MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

Representatives:
Bob Charles – Knik Tribe **(Secretary)**
Edna DeVries, Mayor - MSB
Glenda Ledford, Mayor – City of Wasilla **(Chair)**
Brian Winnestaffer - Chickaloon Native Village
Mike Brown - MSB
Sean Holland - DOT&PF **(Treasurer)**
Jim Cooper, Mayor – City of Palmer **(Vice Chair)**

Microsoft Teams meeting
Join on your computer or mobile app.
Join the meeting now
Meeting ID: 253 618 394 457 5
Passcode: v7Xb63rV
Or call in (audio only)
+1 689-223-3510 (U.S. Sioux Falls)
(844) 594-6237 (toll-free)
Phone Conference ID: 568 381 409#

Agenda
Wednesday, November 19, 2025
1:30-3:00 pm

Meeting Location
Alaska DOT Mat Su District Office at 500 S. Seward Meridian Pkwy, Wasilla, Alaska
There is limited parking at the building's main entrance, an overflow parking lot to the south.

1. Meeting called to order and Roll Call

2. Consent Agenda **(Action Item)**
   a. Approval of November 19, 2025, Agenda
   b. Approval of October 22nd, 2025, Minutes

3. Committee/Working Group Reports
   a. Staff Report
4. Voices of the Visitors (Non-Action Items)

5. Technical Committee October 14th Action Items

   a. Officer Elections Recommended Motion: *Motion to Approve Alex Strawn for Chair (Tucker) seconded, no further discussion, no objection, Motion approved. Motion to Approve Chris Bentz, as Vice Chair* ***(Winnestaffer),*** *Motion to approve Erich Schaal for View Chair* ***(Adams)*** *seconded, Roll call vote. Erich Schaal will serve another term as vice chair.*

   b. FFY26 December 2025-November 2026 Technical Committee Meeting Dates: *Motion to approve as presented* ***(Tucker)*** *seconded, no discussion, no objection, motion approved.*

   c. MTP Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook Recommended for approval to the Policy Board: *Motion to approve with minor staff edits* ***(Bradway)*** *seconded, discussion on Criteria 1.2, 5.2 and 6.3.*

   *Motion to amend Criterion 1.2 to replace the word "expand" with the word "improve" throughout (**Adams**), seconded. Motion approved.*

   Motion to amend Criterion 5.2 to remove the scoring criteria "5 points if the project makes a new non-motorized connection of greater than 0.5 miles" and instead assign "5 points if

MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

*the project connects two facilities or extends a facility" (**Winnestaffer**), seconded, motion approved.*

*Motion to amend Criterion 6.3 to remove the scoring criteria "5 points if the project connects a roadway gap of 1 mile or greater" and instead assign "5 points if the project connects two roads or extends a road" (**Tucker**), seconded, motion approved.*

*Motion to approve the MTP evaluation criteria as amended by prior motions (**Bradway**), seconded, motion approved.*

Motion to extend the meeting until 4:20 **(Winnestaffer)** seconded, motion approved.

Motion to postpone Items 7 through 9 to the December 10th meeting. Motion **(Bradway)** seconded, no further discussion, motion approved.

6. Action Items
   - **a.** Officer Elections: Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer, and Secretary: **Election Process on Page 26 of the Packet.**
   - **b.** December 2025-November 2026 Policy Board Meeting Dates (Action Item) **Recommended Motion to approve as meeting dates as presented.**
   - **c.** Personnel Policy Update to Annual COLA policy (Action Item) **Recommended Motion to approve the annual COLA policy as presented.**
   - **d.** Personnel Policy Update to Annual Performance Evaluations (Action Item) **Recommended Motion to approve the amendment to the annual performance evaluations as presented.**
   - **e.** MTP Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook Approval (Action Item) **Recommended Motion to approve MTP project evaluation criteria and scoring guidebook as presented.**

7. Old Business

   a. MTP Update
      - MTP Project Nomination Form
      - Interactive Comment Map and Nomination Process
      - Special Meeting the week of Nov 18th with TC subcommittee to review the Travel Model Assumptions based on concerns identified at a special meeting on November 12th

   b. STIP Memo about MVP FFY 24&25 Funding Allocations, Carryover, and FFY26 Funding Award
      - Policy Board Request: DOT reps on the PB and TC, engage their leadership in documenting improvements that could be made with the 3C process, STIP involvement, and usage of MVP's suballocations without consultation update from Ben White, Alaska DOT Planning Chief
      - MVP FFY 24,25,26 funding and project documentation update requested by the Technical Committee for review

   c. 26-29 STIP Update from Lauren Little, Chief Engineer DOT&PF

   d. Alaska DOT&PF SAFEROADS initiative Lauren Little, Chief Engineer DOT&PF

8. New Business
    a. None

9. Other Issues
    a. Transit update

10. Informational Items

    a. Annual Conflict of Interest Policy Signatures
    b. Audit and 990 prep Engagement Letter from Altman, Rodgers Co.
    c. Vision, Goals, and Objectives public comment period closes November 24th
    d. Reminder about the December 3rd Open House for the MTP will be held at the MSB Assembly Chamber from 4:30 pm-6:30 pm

11. Policy Board Comments

12. Adjournment

Next Scheduled MPO Policy Board Meeting – December 17th, from 1:30 pm to 3:00 p.m. to be held via Microsoft TEAMS and at the Alaska DOT Mat-Su District Office at 500 S Seward Meridian Pkwy, Wasilla, Alaska.

Policy Board Action Item Overview
November 19th

Purpose: To guide the Board discussion and action on key agenda items.

<u>Action Item A.</u> Officer Elections

- **Nominations Review- submitted in writing?**
  Nominations- from the floor
    - **Nominations for Chair**
    - **Nominations for Vice Chair**
    - **Nomination for Secretary**
    - **Nomination for Treasurer**

Draft Motion for Chair:

"I move to elect [Name] as Chair of the Policy Board for the Federal Fiscal Year 26."

Seconded by:
Yes
No
Abstain

Draft Motion for Vice Chair

" I move to elect [Name] as Vice Chair of the Policy Board for the Federal Fiscal Year 26."

Seconded by:
Yes
No
Abstain

Draft Motion for Secretary

" I move to elect [Name] as Secretary of the Policy Board for the Federal Fiscal Year 26."

Seconded by:
Yes
No
Abstain

Draft Motion for Treasurer

" I move to elect [Name] as Treasurer of the Policy Board for the Federal Fiscal Year 26."

Seconded by:
Yes
No
Abstain

Staff Summary:
Per the committee's bylaws, officer elections are held annually for the upcoming calendar year. The Chair presides over meetings and represents the Policy Board at meetings upon request. The Vice Chair assumes the Chair's duties when absent. Nominations may be made from the floor, and self-nominations are permitted. Excerpt from the bylaws governing elections is in the packet at page 26.

<u>Action Item B.</u> FFY26 Policy Board Meeting Dates (December 2025 – November 2026)

Draft Motion:

"I move to approve the Policy Board meeting schedule for FFY26 (December 2025 through November 2026) as presented."

Seconded by:
Yes
No
Abstain

Staff Summary:
Staff recommends approval of the proposed FFY26 Policy Board meeting schedule. Meetings are generally held on the 4th Wednesday of each month from 1:30-3pm via Teams and in person at the Mat-Su DOT office. Adjustments have been made to avoid holidays and major conferences. Approval of the schedule provides consistency for members and the public. Draft dates are on page 27 of the packet.

<u>Action Item C.</u> Updated to the Annual COLA calculation in Personnel Policies as presented

Draft Motion "*I move to approve the updated Annual COLA calculation in Personnel Policies as presented."*

Staff summary: During the executive session at the Policy Board meeting on October 22nd, the board requested that our annual COLA calculation follow the federal fiscal year update rather than what was listed in our Personnel Policy: averaging the 2nd ½ of one fiscal year and the first ½ of the following fiscal year. The proposed update is on page 28 of the packet.

