



STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & PUBLIC FACILITIES
Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) Agenda
February 24, 2026, 12:00 PM – 1:00 PM

This meeting will take place via Zoom: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81535159833>

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

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

DOT&PF: Andy Mills, Shannon McCarthy, Hazel Cristobal, and Rebecca Garrett

Purpose Meeting: The purpose of this meeting is to review and take action on prior meeting minutes, review and take action on the committee bylaws, and review and discuss the project scoring criteria.

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

Agenda					
Time	Item		Speaker	Purpose	Materials
12:00 PM	Item 1	Call to Order/Roll Call	Hazel Cristobal		
	Item 2	Introduction and Review of Meeting Purpose	Rebecca Garrett, Chair		Materials included
	Item 3	Approval of Agenda	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	
12:05 PM	Item 4	General Public Comments	Comm		
12:10 PM	Item 5	Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	Materials included
12:15 PM	Item 6	Review Red Line Version of By-Laws	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	Materials included
12:45 PM	Item 7	Introduction to Existing Scoring Criteria for Recreational Trails Program (Multi-Use Trails)	Committee Members	Discussion	Materials included
12:50 PM	Item 8	General Public Comments	Comms		
12:58 PM	Item 9	Set Date for Next Meeting	Rebecca Garrett, Chair	Action	
1:00 PM	Item 10	Adjourn			

Meeting Minutes

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: January 13, 2026

Time: 12:00 PM – 1:00PM

Location: Via Zoom

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

In Attendance

- ARTAC Members Present: Lisa Agnew, Craig Compeau, Jeffrey Collins, Allie Sargent, Terry Valentine, and Jennifer Yuhas
- ARTAC Member Absent: Lee Hart
- Agency Staff Present: Ryan Anderson, Andy Mills, Shannon McCarthy, Hazel Cristobal, Rebecca Garrett (Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF)); Ricky Gease (Department of Natural Resources).

Summary

The committee received information regarding Alaska’s multi-use trail system, including winter trails, ice roads, and seasonal roads, and their role in statewide transportation access and economic development. Information was provided regarding expanded federal funding eligibility under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, as well as challenges related to federal requirements, nonprofit agreements, and fund transfers.

Information was presented on the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) and its flexibility in working with private non-profits. DOT&PF reported that, under Administrative Order 361, the RTP is being transitioned to the department and that the Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) has been formally established to provide advisory recommendations on prioritization and allocation of funds for multi-use trails, winter trails, snowtrails, and ice roads.

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) was identified as a primary funding mechanism. DOT&PF reported that development of the 2026–2029 STIP is underway. ARTAC members were informed of challenges affecting the current Snowtrails Program, including federal requirements impacting implementation.

Roles and responsibilities were reviewed, with ARTAC serving in an advisory capacity and DOT&PF responsible for program administration, implementation, and compliance.

RTP funding requirements were reviewed, including allocation guidelines of 40 percent for diverse trail uses, 30 percent for motorized trails, and 30 percent for non-motorized trails. DOT&PF reported that RTP applications will be reopened using existing scoring criteria. The Snowtrails Program was reported to include 13 applications totaling over \$2 million in available funding, requiring ARTAC review and recommendation.

Follow-Up Items

- ARTAC will review and provide recommendations on existing Snowtrails projects, including the 13 current applications totaling over \$2 million in available funding.
- DOT&PF will reopen the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) application process using existing scoring criteria for current applications.
- ARTAC, in coordination with DOT&PF, will develop a prioritized list of trail projects suitable for matching funds from donors or private entities.
- ARTAC will deliberate and designate a public member to serve as Vice-Chair.
- ARTAC will identify and discuss statewide maintenance needs for existing trail systems.
- DOT&PF and ARTAC will consider development of a user survey to gather stakeholder input on trail use and funding priorities.
- ARTAC will review existing scoring criteria for Snowtrails, Ice Roads, and other RTP-funded programs.
- ARTAC will prepare for the review of Ice Road applications for the upcoming funding cycle.

Nomination & Selection of Chair and Vice-Chair

A motion was made and seconded that the Commissioner's designee, Rebecca Garrett, be designated as Chair of ARTAC, with a public member to serve as Vice Chair. The motion passed. Selection of the Vice-Chair will be addressed as a future action item.

