simple 5-10 question format) to gauge satisfaction and quality of grooming.

GPS Tracking: Proposed requiring GPS tracking for all grooming machines to verify miles groomed, similar to practices in construction or Matsu Borough's existing system.

Objectivity: Difficulty in objectively measuring grooming quality due to weather, use, and volunteer availability.

Implementation: Questions about staff capacity to manage GPS data, and whether it's appropriate to add new stipulations to current funding applications.

Cost: GPS units and internet service costs are currently not funded by the program.

Specific Applicant Discussion:

Eureka Trails: Noted for a significantly larger ask due to increased miles (estimated 120 additional miles). Concerns raised about the cost per mile and potential overlap with other clubs like Lake Louise.

Hatcher Pass: High cost per mile attributed to alpine terrain and extensive brushing work.

Matsu Borough: Confirmed Matsu Borough clubs receive some funding and utilize GPS tracking, with data often publicly available.

Timeline for Snowtrails Awards: Goal to have awards in place by October 1st, optimally finalized before September due to FHWA closing period.

Next Steps for Snowtrails: Staff will clarify Committee's request for information and provide the map for Eureka Trails for committee review before the next meeting to decide on funding. A meeting will be scheduled soon.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made at 3:48 p.m., seconded, and approved.

Meeting Minutes

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: August 11, 2026 (Tuesday)

Time: 2:00 PM – 3:00PM

Location: Via Zoom

Meeting called to order by: Angelica Stabs/Rebecca Garrett

In Attendance

- ARTAC Members Present: Lisa Agnew, Craig Compeau, Lee Hart, Allie Sargent, Terry Valentine, and Jennifer Yuhas.
- ARTAC Members Absent: Jeffrey Collins
- Agency Staff Present: Angelica Stabs, and Rebecca Garrett (Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF)) and Natalya Fomina, Department of Natural Resources.

Summary

The ARTAC committee met to discuss fiscal year (FY) 27 snowtrails funding and multi-use trails scoring rubric. Rebecca presented the updated scoring rubric with revised weights and criteria, including specific points for historic access trails. The committee reviewed 13 snowtrails applications, with discussion about Eureka Trails application due to compliance issues with nonprofit status and procurement policies. After debate, the committee voted to fund the entire slate of snowtrails projects with a contingency that Eureka Trails must complete their required paperwork before funding can be awarded. The committee also discussed the need for better preprocessing of applications to ensure all documentation is complete before committee review. Lee suggested forming a formalized process to prevent similar issues in future cycles and recommended adding discussion about grant applicant recusal policies to the next agenda. The committee agreed to schedule their next meeting for early November to review multi-use trails applications once DOT&PF completes their initial review.

Introduction to Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric

Rebecca Garrett (DOT&PF) introduces the multi-use trails scoring rubric for discussion. Jennifer Yuhas confirms that the rubric includes the changes discussed in previous meetings.

Rebecca Garrett (DOT&PF) explains the changes made to the rubric, including clearer instructions and percentages for scoring.

Angelica Stabs (DOT&PF) informs Craig Compeau that he has been promoted to a panelist.

Detailed Review of Scoring Rubric

Rebecca Garrett (DOT&PF) reviews the scoring rubric in detail, explaining each criterion and its weight. The rubric includes criteria such as applicant capacity, project description, project readiness, maps and graphics, public benefit, community support, and budget quality.

Jennifer Yuhas raises a concern about the inclusion of historic access trails, emphasizing their importance in Alaska. Craig Compeau supports the inclusion of historic access trails, sharing his experience with BLM and RS 2477 trails.

Discussion on Historic Access Trails

Rebecca Garrett (DOT&PF) agrees to update the rubric to clarify the inclusion of historic access trails. Plans to update the rubric to ensure applicants understand the need to clarify historic access trails. The committee agrees to accept scoring rubric after the updates are made.

Fiscal Year 27 Snowtrails Funding Discussion

Jennifer Yuhas places the fiscal year 27 snowtrails funding on the table for discussion. Rebecca Garrett (DOT&PF) presents the 13 applications received for snow trails funding, including mileage and cost per mile. And explains that Eureka Trails has not provided all the required documentation and is not currently approved for funding.

Concerns and Clarifications on Snowtrails Funding

Terry Valentine expresses concern about the high costs in Eureka Trails' application compared to other clubs. Rebecca Garrett (DOT&PF) clarifies that Eureka Trails has not completed their paperwork and is not currently eligible for funding. Lee Hart and Jennifer Yuhas discuss the importance of ensuring all paperwork is complete before approving funding. The committee decided to fund all other snow trails applications without Eureka Trails.

Public Comment and Final Vote

Petersville Nonprofit thanks the committee for their efforts and timely processing of grants. Lee Hart suggests formalizing the process to ensure all paperwork is complete before grant approval. The committee discusses the timing of future meetings and the need to review multi-use trail applications. A motion is made to adjourn the meeting, with a consensus to meet in early November to review multi-use trail applications.

Next Steps

Rebecca: Update the Multi-Use Trails Scoring Rubric to clearly reference and explain "Historic Access Trails" without specifically naming RS2477, ensuring applicants understand when to reference historic access.

Rebecca: Review and clarify the accounting process for unspent Snowtrails funds and report back to the committee.

Rebecca: Work with Matsu Borough and potentially DNR/State Parks to explore options for a website or system to track and report on winter trail grooming conditions.

Rebecca: Finalize the Multi-Use Trails application process in Submittable and open applications, considering adjusting the deadline from end of October to mid-October if possible.

Rebecca: Propose dates for the next ARTAC meeting early to mid-November to discuss the scoring process for Multi-Use Trails applications.

Rebecca: Follow up Eureka Trails to ensure they complete all requested paperwork (procurement documents, conflict of interest policy) and bring them back to the committee for reconsideration once completed.

Genevieve (Eureka Trails): Complete and submit all requested paperwork (procurement documents, conflict of interest policy) to DOT as soon as possible.

Committee: Consider formalizing a process to ensure all applicant paperwork is complete before grants are considered for approval at future meetings.

Committee: Add an agenda for the next meeting to discuss whether committee members who assist grant applicants should recuse themselves from voting on those grants.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made at 3:25 p.m., seconded, and approved.

MULTI-USE TRAILS

ARTAC Reviewer Instructions, Staff Review, and Score Sheet

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.

Conflicts and Applicant Assistance

- Members may provide general public information but may not assist with drafting, editing, or strengthening a specific application. Before reviewing applications, members must disclose any assistance, affiliation, or interest involving an applicant. Members must not score or discuss an application they assisted. A member who is an applicant, or whose immediate family or affiliated organization is an applicant, is recused from reviewing and scoring all applications in that funding cycle. Direct questions to the ARTAC Chair and DOT&PF program staff.

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 ☐ 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 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.	☐	☐	
Public recreational purpose Project primarily enhances a public recreational trail opportunity and is not	☐	☐	

Review item	Pass	Fail	Staff findings / required follow-up
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

Select all that apply: ☐ New recreational opportunity ☐ Missing link ☐ Maintenance or rehabilitation
☐ Safety and education ☐ Historic access trail ☐ 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.
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
- 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.
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	
Budget Quality, Reasonableness, and Alignment	10	
TOTAL	100	

Final Reviewer Comments

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