Action Item D. Update to performance evaluation criteria in the Personnel Policies, as presented

Draft Motion: *I move to approve the updated performance evaluation criteria in the Personnel Policies, as presented*

Staff summary: During the executive session of the Policy Board, there was a request to add a numeric matrix to the annual performance evaluation. The proposed update is in the packet on page 30.

Action Item E. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook

Draft Motion:

"I move to approve the updated Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook as presented."

Seconded by:
Yes
No
Abstain

Staff Summary:
Staff have prepared updated MTP Project Evaluation Criteria based on the TC work session on October 23rd, and during the TC meeting on November 4th for use in scoring and prioritizing projects nominated for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan update. The revisions align the criteria with current federal planning factors, regional goals, and performance-based planning requirements. The updated criteria include measurable indicators for safety, system preservation, mobility, equity, environmental sustainability, and economic vitality.

Approval of the criteria will guide consistent, data-driven project evaluation and ensure transparency in project selection. Project scoring guide and the project scoring criteria are on pages 33 and 47 in the packet respectively.

MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

Representatives:
Bob Charles – Knik Tribe **(Secretary)**
Edna DeVries, Mayor - MSB
Glenda Ledford, Mayor – City of Wasilla **(Chair)**
Brian Winnestaffer - Chickaloon Native Village
Mike Brown - MSB
Sean Holland - DOT&PF **(Treasurer)**
Jim Cooper, Mayor – City of Palmer **(Vice Chair)**

Microsoft Teams meeting
Join on your computer or mobile app.
Join the meeting now
Meeting ID: 253 618 394 457 5
Passcode: v7Xb63rV
Or call in (audio only)
+1 689-223-3510 (U.S. Sioux Falls)
(844) 594-6237 (toll-free)
Phone Conference ID: 568 381 409#

Minutes
Wednesday, October 22nd, 2025
1:30-3:00 pm

Meeting Location
Alaska DOT Mat Su District Office at 500 S. Seward Meridian Pkwy, Wasilla, Alaska
There is limited parking at the building's main entrance, an overflow parking lot to the south.

1. Meeting called to order and Roll Call

Meeting called to order: 1:30 pm

Members Present:
Bob Charles – Knik Tribe (Secretary)
Edna DeVries, Mayor - MSB
Glenda Ledford, Mayor – City of Wasilla (Chair)
Brian Winnestaffer - Chickaloon Native Village
Mike Brown - MSB
Luke Bowland DOT&PF (proxy for Sean Holland – DOT&PF (Treasurer))
Jim Cooper, Mayor – City of Palmer (Vice Chair)

Visitors Present:
Kim Sollien – MVP, Executive Director
Anjie Goulding - MVP
Carrie Cecil - MVP
Adam Bradway – AK DOT&PF
Pat Cotter - RESPEC
Ben White - AK DOT&PF
Mark Eisenman - AK DOT&PF
Kristina Huling - AK DOT&PF

2. Consent Agenda **(Action Item)**
    a. Approval of October 22nd, 2025, Agenda
    b. Approval of August 27th, 2025, Minutes

*Motion to approve the consent agenda and meeting minutes from August 27, 2025 (**Winnestaffer**), seconded. No edits. Motion is approved.*

3. Committee/Working Group Reports
    a. Staff Report

Kim Sollien gave staff report:

- *New MVP Staff:* Introduced Carrie Cecil, MVP's new Senior Planner, started on October 14. Carrie will support MVP across planning initiatives such as Travel Demand Modeling, Household Travel Survey, Transit Development Plans, etc.
- *AMPO Conference:* MVP staff attended the Association for Metropolitan Planning Organizations meeting in Providence, RI where they attended informational sessions and developed network connections with other MPOs.
- *Review of Annual Financial Statement (starting on pg.* 21 of packet)
    - The Financial Statement includes an overview of current account balances and summary of profits and losses for the period from October 1, 2024 through September 30, 2025 (FFY25).
    - Note that FAST Planning was a fiscal sponsor for a portion of FFY25 which is not accounted for in this financial statement.
    - Reminder that MVP receives an annual 9.03% match to federal PL funds from member organizations.

4. Voices of the Visitors (Non-Action Items)

None.

5. Technical Committee October 14th Action Items
    a. Motion to approve the MTP Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives as presented for a 30-day Public Comment Period. (*Winnestaffer*), seconded. *Passed unanimously.*

    b. Motion to recommend that the Policy Board adopt the Public Participation Plan as presented. (*Tucker*), Seconded. *Passed unanimously.*

    c. Motion to recommend that the Policy Board approve and send a letter to Alaska DOT &PF documenting the lack of consultation on MVP's carryover funding, utilization of MVP STBG and CRP funds without consultation, and for not involving MVP in the discussion about the FFY26-29 STIP prior to its release to the public. *New motion: postpone, to allow staff time to document FFY24 and FFY25 projects using MVP's suballocations and an accounting of available funds for FFY26 for the November 4th meeting. (Strawn),* seconded. *Yes – 9, No – 2. Motion carried. The letter presented to the TC is in the Packet on Page 76.*

Kim Sollien provided a summary of the letter and discussion with Technical Committee. The Technical Committee requested additional information on project accounting to be included in updated draft. This updated version would be subject to review by the Technical Committee at the Nov. 4 meeting before being presented to Policy Board.

Discussion Highlights:

- Members suggest reframing the letter to focus more broadly on improving communication between MVP and DOT&PF related to programming.
- DOT&PF representatives acknowledged that improved communication about programming is needed internally and externally to foster consultation with MPOs and steps are being taken.

6. Action Items
    a. MTP Vision Statement, Goals and Objectives Release for a 30-day Public Comment Period (Action Item)
    Recommended Motion: Motion to approve the MTP Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives as presented for a 30-day Public Comment Period.

*Motion to approve (**Winnestaffer**), seconded. Item raised for discussion by **Mike Brown.***

Discussion:

- Introduce motion to amend Goal 1 and Objectives as presented in MTP Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives as follows (consistent with revised language as proposed by **Kim Sollien** in October 20, 2025 email to the Policy Board:

Goal 1: Ensure transportation improvements align with local land use patterns and connect housing to employment,

Objective 1: Improve coordination between transportation planning and local land use plans to ensure consistency between transportation projects and community development patterns.
Objective 2: Enhance multimodal connections between residential areas and employment hubs.
Objective 3: Prioritize transportation investments that maximize network efficiency based on local growth patterns.

- Changes recommended to bring goals more in line with expectations and purview of MPO and reduce potential points of conflicts between MVP and local governments.

*Motion to amend (**Brown**), seconded. No objection.*

*Motion to approve as amended (**Winnestaffer**), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*

b. Public Participation Plan adoption (Action Item)
Recommended Motion: Motion to adopt the Public Participation Plan as presented.

*Motion to approve (Winnestaffer), seconded. Item raised for discussion by **Mike Brown.***

Discussion:

- Would like to recognize that there is a sensitivity to off-road vehicles and their use of public ROWs as part of MVP public participation planning and outreach.

Motion to add language acknowledging off-road vehicle users as interested stakeholder on page 19 of the Public Participation Plan (Brown), seconded. Amendment is approved.

Motion to adopt as amended (Winnestaffer), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.

c. MVP FFY 26 Annual Budget Approval
Recommended Motion: Motion to approve the FFY annual budget as presented

*Motion to approve (**Cooper**), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*

d. IRS Form 990 prep and FFY 2025 Annual Audit
Recommended Motion: Motion to approve a professional services agreement with Altman, Rogers &Co. for IRS Form 990 prep and FFY 2025 Annual Audit

*Motion to approve (**Bowland**), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*

7. Executive Session
    a. Executive Director Review

    b. Staffing Update and Performance Review Summary

Executive Session is not included in public record. Executive Session exceeded allotted time.

