



# SNOWTRAILS PROGRAM SCORING RUBRIC

<b>Applicant</b>	
<b>Reviewer</b>	
<b>Requested total project</b>	\$
<b>Cost per mile</b>	\$
<b>Score</b>	/75

## SECTION 0 – ELIGIBILITY & REQUIRED DOCUMENTS (PASS/FAIL)

- Land access permissions secured
- Permits obtained or certified
- Required attachments included
- Application complete and signed

**Result:**  Pass  Fail

Result	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

## SECTION I – APPLICATION COMPLETENESS (8 PTS)

- 8 pts – All required components submitted and complete
- 5 pts – Minor omissions or inconsistencies
- 2 pts – Multiple missing items
- 0 pts – Major required components missing

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

## SECTION II – NARRATIVE QUALITY (2 PTS)

Evaluate relative to applicant size and project for clarity of response, completeness of required information, and ability to understand the project.

- 2 pts – Clear, detailed, well-supported
- 1 pt – Generally clear, minor gaps
- 0 - Low – Unclear

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

### SECTION III – MAPS (5 PTS)

5 pts – Clear and complete

3 pts – Limited detail

1 pts – Unclear

0 – Missing

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

### SECTION IV – BUDGET QUALITY (8 PTS)

8 pts – Budget is complete, mathematically accurate, and supported by documentation

5 pts – Minor math or documentation issues

2 pts – Significant inconsistencies or unclear line items

0 pts – Budget missing, incomplete, or unreliable

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

### SECTION V – FUNDING & MATCH (2 PTS)

2 pts – Match requirement is fully met and clearly documented

1 pt – Minor documentation issue, but match appears sufficient

0 – Match is missing, noncompliant, or cannot be verified

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

### SECTION VI – PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND ESTIMATE (PS&E) (10 PTS)

Plans, Specification and Estimate (PS&E). The applicant describes their seasonal operations and procedures clearly defining a work plan for the upcoming year.

10 pts – Clear, detailed, well-supported

7 pts – Generally clear, minor gaps

3 pts – Limited detail or weak support

0 pts – Missing or insufficient

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

## SECTION VII – SAFETY (10 PTS)

The applicant includes a comprehensive list of safety activities for the trails and operations such as regular maintenance to clear or flatten snow and smooth ice, place trail markings, illuminated signage, max speed limits, advisories, flagging, etc. along existing trails identified in the application.

- 10 pts – Comprehensive safety activities clearly described
- 7 pts – Adequate safety measures with minor gaps
- 3 pts – Limited safety planning
- 0 pts – No safety activities

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

## SECTION VIII – COMMUNITY BENEFIT (20 PTS)

Evaluate based on economic benefits that include transportation connections, access to subsistence, and access to infrastructure, lower cost of living AND health and quality of life; social connections, recreation, and wellbeing.

- 20 pts – Strong evidence the project improves transportation access, subsistence access, community connectivity, recreation, and/or quality of life
- 12 pts – Moderate community benefit described, with some supporting detail
- 6 pts – Limited benefit described or weak support
- 0 pts – No demonstrated community benefit

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

## SECTION IX – APPLICANT CAPACITY & READINESS (10 PTS)

These questions are answered in the RISK ASSESSMENT & MITIGATION section of the application.

The project has strong contributing factors such as:

- Past performance
- Equipment availability and condition
- Staff and resource availability
- Partnerships to plan, maintain, and operate
- Other added benefits not scored elsewhere

- 10 pts – Clear, detailed, well-supported
- 7 pts – Generally clear, minor gaps
- 3 pts – Limited detail or weak support
- 0 pts – Missing or insufficient

Score	Reviewer Justification
___ / ___	

# REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

## Purpose of Scoring

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

## General Guidance

Reviewers must:

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

## Community Context and Fairness

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

## Application Quality vs. Project Value

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

## Use of Scoring Criteria

For each section:

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

## Public / Community Benefit

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

## Safety and Operations

- Evaluate whether the applicant demonstrates:
  - A clear and realistic operations plan
  - Appropriate safety measures for the project type

## Budget Review

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

- Minor documentation issues should not outweigh an otherwise strong project

**What NOT to Consider**

Reviewers should not consider:

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

**Final Scoring**

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