Next meeting

Quarterly meetings proposed (March, June or August, October, December or January) with additional smaller meetings as needed for time-sensitive items such as Snowtrails projects. Meeting times will remain flexible to accommodate member availability.

Motion to adjourn was made at 12:58 p.m. and was passed.

Meeting Minutes

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: January 21, 2026

Time: 12:00 PM – 1:00PM

Location: Via Zoom

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

In Attendance

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

Summary

The Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (ARTAC) meeting on January 21, 2026, discussed the Snowtrails program, applications, and funding methodology. Committee members confirmed the use of reasonable and transparent criteria for project evaluation. Andy Morrison representing Alaska Backcountry Access raised concerns about funding for federal lands. The committee voted to proceed with the Snowtrails program, releasing federal funds for fiscal year 26. They also discussed the need for expediency in awarding funds and planned to review bylaws and charter in the next meeting, scheduled via Doodle poll. The meeting concluded at 12:27 PM.

Overview and Applications

- Snowtrails Program is a subrecipient award to local nonprofits, tribes, municipalities, or government agencies for grooming existing trails.
- Eligible activities include snow grooming, brush cutting, and similar trail maintenance.
- Funding source chosen: Recreational Trail Program (RTP) pending an advisory motion from ARTAC; STBG was previously considered but deemed more burdensome.
- Administration funding is forthcoming; inspections are planned and a partnership with the Matanuska Susitna Borough will assist inspections and reduce admin costs; reporting requires photo documentation.

- Committee requested confirmation of state-agency oversight for accountability; grants were previously submitted/tentatively approved and are being confirmed for procedural appropriateness

Funding Source and Federal/State Process Details

- Advisory motion requested to use Recreational Trail Program (RTP) funds for the snowtrails snow-grooming program instead of STBG; funding is specific to multi-use snow trails.
- Projects are for FY26 only; awards were intended by October 1 but that deadline was missed.
- Clubs are operating on state (non-participating) funds currently; many awards historically issued in December or January.
- Planned timeline: applications in March–April, committee review and advisory recommendation in June, awards in place before October 1 to allow year-round maintenance (tree/brush removal, etc.).
- Federal award release requires this advisory vote; federal award process takes 4–6 weeks, staff will supplement with additional state funds while federal processing occurs; some awards already signed and funded by state.

Vote, Recusal, Governance & Next Meeting

- Advisory motion to release federal funds passed by roll call 6-0-1 (abstain) and was forwarded to the commissioner.
- Federal award processing is expected to take 4–6 weeks; additional state funds will bridge awards while awaiting federal release; funding spreadsheet breaks out federal and state amounts by award.
- Committee will review bylaws, charter, program criteria and scoring for RTP, Snowtrails, Ice Roads, and Winter Trail marking and will aim to move applications earlier in the year.
- Next meeting to be scheduled via Doodle poll in 2–3 weeks with midday and evening options; at least two members requested avoiding Wednesday noon.
- Member recused due to board membership in a recipient; parliamentarian noted that a tied vote with recusals (e.g., 3-3) would result in a failed motion.

Motion to adjourn was made at 12:27 p.m. and was passed.

Meeting Minutes

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: February 5, 2026

Time: 12:00 PM – 1:00PM

Location: Via Zoom

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

In Attendance

- ARTAC Members Present: Lisa Agnew, Craig Compeau, Jeffrey Collins, Lee Hart (12:12PM), Allie Sargent, 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 meeting focused on reviewing government documents, introducing scoring criteria for the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), and addressing other business.

Public comments highlighted concerns about the exclusion of for-profit businesses, the 1099 model for snowmobile trail work, and the geographic inequality of the club-based grant system, particularly for Western Alaska. Bylaws need further revisions based on committee and public feedback, including public comment sections and record-keeping details. The Charter was approved with minor edits. Significant discussion revolved around the scoring criteria for the Multi-Use Trails and Ice Roads/Snow Trails programs, with a focus on reducing the weight of the "general quality and accuracy" category and incorporating equity considerations. The meeting concluded at 12:55 PM.