Motion to extend the meeting to 3:30 pm (Winnestaffer), seconded. *No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*

8. Old Business
    a. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update
        i. Review Public Involvement Schedule and First Open House, December 3rd, location TBD (RESPEC)

- Tentative meeting location at Wasilla High School Theater Room (4:30 – 6:30 pm. Meeting will provide an overview of the MTP process, who is MVP, launch project map, and general engagement with the public – e.g., what do you need, want, see as challenges and opportunities.

b. Evaluation Criteria Work Session October 23rd, 10am-1pm at the Curtis D. Menard Memorial Sports Center

- Technical Committee will be meeting to work through evaluation criteria for reviewing and evaluating projects submitted. Policy Board members are invited to join if available.

c. 26-29 STIP Update from Lauren Little, Chief Engineer DOT&PF

- No update, awaiting further information from DOT. Was expected in October, no timeline.

9. New Business
   a. None

10. Other Issues
    a. Transit update

- Contract between MSB and Valley Transit has been signed. MVP will be meeting with Jennfier Bush of Valley Transit on Monday to discuss ways that MVP can provide support.

Discussion Highlights:
- Question – Is there a map of where valley transit is going to be operating?
- There will be no additional routes within core area, same fixed route. The questions to explore – what is level of service and what, if any, change in ridership?
- Note that have not yet received the federal grant side for FFY26 from FTA due to the ongoing government shutdown. This does increase risk of uninterrupted operation depending on length of shutdown.
- Suggestion to explore opportunities to leverage additional support for rural areas using rural funds potentially freed up by grant funding shift.

11. Informational Items
    a. STIP Memo Carry-Over Funding – Lack of 3C Process for MVP Sub-Allocations

- See above notes under topic 5.

b. Office Space Consideration
   a. AlaskaRealEstate.com - (MLS# 25-12477): 432 S Alaska Street #1-3, Palmer

- **Kim Solien** noted that MVP has been working with a realtor to identify space within MVP needs constraints (office space and conference room). Options are limited within allocated budget.

Discussion Highlights:
- Meeting space might be available in new gateway center (will be a Borough owned facility) to flex meeting. Also, Palmer Senior Center may be looking to allocate some space.
- Discussion of whether renting or purchasing is more appropriate.

c. UPWP Quarterly/Final Report

- Kim Sollien will be submitting report to Alaska DOT&PF at the end of October.

d. PL Match Request for FFY26: Invoices sent to Policy Board Members

- Kim Sollien notes that MVP has received payment from almost everyone.

e. Element Agency Branding Update

- **Anjie Goulding** presented new branding and website. Goal is to launch website by end of October. The new format is designed to be able to drive users to most critical information that the need to foster effective engagement.

f. MVP Facebook/Instagram Review

- New Social Media is launched. Find us on Facebook and Instagram (@mvpmpo). Like and follow!

12. Policy Board Comments

- **Brian Winnestaffer** – Revisiting the letter from the DOT vs. MVP letter, highlighted potential concern over a political vs. data driven STIP. Is there some way that we can ensure that the STIP is transparent and back into the hands of the planning department and data driven?
- **Luke Bowland** – The Seward to Glen linkage open house was held in Anchorage on October21, 2025. Although the project site is outside of the MPO boundary, it is worth tracking as it will impact commuters. Public comment period is currently open to review alternatives.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:33 pm.

Next Scheduled MPO Policy Board Meeting – November 19th, from 1:30 pm to 3:00 p.m. to be held via Microsoft TEAMS and at the Alaska DOT MatSu District Office at 500 S Seward Meridian Pkwy, Wasilla, Alaska.

October 2025 Staff Report

FFY25/26 UPWP Tasks

TASK 100 A UPWP

- Prepared the TC and PB agenda and packet
- Hosted the TC meeting and Policy Board Meeting
- Submitted the 4th Quarter Report to DOT

Task 100 B Metropolitan Transportation Plan

- Met with the MTP Team to finalize the draft Vision Goals and Objectives for the TC packet
- Reviewed the draft Press Release for the MTP Vision, Goals, and Objectives
- Set the date for the Evaluation Criteria Work Session
- Met with RESPEC to review deliverables to date and to discuss all that is planned for November TC and Policy Board review, including: Existing Conditions and System Deficiency Report, Travel Demand Model output, RESPEC project list, Public Involvement schedule and Open House agenda, and Gap analysis.
- Engaged Element Agency to develop an MTP 101 video to help tell the story of this plan to the public
- Met with MSB GIS and the RESPEC Team to review mapping deliverables for the interactive comment map, the project nomination form, and the evaluation criteria
- Developed a draft project nomination form to share with RESPEC and MSB GIS
- Launched the 30-day public comment period for the MTP Vision, Goals and Objectives

- Developed social media posts for the MTP Vision, Goals and Objectives

TIP /Project Scoring Criteria

- Continue to work with RESPEC to develop the MTP project Scoring Criteria

Complete Streets Policy

- Attended a complete streets training

Task 100 C TransCad Modeling

- Reviewed the new MVP 2050 Allocation Memo from RSG

TASK 100 D Household Travel Survey

TASK 100 E Transportation Improvement Program

TASK 100 F: Update and Implementation of the Public Participation Plan and Title VI Plan

- Finalized the PPP, sent it to Element Agency to format into MVP's new brand

TASK 100 G Support Services

Budget Management

- Met with the accountant to discuss the year-end financial report
- Reviewed year-end financials for FFY 25 and drafted the FFY26 budget proposal to be presented to the board
- Presented year end financials to the board

Meetings

- Met with FHWA, FTA, and the other MPO directors to discuss the Peer Exchange and whether progress has been made on better coordination and communication

- Met with Adam Bradway to discuss ongoing MTP funding issues for public involvement and MVP budget guidelines within the UPWP
- Met with Element Agency to finish Brand Refresh Deliverables including the website update, Canva Brand Package, Brand Guidelines and the three videos
- Attended the Active Transportation Coalition Monthly Meeting
- Began calendaring public engagement opportunities for MVP staff to attend Chamber lunches, Community Councils, RSAs, the city councils, and the MSB assembly.
- Attended Flip the Script Candidate Forum.
- Met with RESPEC to Review the Evaluation Criteria Workshop agenda and activities
- Met with RESPEC to Review Project Evaluation Criteria
- Hosted the TC work session on project evaluation criteria
- Met with Valley Transit and they requested MVP ask the Alaska DOT to make a change to the state Transit Management Plan to allow providers to access both Rural and Urban Funding if there region includes both designations. They also asked if MVP could request that the Assembly to consider a continuation of funding while the Federal Government is shut down, with the understanding that they will be reimbursed once funding is allocated.
-

Staffing

- Carrie Cecil started Oct 14th as our new Senior Planner
- Finalized staff evaluations to present to the Board during Executive Session

Correspondence

- Drafted a new letter to Alaska DOT & PF for TC and Policy Board approval highlighting the lack of consultation on MVP's carryover funding, the 3'C process, utilization of MVP STBG and CRP funds without consultation, and for not involving MVP in the discussion about the FFY26-29 STIP prior to its release to the public. Shared letter with ADOT Planning staff.
- Began the development of a stakeholder list for MVP to include federal, state, tribal, and local government points of contact, local interest groups, local services (e.g., schools, senior centers, healthcare centers), and local businesses. List will be used to facilitate project and planning related outreach.
- Developed local events calendar for MVP staff to improve tracking and regular engagement with local interest groups and policy boards
- Follow-up with the MVP Board on Packet Material related to the MTP Goals and Objectives

Nonprofit Filings and Reports

Organizational Documents

Agency Relationships

Contract Management

Requests from the Policy Board and Technical Committee directed to the staff

- Bob Charles and Brian Winnestaffer requested a timeline/flow chart for our website that tacks and displays all of our projects, deliverables and timelines. RESPEC made a simple one for the MTP. MVP staff are looking at options to make this information available to board members and the public.

Strategic Planning

Short-Range and Tactical Planning

Long-Range Planning

MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

Funding / Budget

- Submitted a quarterly report to the MSB Planning Department based on expenditures in the Legislative Grant

Training

- Carrie completed AMPO MPO 101 Training
- Anjie completed AMPO MPO 101 Training
- Anjie started AMPO MTP 101 Training

TASK 200 A MSB Public Transit Planning Support

TASK 200 B Transit Development Plan

TASK 300 Asset Management Plans

TASK 300 A MVP Sign Management Plan

TASK 300 B MVP Advanced Project Definition

TASK 300 C MVP Streetlight and Intersection Management Plan

TASK 300 D Pavement Asset Management Plan

November 2025 Staff Report

FFY25/26 UPWP Tasks

TASK 100 A UPWP

- Prepared the Technical Committee and Policy Board agenda and packet
- Hosted the Technical Committee meeting and Policy Board Meeting

Task 100 B Metropolitan Transportation Plan

- Developed social media posts for the MTP Vision, Goals, and Objectives, MVP intro, and December 3rd open house
- Worked with MSB GIS to finalize the public-facing interactive map, the project nomination survey 123, and the GIS based scoring form.
- Scheduled a special work session for the TC to review the project nomination form, interactive comment map, travel model data review, and the final scoring criteria and guide amended at the November TC meeting.

TIP /Project Scoring Criteria

- Finalized the MTP project Scoring Criteria, Scoring Guide, and Project Nomination Application

Complete Streets Policy

Task 100 C TransCad Modeling

- Reviewed the new MVP 2050 Allocation Memo from RSG
- Met with RSB to discuss the TC work session model review
- During the TC review of the base run of the model, questions were raised about the population data for the base year and assumptions about the roadway data. Another special meeting will be scheduled for the week of November 18th.

- At the November 12th special meeting, Bob Charles asked that the model include larger projects like the West-Su Access Road so that MVP can be responsive to the needs of the system if these projects develop. This contract does not have a budget to run multiple scenarios. RSG will only be analyzing the business as usual, with no alternative scenarios for the MTP. When MVP does our own full Travel Model Development, we will have the option to include multiple scenarios.

TASK 100 D Household Travel Survey

TASK 100 E Transportation Improvement Program

TASK 100 F: Update and Implementation of the Public Participation Plan and Title VI Plan

- MVP received a Title VI complaint about Valley Transit and the services being provided. MVP staff are following up with the individual and intend to direct them to the MSB to file a formal complaint

TASK 100 G Support Services

Budget Management

- Received an engagement letter from Altman, Rogers & Co. for the FFY25 audit and 990 prep, need to determine if the board would like to sign or if it is okay for the director to.

Meetings

- Met with MSB GIS staff to work on MVP's MTP GIS needs
- Bi-weekly MTP project and contract check-in
- Attended the Alaska Active Transportation Coalition Goal Area meeting

Staffing

Correspondence

Nonprofit Filings and Reports

Organizational Documents

- Drafted updates to the Personnel Policy on COLA and Performance Evaluations
- Requested Ashburn & Mason provide guidance on MVP and the Open Meetings Act and Robert's Rules of Order Executive Session. Waiting for their reply

Agency Relationships

- Became a Member of the Wasilla Chamber and attended lunch

Contract Management

Requests from the Policy Board and Technical Committee directed to the staff

- Bob Charles and Brian Winnestaffer requested a timeline/flow chart for our website that tracks and displays all of our projects, deliverables and timelines. RESPEC made a simple one for the MTP. MVP staff are looking at options to make this information available to board members and the public.
- Mike Brown suggested that we explore the Palmer Senior Center for space rental and the new CVB Gateway Visitor Center.
  - Staff reached out to the Palmer Senior Center and discussed space needs. Senior Center staff assured follow-up on pricing and availability, but we have not heard back after two follow-up calls and an email.
  - Staff reached out to the CVB about space rental. They will not have office space to rent but will have meeting space at the new center. They mention space in the Mann Dentistry building on the corner of Bogard and Seldon. Staff will follow up on this option.
  - Alaska DOT offered office space at the Mat-Su District office and we are following up on this option.

Strategic Planning

Short-Range and Tactical Planning

Long-Range Planning

Funding / Budget

Training

Transit Support

- Met with Valley Transit to discuss how MVP could support them with operations and or infrastructure
- Added a discussion to the TC agenda based on a VT ask for MVP to ask Alaska DOT about changing their transit management plan to allow a provider to apply for rural and urban funding because they are in a unique situation with their service area. This discussion was postponed to the December meeting.

TASK 200 A MSB Public Transit Planning Support

TASK 200 B Transit Development Plan

TASK 300 Asset Management Plans

TASK 300 A MVP Sign Management Plan

TASK 300 B MVP Advanced Project Definition

TASK 300 C MVP Streetlight and Intersection Management Plan

TASK 300 D Pavement Asset Management Plan

MVP Monthly Schedule of Topics October 2026-December 2026

October 2025

- UPWP Quarterly /Final annual Report
- Interactive comment map for the MTP
- Review the Model run – business as usual
- Present the MTP Goals, Objectives to TC and PB
- MVP Annual Budget Proposal to PB
- Engage an audit firm for MVPs audit and 990 prep
- Staff Evaluations
- Review and update MVP's updated Program of Projects FFY26
- Review and update STIP memo to DOT
- Develop content for the Internal call for MTP projects from MSB, cities, and tribes
- Set up an MVP Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn account
- Schedule first round of MTP public Involvement
- Special work Session to develop eligibility and evaluation criteria for projects

November 2025

- Finalize MTP outreach plan and content development, including stakeholder meeting, focus groups, survey, social media outreach, and news articles
- Develop MTP 101 presentation
- Review MTP 101 video draft
- Finalize and launch new MVP website
- Purchase LOGO items and prizes to give out at open house events
- Determine if there are federal lands in the MPA and schedule Formal Consultation of Federal Land Owners.
- Schedule Formal Consultation with Tribes about the MTP (December meeting)
- Schedule MSB and City Planning Commission Presentations about MTP (December)
- Alaska DOT 3c policy review and comments
- Review Travel Demand Model Run presentation with Consultant projects with TC and PB
- Internal Call for Projects and interactive map review

- Presentation about MTP Project Eligibility Criteria, Travel Demand Model Run presentation with Consultant projects discussion with staff
- Special TC meeting to review project nomination form, LOS and System Deficiency Report, and Interactive Map
- Launch Interactive Map
- TC and PB Officer Elections
- FFY26 Meeting Schedule and Location
- Launch survey

December 2025

- Launch Call for Projects and project nominations
- Finalize Existing Conditions report and present to TC and PB for Review
- Finalize System Deficiency Report and present to TC and PB to review
- Finalize the Internal Project list from the LOS and System Deficiency report
- Regional & Local Government Consultation/Presentations (MSB, Cities (planning commission), Commissioners' office and Federal land managers)
- Evaluate the Scenarios for the model – business as usual
- Public Event for MTP
- Tribal Coordination Meeting MTP and Call for Projects
- Reach out to Mat-Su Delegation about MVP and our MTP call for projects
- MTP Public Involvement Open House, focus groups, comment map, and survey
- Discussion on Planning Studies/ new committees bike and ped and freight that may be needed as a result of the MTP what else do we need to look at to support the building of our transportation system/infrastructure
- Continue Call for Project nominations