Decisions Made

Agenda Approval: The agenda for the current meeting was approved.

Motion by: Jeffrey Collins

Seconded by: Jennifer Yuhas

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes: Postponed due to minutes not being included in packets. Will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Adoption of Charter: The charter was adopted as written; with the understanding that "draft" will be removed.

Motion by: Jennifer Yuhas

Seconded by: Lee Hart

Scoring Criteria Discussion: A motion was made and seconded to initiate discussion on the scoring criteria without expectation of adopting specifics at this meeting.

Motion by: Jennifer Yuhas

Seconded by: Allie Sargent

Tasks

Bylaws Revision: Rebecca to prepare edits for the bylaws based on comments received, to be reviewed at the next meeting.

Details: Incorporate feedback on actions between meetings (4.3), officer elections (7.1), officer removal (7.3), public participation specifics (2.3), and meeting records (2.5).

Charter Edits: Rebecca to remove "draft" language from the charter.

Scoring Criteria Revision: Rebecca to prepare a marked-up version or new draft of the scoring criteria based on committee comments for discussion at the next meeting.

Details: Address the weighting of the "general quality and accuracy" category (28 points), consider breaking it into subcategories (e.g., narrative clarity, budget accuracy, schedule feasibility, completeness), incorporate historical access considerations, explore a rating system for previous awardees, and address geographic equity concerns (e.g., population served, rural/remote areas).

Public Comment Emails: Committee members to send emails with their comments on the bylaws and scoring criteria to Rebecca.

Responsible: All committee members

Meeting Scheduling: Rebecca to send out a Doodle Poll for the next meeting, approximately two weeks from now.

Deadlines

Public Comment Submission (Bylaws & Scoring Criteria): Within the next three days (from the meeting date).

Next Meeting: Approximately two weeks from the current meeting date (Doodle Poll to be sent out).

Follow-up Actions

Bylaws Re-review: Committee to review the revised bylaws at the next meeting with potential action.

Scoring Criteria Re-discussion: Committee to discuss the new draft of the scoring criteria at the next meeting.

Public Comment Periods: Ensure future meetings include two public comment periods: one at the beginning and one at the end.

Record Keeping: Provide specific directions for where meeting materials and minutes can be found.

Discussion Points

Public Comment Period Structure: Request for more specific details on when public comment sections occur and for two comment opportunities per meeting (beginning and end).

Bylaws Content:

Redundancy of "advisory only" statement in 4.3.

Clarity on officer elections (7.1) and removal (7.3) regarding commissioner concurrence and "at will" appointments.

Inclusion of guidelines for written comments and clear links to meeting records.

Charter Content: General agreement on the charter, with Rebecca noting the removal of "draft." Andy Mills provided context on the purpose of a department charter (vision, mission, values).

Scoring Criteria (Multi-Use Trails, Ice Roads, Snow Trails):

Weight of "General Quality and Accuracy" (28 points): Concerns raised about this category being too heavily weighted, potentially penalizing applicants with less writing expertise and focusing on grammar/spelling over project quality. Suggestions to break it into subcategories (e.g., narrative clarity, budget accuracy, schedule feasibility, completeness).

New Recreation Assets Criterion: Lee Hart pointed out that the current scoring focuses solely on new assets, while RTP grants have broader allowable uses. Suggested indicating which of the seven general priority areas a grant fall under.

Historical Access: Jennifer Yuhas proposed adding criteria to consider projects that facilitate or further historic access.

Previous Awardee Performance: Jennifer Yuhas suggested a rating system for past awardees (like vendor procurement) to identify good partners and those who defaulted, while acknowledging the need to consider changes in entity leadership.

Geographic Equity:

Concerns about funding primarily going to Railbelt snowmobile clubs and the exclusion of Western Alaska and other rural areas.

Lisa Agnew proposed adding a geographic question to the scoring, such as prioritizing projects in rural/remote areas or outside the Railbelt.

Lee Hart questioned the "population served" criterion, arguing it biases against projects in smaller communities that may have significant impact. Suggested focusing on "depth of partnerships."

Andy Mills provided context on DOT's Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) which considers geographic parity, acknowledging higher infrastructure costs in some areas.