January 2026

- Presentation about complete streets/link to federal regulations and plan goals to TC
- Develop Carbon Reduction Program Criteria: priorities for MVP-projects need to be awarded under a competitive process

- Grandfather agreements with ADOT&PF for all the current CTP & TAP projects so that we have them prior to the TIP development
- Review Complete Streets Policy with TC and PB
- Review TIP Funding Policy to Technical Committee and Policy Board [TIP policies MVP K.s. commnets.docx]

February 2026

- Review Projects Nominated
- Project Review Committee Special Meeting
- Approve Complete Streets Policy with Technical Committee and Policy Board
- Approve TIP Funding Policy to Technical Committee and Policy Board [TIP policies MVP K.s. commnets.docx]

March 2026

- Public engagement to review nominated projects
- ADOT provide planning-level cost estimates for projects
- Finalize MTP Project list
- Present project list to TC and PB for approval

April 2026

- 30-day public notice about MTP projects
- Draft FFY27&28 UPWP
- Draft TIP
- Draft Fiscal Plan for MTP and TIP

May 2026

- Draft TIP and Review with TC and PB
- O&M state of the system maintenance report
- Draft Summary Fiscal Plan Report

June 2026

- Receive FFY27 PL allocations
- Approval of FFY27&28 UPWP 30-day public review
- Apply Performance Measures to MTP projects

- Fiscal Plan Summary Report Review with TC and PB

July 2026

- MTP and Complete Streets Completion
- 30-UPWP Review
- Review and Approve 30-day public comment period TIP and Review with TC and PB
- Public Event – final draft project list

August 2026

- Review and Approve FFY27/28 UPWP and submit to ADOT, FHWA, and FTA

September 2026

October 2026

- TIP Completion

December 2026

- New MPOs should have a formally adopted MTP and TIP by **December 29, 2026**

Excerpt from MVP Bylaws- Policy Board Election Process

Officer Elections. Policy Board Officers are elected by the Board members via written nominations in advance of the meeting and open nominations from the floor at the November meeting.

- Nominations can be made in writing no later than 24 hours before the meeting.
- The Chair will announce the written nominations and call for nominations from the floor for each officer position: Chair, Vice Chair (Secretary, and Treasurer, in rotation. Only for PB)
- The higher position election will be completed prior to the nominees for the next position.
- No Board member may nominate more than one candidate for each position, and candidates may nominate themselves.
- The same Policy Board member may fill the Secretary and Treasurer positions only.
- Nominations do not have to be seconded.
- Nominees may decline the nomination.
- Nominations are closed when no other nominations are made for the current position. If there is only one nominee and there is no objection, they are confirmed
- If more than one candidate is nominated, voting takes place.
- Elections are decided by roll call vote, with the nominee with the highest number of votes winning.
- In the case of a tie vote, there will be a revote until one of the nominees gets
- the highest number of votes
- Officers shall serve a one-year term.
- A quorum is needed for officer elections.

MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

Policy Board FFY26 Proposed Meeting Dates

Fourth Wednesday of each month from 1:30-3 pm unless otherwise scheduled due to conflict

Month	**Date**	**Notes**
October (2025)	22nd	
November (2025)	19th	Scheduled one week early to accommodate Thanksgiving
December (2025)	17th	Scheduled one week early to accommodate Christmas holidays
January (2026)	28th	
February (2026)	25th	
March (2026)	25th	
April (2026)	22nd	
May (2026)	27th	
June (2026)	24th	
July (2026)	22nd	
August (2026)	26th	
September (2026)	23rd	
October (2026)	28th	
November (2026)	18th	Scheduled one week early to accommodate Thanksgiving

MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

Current MVP COLA Policy

Cost of Living Adjustment

At the beginning of MVP for Transportation's fiscal year (October 1), all regular full-time and part-time employees shall receive a Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) added to their gross wages based on the U.S. Department of Labor Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for Anchorage. The COLA shall reflect the average of the CPI-U for the second half of the previous calendar year and the first half of the current calendar year. If the CPI-U average is negative, employees' wages will not change. Temporary employees are not eligible for COLA.

Proposed Policy

Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)

At the beginning of each federal fiscal year (October 1), all regular full-time and part-time employees of MVP for Transportation shall receive a Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) to their base wages.

The COLA will be based on the annual percentage increase determined by the **Social Security Administration (SSA)** for **Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI)** benefits for that same fiscal year. This adjustment reflects the change in the **Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W)** as published by the U.S. Department of Labor.

If the federal COLA is zero or negative for the applicable period, employees' wages will remain unchanged. Temporary employees are not eligible for COLA.

Implementation:
The COLA will be applied to employee wages beginning with the **first full pay period starting on or after October 1** of each year.

Example:
If the SSA announces a 3.2% COLA increase for the new fiscal year, MVP for

Transportation will apply a 3.2% increase to the base wages of all eligible employees starting with the first pay period beginning on or after October 1.

References:

- Social Security Administration – Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) Information

MATSU VALLEY PLANNING *for* TRANSPORTATION

Performance Review

The annual performance review is a formal opportunity for the supervisor and employee to exchange ideas that will strengthen their working relationship, review the past year, and anticipate MVP for Transportations needs in the coming year. The purpose of the review is to encourage the exchange of ideas in order to create positive change within the organization.

The Executive Director of the MVP for Transportation shall implement a formal system by which each employee's job performance is evaluated in accordance with the following schedule:

1. Probationary employees will be evaluated after completing six months of service.
2. After completing the probation period, all employees will be evaluated annually, as calculated from the last date of evaluation.
3. Employees will be evaluated at the time of separation, and their rehire status will be documented.

Each employee will offer a brief narrative self-evaluation based on their job description, work objectives, and deliverables, and an assessment of three areas for growth and three areas of strength. The self-evaluation will be submitted to the supervisor. The supervisor will offer an additional evaluation of performance, growth opportunities, and strengths using the Glows and Grows format. The evaluation and any written responses by the employee will be placed in the employee's personnel record. Using the same feedback model, the Executive Director will be evaluated by the Policy Board during Executive Session. The Executive Director will deliver the self-evaluation to the Policy Board Chair, documenting a reflection of performance on organizational management, personnel management, project management, and financial management, including three aspects of the performance they are working to strengthen, and three aspects they feel are the strongest. The Policy Board will be invited to offer additional strengths and areas for growth.

Proposed Performance Review Policy

MVP for Transportation conducts annual performance reviews to evaluate employee effectiveness, support professional growth, and align individual goals with organizational priorities.

1. Review Schedule

- **Probationary employees:** Evaluated after six (6) months of service.
- **All employees:** Evaluated annually, based on the date of the last evaluation.

- **Separating employees:** Evaluated at the time of separation, with rehire status documented.

2. Review Components
Each review includes:

- A **self-evaluation** addressing key responsibilities, objectives, and deliverables.
- Identification of **three strengths** and **three areas for growth**.

3. Numeric Performance Assessment
Supervisors will assess each employee using both narrative feedback and quantitative scoring across core performance areas:

- Job Knowledge & Quality of Work
- Productivity & Timeliness
- Communication & Teamwork
- Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking
- Professional Conduct & Relationship Building

Each category will be rated on a **five-point scale**:

Rating	Description
5	Exceptional – Consistently exceeds all performance expectations
4	Exceeds Expectations – Frequently performs above required standards
3	Meets Expectations – Consistently meets job requirements
2	Needs Improvement – Occasionally falls short of expectations
1	Unsatisfactory – Consistently below expectations

An overall **Performance Rating** (average of all categories) will be documented in the employee's personnel record.

4. Executive Director Evaluation

The Executive Director will complete a self-evaluation addressing organizational, personnel, project, and financial management, including metrics for each area. The Policy Board will review and score performance using the same five-point scale during Executive Session.

Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Project Evaluation and Scoring Methodology

Introduction

This document outlines the process and methodology used by MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation (MVP) to evaluate and score transportation projects nominated for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). This evaluation framework provides a consistent, transparent, and data-driven approach to prioritizing investments that advance regional goals and meet federal performance-based planning requirements. It is intended to support both project sponsors during the submission process, as well as project evaluators.

Objectives of the evaluation process include:

- Ensuring fair and transparent project selection.
- Supporting regional goals for safety, integration with land use, and resilience, among others.
- Linking planning and programming (MTP → Transportation Improvement Program).

Framework for Evaluation

The evaluation framework aligns with federal performance goals under Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). It ensures that project selection supports regional transportation goals and objectives.

Types of evaluation criteria include:

- Quantitative/Objective – measurable, data-based metrics such as safety performance or asset condition improvement.
- Qualitative/Subjective – context-based assessments such as consistency with land use plans or community priorities.

Quantitative criteria are referred to in this document as **Scored Programmatically**. The project sponsor does <u>not</u> need to submit this information with the project nomination as MVP staff will use GIS and other tools to determine the score. These programmatically scored criteria are delineated with a in this guide.

Qualitative information will need to be submitted by the project sponsor and scored by the MTP scoring committee. The MTP scoring committee includes members of the MVP Technical Committee and MVP staff. Criteria that require the project sponsor to submit evidence of meeting the criterion are denoted with a in this guide.

Scoring Process Overview

MVP's evaluation and scoring process will include the following steps:

1. Step 1 – Data Compilation: MPO staff or consultants collect datasets, modeling outputs, and plan references.
2. Step 2 – Project Submission: Sponsors submit proposals with supporting documentation.
3. Step 2A – Initial Screening: projects are screened to ensure they fit the program, include everything necessary for evaluation, and have budgets that fit within MVP's resources.
4. Step 3 – Criteria Scoring: Each project is scored by each member of the MTP scoring committee using standardized scales (e.g., 1–5).
5. Step 4 – Composite Scoring and Weighting: Scores are weighted and summed to produce a total score.
6. Step 5 – Review and Validation: Scores undergo internal and committee review. Evaluators may reach out to sponsors for clarification.
7. Step 6 – Ranking and Recommendation: Projects are prioritized for inclusion in the MTP and for TIP programming.
8. Step 7 – The draft MTP will be put out for public review and comment.

Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidance

Goal area 1: Ensure transportation improvements align with land use patterns and connect housing to employment

Land use compatibility assesses how well a proposed transportation project aligns with existing and planned land uses, local comprehensive plans, and regional growth patterns.

Projects that are land-use compatible reinforce desired development patterns, support sustainable growth, and improve accessibility to activity centers, rather than conflicting with land use goals or degrading sensitive areas.

Criterion 1.1: Consistent with adopted plans and local land use policies

How to score:

- 3 points if the project is included in an adopted plan; do <u>not</u> consider Safety Plans since they are included in the next goal area (Safety)
- If the project is NOT included in a plan, 0 points

Project sponsor to provide the name of the plan. Examples of acceptable plans include but are not limited to Borough Wide Comprehensive Plan, Community Council Comprehensive Plans, MSB LRTP, Special Use District (SPUD) plan, Transit Plan, or Official Streets & Highways Plan.

Criterion 1.2: Improves access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations

How to score:

- 0 points if the project would not improve access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations
- 3 points if the project would minimally improve access (the project sponsor should provide evidence of how the project meets this criterion)
- 5 points if the project focuses on improving access (i.e., the project's primary goal is to provide access to employment, education, or healthcare; the project sponsor will provide the evidence of this in the submission)

The project sponsor will provide the evidence of improved access as part of the project description.

Criterion 1.3: Includes right-of-way (ROW) or access management components that coordinate with land use

How to score:

- 3 points if the project is included in an access management plan
- 0 points if the project is NOT included in an access management plan

The project sponsor to provide the name of the access management plan. The Bogard-Seldon Access Management Plan is an example of an access management plan.

Goal area 2: Improve transportation safety for all modes

Projects that improve safety for all users (motorists, cyclists, pedestrians, etc.) support quality of life and help prevent crashes or injuries.

Criterion 2.1: addresses a high crash location or issue

How to score (scored programmatically with the Equivalent Property Damage Only [EPDO] analysis layer in GIS):

- 5 points if the project is on a road/corridor with an EPDO score in the top 20th percentile
- 3 points if the project is on a road/corridor with an EPDO score in the 60th-80th percentile
- 1 point if the project is on a road/corridor with an EPDO score in the 40th-60th percentile

Project sponsor does not provide documentation for this criterion.

Criterion 2.2: identified need in a safety plan

How to score:

- 3 points if the project is in a safety plan

Project sponsor to provide the name of the safety plan; examples include Safe Routes to School, Community Safety Action Plan, School Walking Routes; other plans may be considered if the project sponsor provides the name of the plan and section that references the project

Criterion 2.3: implements safety design features[1] / addresses a documented[2] issue

How to score:

- 3 points if the project implements safety features or addresses a documented issue for all modes
- 1 point if the project implements safety features or addresses a documented issue for one mode

[1]Project sponsor to provide a description of the safety features in the project description and what modes are addressed; for purposes of scoring this criterion, modes include motor vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists; examples of safety features include but are not limited to items such as guardrails, lighting, traffic calming (e.g., speed humps), intersection realignments, sight distance improvements, enhanced pedestrian crossings (e.g., rectangular rapid flashing beacons), or early warning flashers.

[2]Project sponsor to provide the source of the documented issues; the source may be a study, report, analysis, or other technical assessment; public comments/complaints are not considered when evaluating this criterion as that metric is scored elsewhere.

Criterion 2.4: within ½-mile of a school, senior center, senior housing, or playground

How to score (scored programmatically with GIS by using a ½-mile buffer around the project location):

- 1 point if the project meets the criterion (one of the listed facilities falls within the ½-mile buffer)

Goal area 3: leverage all available funding resources

Projects with funding identified and allocated are closer to implementation than those without funding. Most federally funded projects require a local match. Identifying that match early helps keep a project on schedule.

Criterion 3.1: Project funding has been allocated

How to score:

- 3 points if match funding has been secured

Project sponsor to provide evidence of funding through a resolution or budget line item that identifies the project and the amount of funding dedicated to it. Projects that are early in the development process are unlikely to have funding.

Goal area 4: Maintain the system in a state of good repair

Maintenance of transportation facilities is important to support quality of life, facilitate economic development, reduce crashes, and protect transportation investments.

Criterion 4.1: improves asset condition

How to score:

- 5 points if the project addresses pavement or bridge conditions

Project sponsor will provide evidence of the improvement in the project description. For example, they may indicate that a road's IRI value will decrease after the project is completed.

Criterion 4.2: improves operations

How to score:

- 5 points if the project improves operations
- 0 points if the project does not improve operations

Project sponsor will provide the improvements to operations in the project description. Examples include replacing streetlights, adding stoplights, incorporating Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). Projects that get a 'yes' on this criterion generally include elements that improve how the transportation network operates.

Criterion 4.3: addresses public complaints

How to score:

- 3 points if there is a record of public complaints

Project sponsor to provide the source of the recorded complaints. The Matanuska Susitna Borough's (MSB) 'problem reporter' is an example of a source of recorded public complaints. Other sources of complaints may include letters from community or user groups or comments submitted at public meetings or through online forms.