Subjective Terminology: Lee Hart noted the use of subjective terms in the criteria (e.g., "excellence") that lack clear definitions for applicants and scorers.

Procurement/Bidding Requirements: Lee Hart highlighted issues with requirements like three bids for materials over \$1,000, which can be unfeasible in remote communities with limited vendors.

Public Notice and Landowner Identification: Lisa Agnew suggested these should be eligibility requirements (yay/nay) rather than scored items, arguing that failure to meet them should disqualify an application. Rebecca confirmed public notice is a requirement for application.

Public Comment (Second Period):

Andy Morrison reiterated concerns about permit procurement violations, discrimination against Western Alaska due to the nonprofit-only restriction, and federal non-compliance issues if the charter funds unpermitted entities. He urged the board to amend the eligibility section to be "entity neutral."

Jennifer Yuhas sought clarification from staff on whether applications were received from Western Alaska for the Snow Trails program, noting none were received. She also reiterated that many tribal entities and local governments are nonprofits and asked about federal constraints on funds. Rebecca confirmed that RTP funds, used for snow trails, have specific eligibility criteria, limiting applicants to nonprofits, tribes, and local governments, and it is a grant program, not a bid program.

Motion to adjourn was made at 12:55 p.m. and was passed.

Alaska Recreational Trails Advisory Committee
(ARTAC)
Bylaws
February 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 in the Chair's absence by the Vice Chair, 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 an opportunity for public comment at the beginning and end of each meeting, except as otherwise limited by law.

Members of the public may provide testimony orally during the meeting or submit written comments in advance of the meeting. Written comments shall be submitted to the designated Department staff contact identified in the public meeting notice and must be 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 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. Election of the Chair shall be subject to concurrence by the Commissioner of DOT&PF or designee.

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

Officers shall serve one-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.

Officers may serve no more than two 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

In the event of a vacancy in the office of Chair, the Vice Chair shall assume the duties of Chair until a successor is elected by the Committee.

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.

The Chair shall not exercise independent decision-making authority on behalf of the Committee except as expressly provided in these Bylaws.

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 absence from two (2) 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

ARTAC Scoring Rubric Comments

Compeau:

- Create a timely and simple scoring criteria for projects after completion. Perhaps a rating system (1-20) that provides good review for future bids/history. Need to discuss how review is scored and by whom.

-emphasis on historical trails and RS2477's when reviewing potential trail systems

- Need to adjust scoring criteria for project bid sheet. 28 points should be reduced (by appx 25%) to 20 points to eliminate less important scoring for issues that address grammar, presentation details, etc. Those 8 points to be moved to more project focused details to provide a more valuable final bidder score.

Yuhas:

Section VIII Public Benefit, does the project facilitate historical access?

Would like to see criteria that covers:

-How an entity plans to overcome any past hurdles and reward good partners (like in Procurement)

Sargent:

1. Add explicit anchor examples for *each score band*

- **5 points:** Clear problem statement supported by local data or documented need; benefits multiple user groups or communities
- **3 points:** General description of need with limited supporting detail
- **1 point:** Need is asserted but not explained or supported

2. Acknowledge Community Context and Scale

Smaller, rural, and capacity-limited communities may propose appropriately scaled projects that meet critical local needs but appear less “polished” than larger applications.

Suggested edit: Include a short statement indicating that projects should be evaluated in relation to community size, capacity, and context, and that smaller communities should not be disadvantaged for proposing right-sized projects.

3. Increase Transparency in High-Weight Scoring Sections

Sections such as “General Quality and Accuracy” carry significant weight and combine multiple factors into a single score.

Suggested edit: Either break these into informal sub-components (e.g., narrative clarity, budget accuracy, schedule feasibility), or require a brief written justification for unusually high or low scores to support consistency and public understanding.

4. Clarify How Public Opposition Is Considered

Some criteria reference the absence of “serious opposition” without defining how opposition is weighed.

Suggested edit: Clarify that the presence of opposition alone does not disqualify a project, and that reviewers should consider whether concerns have been acknowledged and addressed through outreach or mitigation.