Goal area 5: Create opportunities for more diverse transportation options

A transportation system with diverse transportation options allows people of different economic, social, and demographic backgrounds to move about the MPA.

Criterion 5.1: project upgrades/adds non-motorized facilities

How to score:

- 5 points if the project adds facilities recommended in the MSB Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (BPP)
- 3 points if the project adds or improves other transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities
- 1 point if the project maintains existing facilities

Project sponsor to indicate if the project is in the BPP; if the project is not in the BPP but the project sponsor feels that it improves non-motorized or transit facilities, then the project sponsor shall include a description of the improvements; if the project maintains a facility without any additional improvements, the project sponsor shall indicate what maintenance is expected.

Criterion 5.2: closes a gap in the multi-modal network

How to score:

- 5 points if the project connects two facilities or extends a facility
- The project sponsor must describe the project termini and indicate what connection or which facilities the project is connecting or extending. This criterion evaluates non-motorized connections only. For roadway network gaps, see Criterion 6.3.

Criterion 5.3: supports transit

How to score:

- 5 points if the project adds or improves transit facilities
- 3 points if the project maintains transit facilities

Project sponsor must describe the new or improved transit facilities, or provide a description of how the facility will be maintained.

Criterion 5.4: reduces user group conflicts

How to score:

- 3 points if the project reduces user group conflicts

Project sponsor will provide a description of how user group conflicts are reduced or eliminated. This criterion is focused on reducing conflicts such as those that occur between motorized and non-motorized users or higher-speed users from slower uses. Examples may include separating cyclists from pedestrians, consolidating driveways to limit non-motorized/vehicular interactions, or relocating ATV trails away from roadways.

Goal area 6: Shorten commute times & improve mobility

Shorter travel times between home, work, healthcare, and other services improve quality of life, lower vehicle emissions, and reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled.

Criterion 6.1: improves level of service (LOS)

How to score (scored programmatically with GIS based on the LOS analysis layer):

- 5 points if the project is on LOS E or F roads
- 3 points if the project is on LOS C or D roads

Project sponsor does not provide any information.

Criterion 6.2: increases mobility for freight movement

How to score (scored programmatically by cross-referencing the project location with the State Freight Network data and DOT&PF's traffic volume reports):

- 5 points if the project is on a designated freight network
- 3 points if the project is on a route with a truck volume greater than 10%

- 1 point if the project is on a route with a truck volume of 5-10%

Project sponsor does not provide any information.

Criterion 6.3: addresses a gap in the roadway network

How to score:

- 5 points if the project connects two roads or extends a road

Project sponsor shall describe the project termini and names of the roads being connected or extended; this criterion does not evaluate non-motorized facility connections.

Goal area 7: Build a resilient transportation network

A resilient transportation network is one that is able to bounce back from natural disasters, extreme weather events, or other significant impacts. A resilient transportation network provides redundant facilities, avoids natural hazards, and is designed to mitigate environmental impacts.

Criterion 7.1: improves resiliency of at-risk infrastructure

How to score:

- 5 points if the project addresses transportation infrastructure in the 100-year floodplain
- 3 points if the project reduces the vulnerability of transport infrastructure

Project sponsor will indicate if the project is in the 100-year floodplain as identified in FEMA flood mapping. Flood maps are available through the MSB. If the project is not in the 100-year floodplain but the project sponsor believes the project reduces the vulnerability of transportation infrastructure, then the project sponsor must describe how the project reduces vulnerability. Examples may include increasing culvert sizes to accommodate larger floods or moving a road away from an rockfall zone.

Criterion 7.2: includes features that enhance or protect the natural environment

How to score:

- 5 points if the project enhances or protects the natural environment

Project sponsor will provide documentation on how the natural environment is enhanced or protected. Examples could include installation or repair of fish passage culverts, construction of wildlife under-crossings, or restoration of wetlands.

Criterion 7.3: provides network redundancy or improves emergency access

How to score:

- 5 points if the project provides redundant access to a single-access community or emergency facility
- 1 point if the project improves emergency vehicle access or enhances emergency response

Project sponsor is responsible for providing documentation on how the project meets this criterion. Documentation from an emergency response entity such as EMS or fire departments are examples.

Additional criteria

These criteria were deemed important to consider when evaluating project nominations, however, they did not fit under any goal area. These criteria are typically included in the MTP project evaluation process by peer MPOs and represent best practices.

Criterion 8.1: Public Support

How to score:

- 5 points for a letter of resolution from an organized governing body (e.g., community council, Road Service Area, city council)
- 3 points for documented public support (e.g., public comments, letters of support, petitions)

The project sponsor is responsible for providing this documentation.

Criterion 8.2: Population Reached

How to score:

- 5 points if the project reaches a regional/areawide population
- 3 points if the project reaches a single community
- 1 point if the project reaches multiple neighborhoods
- No points are awarded for projects that only reach a single neighborhood

MVP staff will evaluate this criterion using GIS to analyze the project's reach. The extent of the project's reach will be determined from the MSB's parcel data layer.

Criterion 8.3: Roadway Functional Classification

How to score:

- 5 points if the project is on arterials or greater
- 3 points if the project is on a major collector
- 1 point if the project is on a minor collector

MVP staff will evaluate this criterion using the roadway functional classifications GIS layer.

Scoring Matrix Summary

Goal	Weight (%)	Total points available	Total potential score	Data Source / Method
Transportation alignment with land use	15	11	165	Plans referenced by the project sponsor
Improve safety for all modes	25	12	300	Crash analysis/EPDO GIS
Leverage funding sources	5	3	15	Project sponsor provided; budgets
Maintain a system in good repair	20	13	260	Baseline condition assessments (e.g., IRI, PCI); public comments
Create transportation options	10	18	180	Project sponsor provided descriptions
Shorten commute times & improve mobility	10	15	150	GIS of LOS and freight routes; project sponsor provided info
Build a resilient transportation network	15	15	225	Project sponsor provided info
Public support	1	5	5	Documentation
Population reached	1	5	5	GIS analysis of adjacent parcel data
Functional class	1	5	5	DOT&PF maps
	Totals	**102**	**1,460**	

Data and Tools

Evaluation relies on both analytical tools and qualitative input.

Documentation and Transparency

All project scores, assumptions, and data sources will be documented. Summary score sheets are made available for review by MPO committees and the public.

Periodic Review and Updates

The MPO will periodically review and refine its evaluation criteria and weighting structure to reflect updated regional goals, new data sources, and federal guidance.

Draft MVP MTP Project Nomination Form

Final form will be available in Survey123

Splash Page Content:

(Includes MVP brand logo)

Title: MVP's Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Nomination Form

Text:

MVP is developing its very first Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The MTP will chart our region's transportation future through 2050, identifying the projects and investments needed to keep the Mat-Su Valley connected, safe, and thriving as we grow.

Use this form to nominate transportation projects for consideration in MVP's MTP. All submitted projects will be evaluated for consistency with regional goals, land use integration, safety, asset management, and funding readiness.

The nomination period closes on DATE.

How to Use this Form

For questions about the nomination process please send an email to info@mvpmpo.com.

If you are experiencing issues with the mechanics of the form and data entry, please contact Mackenze Origer (mackenze.origer@matsugov.us).

Project Eligibility

Before you fill this nomination form out, please review the Project Eligibility criteria below and affirm that your project meets all criteria. Only projects that meet these eligibility criteria will be considered for potential inclusion in the MTP:

- Located within the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary
- Have a total budget less than $8,000,000
- Eligible for FHWA funding (Note: ATV or recreational off-road projects are not eligible).

Project Location

Point placement map.

If project nominations are to be submitted as a point, then will need some explanation as to how to decide where to submit that point, especially if looking at extended linear project area. Would also reiterate that the point and project must occur wholly within the MPA.