5. Expand Definitions of Community Support

Current requirements emphasize formal letters and notices, which may unintentionally disadvantage rural or Tribal applicants.

Suggested edit: Allow additional forms of community support documentation, such as meeting summaries, Tribal consultation records, resolutions, or other culturally appropriate engagement methods. Emphasize the quality of engagement rather than the quantity of letters.

6. Improve Transparency of Final Funding Outcomes

Suggested edit: After project selection, publish a brief public summary listing funded projects, total scores, and a short narrative describing how selected projects align with program priorities. This would support public trust and reduce confusion about outcomes.

Hart:

Section II – General Quality and adherence to directions

-Move the and just 3 points for spelling and grammar, the other 25 points should be allocated to already existing categories.

Section III – Project Description, Scope of Work

“Evidence of access and project permission from all property owners is included...” should be a requirement. This is a pass/fail

Section V proposed budget

-Should allow google sheets since not all applicants use MS products*

*State of Alaska in general can't access google documents. Getting permission is very difficult due to security concerns.

-The three bid for items over \$1,000 is very difficult. Propose changing the limit to \$5,000.

-Propose increasing match math to 5 points to encourage correct math.

Section VII Public Benefit

-Remove “project benefits the public at little to no cost to the individual (subjective)

-“Estimated number and types of users provided” estimated number of users is discriminatory to smaller communities. better would be to ask the applicant to describe how the project benefits the local community and/or visitor economy.

-“Does the project provide new recreational opportunities?” this is not the only general allowable use for these funds. this should not be a scored item but rather a checkbox at the top for the applicant to indicate what type of project this is: new recreational asset; maintenance or restoration of a recreational asset, education/safety/training, equipment purchase, land acquisition, trailhead facilities, assessment (new trail feasibility and route planning) . Applicant should check only one, most relevant category.

-abilities: Increase the score to 5 for accommodating a range of physical abilities, skills and ages

Section VIII

Community Support

-Letters of support, increase score to 5 and 5 points would be for more than three letters.

-Project included in the SCORP should be increased to 10 since it is a federal requirement

-Public Notice section needs improvement, instructions for applicant’s vs instructions for scorers.

Collins:

MAJOR STRUCTURAL CHANGES

OLD STRUCTURE (8 sections, 100 points):

3. Section II: General Quality and Accuracy - 28 points
4. Section III: Project Description - 10 points
5. Section IV: Timeline - 10 points
6. Section V: Proposed Budget - 25 points
7. Section VI: Funding/Commitment - 2 points
8. Section VII: Public Benefit - 14 points
9. Section VIII: Community Support - 11 points Total: 100 points (Section VIII appears to have 3 uncounted points)

NEW STRUCTURE (12 sections, 100 points):

10. Section II: Application Completeness - 8 points
11. Section III: Budget Quality and Accuracy - 10 points
12. Section IV: Budget Reasonableness - 7 points
13. Section V: Narrative Quality - 8 points
14. Section VI: Maps and Graphics - 5 points
15. Section VII: Applicant Capacity - 7 points
16. Section VIII: Project Description - 10 points
17. Section IX: Project Timeline - 10 points
18. Section X: Funding/Commitment - 2 points
19. Section XI: Public Benefit - 14 points

20. Section XII: Community Support - 14 points Total: 100 points (corrected total for Community Support)

BREAKDOWN OF FORMER SECTION II (28 POINTS)

The original 28-point section has been divided into 6 sections:

1. APPLICATION COMPLETENESS (8 points) What it measures: Whether required components are submitted Removed subjective language: "professional and well done," "quality execution" New approach: Simple checklist of required components
2. BUDGET QUALITY AND ACCURACY (10 points) What it measures: Budget format, documentation, and mathematical accuracy Removed subjective language: "very detailed," "well composed" New approach: Objective criteria with point-by-point checklist
3. BUDGET REASONABLENESS (7 points) What it measures: Whether budget items align with project scope Removed subjective language: "reasonable for location" New approach: Consistency check between budget and project description
4. NARRATIVE QUALITY (8 points) What it measures: Clarity and completeness of written narratives Removed subjective language: "well composed," "obvious" New approach: Measurable criteria for clarity, completeness, and accuracy
5. MAPS AND GRAPHICS (5 points) What it measures: Quality and completeness of maps and visuals Removed subjective language: "legible and practical" New approach: Specific requirements for scale, boundaries, and identification
6. APPLICANT CAPACITY (7 points) What it measures: Organizational readiness and past performance Removed subjective language: "obviously utilized available resources" New approach: Evidence-based assessment of training, past grants, resource use

TOTAL: 45 points (redistributed from original 28 + 25 budget points = 53)

Summary:

- **Restructure the scoring rubric to reduce subjectivity and over-weighting of application polish**, including dismantling the former 28-point "General Quality and Accuracy" section and redistributing points across discrete, objective categories such as completeness, narrative clarity, budget accuracy, budget reasonableness, maps, and applicant capacity. *(Collins, Compeau, Hart)*
- **Introduce clear scoring anchors and require written justification for scores**, particularly in high-weight sections, to improve scoring consistency, transparency, and public defensibility. *(Sargent)*
- **Explicitly recognize community size, capacity, and context in narrative evaluation**, clarifying that smaller, rural, or capacity-limited communities should not be disadvantaged for proposing appropriately scaled projects. *(Sargent, Hart)*
- **Separate budget evaluation into distinct components** (quality/accuracy vs. reasonableness/alignment) to better distinguish mathematical correctness from scope alignment and cost justification. *(Collins, Hart)*

- **Elevate applicant capacity and readiness into a standalone scored section**, focusing on organizational experience, readiness, and long-term maintenance planning rather than embedding these factors within subjective quality scoring.
(Collins, Sargent)
- **Clarify how public opposition is treated in scoring**, specifying that the presence of opposition alone does not reduce a score and that reviewers should consider whether concerns were acknowledged and addressed through outreach or mitigation.
(Sargent)
- **Expand acceptable forms of community support and engagement documentation** beyond formal letters, including Tribal consultation records, meeting summaries, resolutions, and other culturally appropriate engagement methods.
(Sargent, Hart)
- **Increase emphasis on accessibility and inclusive design**, encouraging projects that accommodate a range of physical abilities, skills, and ages as a meaningful component of public benefit.
(Hart)
- **Explicitly incorporate historical access considerations**, including historic trails and RS2477 routes where applicable, into the Public Benefit evaluation.
(Compeau, Yuhus)
- **Shift Public Benefit scoring away from subjective or discriminatory criteria**, such as “little to no cost to the individual” and raw estimates of user numbers, toward documented need, community benefit, and inclusive outcomes.
(Hart, Sargent)
- **Improve transparency and consistency in community engagement and public notice evaluation**, clarifying expectations for applicants versus reviewers and focusing on the quality of engagement rather than procedural compliance alone.
(Hart)

RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM GRANT
REVISED TRAIL PROJECT SCORE SHEET

PROJECT TITLE: _____

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION: _____

REVIEWER'S PRINTED NAME: _____ Date: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWER:

1. Complete the conflict of interest section below
2. Review the entire score sheet and application
3. Score each criterion using the point ranges provided
4. Award points based on objective completion of requirements
5. Total the score and sign the sheet
6. Keep comments constructive (these are public documents)

SECTION I: CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE

- I DO have a conflict of interest (STOP - do not score this application)
- I DO NOT have a conflict of interest

If you have a conflict of interest, submit this form without scoring and be prepared to explain the conflict at the meeting.

SECTION II: APPLICATION COMPLETENESS (8 points possible)

Criteria: All required application components are submitted and complete.

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

- 7-8 | All required sections completed; all required attachments included
- 4-6 | One required section incomplete OR one required attachment missing
- 1-3 | Multiple required sections incomplete OR multiple attachments missing
- 0 | Application fundamentally incomplete

Required Components Checklist:

- Project Narrative (Section 4)
- Location/Maps (Section 3)

- Timeline (Section 5)
- Budget (Section 6)
- Environmental Review Checklist (if applicable)
- Property access documentation (for trail projects)

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 8

SECTION III: BUDGET QUALITY AND ACCURACY (10 points possible)

Criteria: Budget detail, mathematical accuracy, and supporting documentation.

A. Budget Format and Detail (0-4 points)

- Excel format budget utilized (1 pt)
- Categories filled throughout table (1 pt)
- Information is legible and understandable (1 pt)
- Each Task correlates to schedule (1 pt)

B. Budget Documentation (0-3 points)

- Three quotes obtained for equipment/materials >\$1,000 (2 pts)
- Service vendor quotes included when necessary (1 pt)

C. Budget Narrative and Math (0-3 points)

- Explanations provided for expenditures (1 pt)
- Match requirement met (10% minimum) (1 pt)
- All calculations are mathematically correct (1 pt)

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 10

SECTION IV: BUDGET REASONABLENESS (7 points possible)

Criteria: Labor hours, supplies, and equipment are appropriate for the project.

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

6-7 | Labor hours, supplies, and equipment all align with project scope and location

3-5 | Minor inconsistencies between budget and project description

1-2 | Significant inconsistencies between budget and project description

0 | Budget does not align with project description

Specific Requirements:

Labor hours consistent with timeline and project type

Labor rates reasonable for location and work type

Supplies/equipment itemized (not lumped together)

Supplies/equipment consistent with narrative

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 7

SECTION V: NARRATIVE QUALITY (8 points possible)

Criteria: Project and budget narratives provide clear, comprehensive information.

A. Clarity and Completeness (0-5 points)

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

4-5 | Narratives are clear, complete, and contain all necessary detail

2-3 | Narratives contain some necessary detail but lack clarity or completeness

0-1 | Narratives lack necessary detail or clarity

B. Technical Accuracy (0-3 points)

Few or no grammatical/spelling errors (1 pt)

Technical terminology used correctly (1 pt)

Information is internally consistent (1 pt)

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 8

SECTION VI: MAPS AND GRAPHICS (5 points possible)

Criteria: Maps and visual materials are legible, accurate, and appropriate.

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

- 4-5 | Maps are legible, properly scaled, clearly show project location and property boundaries
- 2-3 | Maps are present but lack some detail or clarity
- 0-1 | Maps are illegible, inaccurate, or missing

Required for Trail Projects:

- Vicinity map included
- Site-specific map included
- Property boundaries identified
- Landowners identified

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 5

SECTION VII: APPLICANT CAPACITY (7 points possible)

Criteria: Evidence of organizational capacity and past performance.

A. Training and Preparation (0-2 points)

- Applicant attended pre-application training (2 pts)
- Applicant did not attend training (0 pts)

B. Past Performance (0-3 points)

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

- 3 | High performance on past grants (if applicable) OR strong capacity demonstrated
- 1-2 | Moderate performance on past grants OR some capacity demonstrated
- 0 | Poor past performance OR limited capacity demonstrated

C. Use of Available Resources (0-2 points)

- Evidence that Application Manual was consulted (1 pt)
- Evidence that guidance documents were used (1 pt)

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 7

SECTION VIII: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (10 points possible)

A. Project Permission and Access (0-5 points)

For Trail Projects:

- Evidence of access from all property owners (2 pts)
- Easement documented OR willingness to sell letter (3 pts)

For Educational/Training Projects:

- Training/educational content described (2 pts)
- Mock-up or illustrations of finished product (3 pts)

For Trail Improvement Projects:

- Ancillary features clearly described (5 pts)

B. Scope of Work Description (0-5 points)

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

- 4-5 | Comprehensive description including all necessary construction/implementation details
- 2-3 | Adequate description with some details missing
- 0-1 | Insufficient description of scope

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 10

SECTION IX: PROJECT TIMELINE (10 points possible)

Criteria: Schedule is realistic, detailed, and aligns with project requirements.

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

- 9-10 | Schedule broken into tasks by weeks; tasks match budget; realistic start/end dates;

includes contingency

6-8 | Schedule has minor gaps in detail or minor inconsistencies with budget

3-5 | Schedule lacks significant detail or has significant inconsistencies

0-2 | Schedule is incomplete or unrealistic

Required Elements:

- Tasks identified and broken down
- Number of weeks per task specified
- Tasks match budget Tasks
- Realistic project start date
- Realistic project duration
- Feasible end date
- Contingency included
- Project ready for implementation

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 10

SECTION X: PROJECT FUNDING AND SPONSOR COMMITMENT (2 points possible)

Criteria: Organizational capacity and maintenance planning.

- Organization has experience with similar projects (1 pt)
- Long-term maintenance plan in place (1 pt)

Evidence may include:

- Previous grant experience
- Project narrative description
- Letters or agreements
- Maintenance agreements

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 2

SECTION XI: PUBLIC BENEFIT (14 points possible)

A. Need and Access (0-5 points)

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

4-5 | Clear description of need; broad public benefit; low/no individual cost; no identified opposition

2-3 | Need described; some public benefit; some individual cost OR minor opposition identified

0-1 | Need unclear; limited public benefit; high individual cost OR significant opposition

B. User Base (0-2 points)

Estimated number of users provided (1 pt)

Project serves general public (not select/paying subset) (1 pt)

C. Recreational Value (0-4 points)

Provides new recreational opportunities (2 pts)

Solves recreational problem or creates missing link (2 pts)

D. Accessibility Features (0-2 points)

Infrastructure for people with disabilities clearly identified in narrative AND budget (ramps, railings, benches, accessible bathrooms, etc.) (2 pts)

E. Youth Development (0-1 point)

Specific youth development opportunities identified in narrative AND budget with details: Who/When/Dates/Confirmation (1 pt)

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 14

SECTION XII: COMMUNITY SUPPORT (14 points possible)

A. Letters of Support (0-3 points)

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

3 | Required letters from project beneficiaries included (for ASP projects in State Parks, one letter from Advisory Board required)

1-2 | Some letters included but incomplete set

0 | Letters missing or inadequate

B. Planning Consistency (0-5 points)

Points | Requirements

-----|-----

- 5 | Project included in adopted local land-use plan or SCORP
- 3-4 | Letter or resolution from governing body supporting project consistency with local planning
- 0-2 | No evidence of planning consistency

C. Public Involvement (0-3 points)

- Public notice posting example with dates and locations (1 pt)
- Posted publicly by October 22 deadline (1 pt)
- Support/opposition described with mitigation plans OR adequate public involvement process documented (1 pt)

Note: Posting only on organization social media or to club membership is inadequate

D. Documentation Currency (0-3 points)

- All support documentation is current
- Updates to older letters provided (if applicable)
- Contact information for supporters included

Comments: _____

Section Score: _____ / 14

TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE: _____ / 100 points

RTP Reference #: _____

SCORING SUMMARY

- Section I: Conflict Check Pass / Fail
- Section II: Completeness _____ / 8
- Section III: Budget Quality _____ / 10
- Section IV: Budget Reasonableness _____ / 7

Section V: Narrative Quality _____ / 8
Section VI: Maps/Graphics _____ / 5
Section VII: Applicant Capacity _____ / 7
Section VIII: Project Description _____ / 10
Section IX: Timeline _____ / 10
Section X: Funding/Commitment _____ / 2
Section XI: Public Benefit _____ / 14
Section XII: Community Support _____ / 14

TOTAL: _____ / 100

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (attach additional pages if needed):

REVISED RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (DOT&PF)
Trail Project Score Sheet (Proposed Draft)
Total Points Possible: 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 Interest (No Points)

[Unchanged]

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:

- 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 – Narrative Quality & Clarity (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)

TOTAL SCORE: _____ / 100

SCORING SUMMARY

SECTION I – Conflict of Interest	____ Pass / ____ Fail
SECTION II – Completeness	____ / 8
SECTION III – Applicant Capacity	____ / 8
SECTION IV – Project Description & Scope	____ / 10
SECTION V – Narrative	____ / 8
SECTION VI – Timeline	____ / 10
SECTION VII – Maps and Graphics	____ / 5
SECTION VIII – Public Benefit	____ / 16
SECTION IX – Community Support	____ / 15
SECTION X – Budget Quality and Accuracy	____ / 10
SECTION XI – Budget Reasonableness & Alignment	____ / 7
SECTION XII – Funding & Match	____ / 2
TOTAL:	____ / 100

Additional Comments:

DRAFT