Please provide a brief description of your project location including nearest cross streets.

Submitter Information

Organization Sponsor (Individual/ Agency/ Organization/Unaffiliated):

Contact Name:
Contact Phone Number:
Contact Email:

Project Information

Project Name:

Project Type:
(Check all that apply project)

- Roadway Capacity - Y/N
- Roadway Maintenance / Reconstruction – Y/N
- Transit (Bus / Rail) – Y/N
- Bicycle / Pedestrian – Y/N
- Freight / Goods Movement – Y/N
- Safety – Y/N
- Technology / Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) – Y/N
- Planning / Study – Y/N
- New Corridor – Y/N
- Bridge – Y/N
- Other: ________________

Project Description (narrative):

Funding and Project Readiness

Note: All projects adopted in the MTP require at least a 9.03% non-federal match.

Estimated project cost (if available):

Are there existing identified funding sources for this project?

- Yes (narrative including the source, amount, and status)
- No

Project Phases Being Nominated:

- Planning/Study
- Preliminary engineering
- Right-of-Way
- Construction
- Operations/Maintenance

Land Use Integration

Is the project included in an existing land use or transportation plan?

- Yes: provide plan name and location in document of project occurrence
- No/ Unknown

Does the project include or is it contained within a corridor identified in an access management plan?

- Yes: provide plan name and location in document of project occurrence
- No/ Unknown

Provide a brief description of how your project would improve access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations.

Improving Network Safety

Is the project included in an existing safety plan?

- Yes: provide plan name and location in document of project occurrence
- No/ Unknown

Does your project implement safety design features (e.g., improved lighting, signage, speed reduction, or crossings) or address documented safety issues?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation for each applicable transportation mode below of how your project addresses documented safety issues and what types of safety design features are included.
    - General Automotive
    - Freight
    - Bike
    - Pedestrian
    - Transit

Supports System Maintenance

Does your project address pavement or bridge condition issues?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation of how your project would address pavement or bridge condition issues.

Does your project improve operations?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation of what operational improvements your project includes.

Does your project directly address an area with a known record of public complaints?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation of how your project would ameliorate public complaints.

Supports More Diverse Transportation Options

Is the project included in the MSB Bike and Pedestrian plan?

- Yes: provide location in document of project occurrence
- No/ Unknown

Does your project support multi-modal transportation?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation of how your project would support multi-modal transportation.

How does your project support transit facilities? (select one)

- It would add new or improve transit facilities
- It would maintain existing transit facilities
- It would have no effect on transit facilities

Does your project reduce user group conflicts?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation of how your project would reduce user group conflicts.

Supports Network Resiliency and Environmental Considerations

Does your project reduce the vulnerability of transportation facilities?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation of how your project would reduce transportation facility vulnerability.

Does your project include features to enhance or protect the natural environment?

- No
- Yes – If yes, please provide a narrative explanation of what features would be included.

Public and Agency Support

Has a governing body or local agency formally endorsed the project?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please attach a document of endorsement.

MVP MTP Project Evaluation Criteria + Scoring

Goal Area	Key	Criterion Number	Criterion Description	Evaluation Metric	Available Points	Scored	Weight	Evaluated Total Score	Evaluator Notes
					11	**0**	**15%**	**0**	
1. Ensure transportation improvements align with land use patterns & connect housing to employment		1.1	consistent with adopted plans and local land use plans/policies	included in an adopted plan	3				
				not included in any plan	0				
		1.2	improves access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations including tourism and recreation	project is focused on improving access	5				
				improves access somewhat	3				
				does not improve access	0				
		1.3	includes ROW or access management components that coordinate with land use	included in an access management plan	3				
				not included in an access management plan	0				
					12	0	**25%**	0	
2. Improve transportation safety for all modes		2.1	addresses a high crash location / issue	project is on a road/corridor in top 20th percentile EPDO	5				
				project is on a road/corridor in 60th-80th percentile EPDO	3				
				project is on a road/corridor in 40th-60th percentile EPDO	1				
		2.2	identified need in a safety plan (e.g., Safe Routes to School, Walking Routes, Comprehensive Safety Action Plan)	project is in a safety plan	3				
				project is not in a safety plan	0				
		2.3	implements safety design features / addresses documented issues	project includes safety feature(s) or addresses documented issues for multiple modes	3				
				project includes safety feature(s) or addresses documented issues for a single mode	1				
				project would not include safety design features	0				
		2.4	addresses vulnerable users (e.g., school crossings, senior housing)	within 1/2-mile of a school, senior center, senior housing	1				
				not within 1/2-mile of a school, senior center, senior housing	0				
					3	0	**5%**	0	
3. Leverage all available funding resources		3.1	Project has some funding allocated	no funding	0				
				match funding secured	3				
					13	0	**20%**	0	
4. Maintain the system in a state of good repair		4.1	improves asset condition (e.g., pavement or bridge condition ratings)	addresses pavement/ bridge condition	5				
				does not address pavement/ bridge condition	0				
		4.2	improves operations (e.g., replaces lights)	yes	5				
				no	0				
		4.3	addresses public complaints	record of public complaints	3				
				no record of public complaints	0				

				18	0	10%	0
5. Create opportunities for more diverse transportation options	5.1	upgrades/adds non-motorized facilities	adds a project identified in MSB Bike and Pedestrian plan	5			
			project adds or improves other transit, bike, pedestrian facilities	3			
			maintains existing facility(ies)	1			
			does not add or improve non-motorized facilities	0			
	5.2	closes a gap in the multimodal network	new connection between two existing facilities or extends a facility	5			
			no change	0			
	5.3	supports transit	project adds or improves transit facilities	5			
			project maintains existing facility	3			
			project does not improve transit facilities	0			
	5.4	reduces user group conflicts	yes	3			
		does not reduce user group conflict	no	0			
				15	0	10%	0
6. Shorten commute times & improve mobility	6.1	improves Level of Service rating	project is on a roadway with LOS E or F	5			
			project is on a roadway with LOS C or D	3			
			project is on a roadway with LOS A or B	0			
	6.2	increases mobility for freight movement	on a designated freight network	5			
			route has truck volume above 10%	3			
			route has truck volume above 5%	1			
	6.3	addresses a gap in the transportation network	new connection between two roads or extends a road	5			
			no change	0			
				15	0	15%	0
7. Build a resilient transportation network	7.1	improves resiliency of at-risk infrastructure	addresses infrastructure in an identified 100-yr flood zone	5			
			reduces the vulnerability of transportation facilities	3			
			no change	0			
	7.2	includes features that enhance or protect the natural environment	improves or protects natural habitat (e.g., fish passage culverts, wildlife under/over, signs, fencing)	5			
			project provides no specific means of improving natural habitat	0			
	7.3	provides network redundancy or improves emergency access	Provides redundant emergency access to single access community or emergency facility	5			
			Improves emergency vehicle access/enhances emergency response	1			
			Does not improve emergency access	0			
						SUB TOTAL	0
8. Additional Criteria							
		Criteria	**Evaluation Metric**	**Available Points**	**Scored**		
	8.1	**Public Support**	Resolution of support from organized governing body (e.g., community council, city, RSA)	5			
			Documented public support/letters/petitions	3			
	8.2	**Population Reached**	Regional/areawide users	5			
			Less than areawide; single community	3			
			Multiple neighborhoods/destinations	1			
			Single neighborhood/destination	0			
	8.3	**Functional classification**	Arterial or greater	5			
			Major Collector	3			
			Minor Collector	1			
			Local	0			
				SUB TOTAL	0		
				TOTAL SCORE	0		

10.8.2025

ATTN: Commissioner Anderson and the STIP team

Subject: Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities' Lack of Coordination and Consultation with MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation Regarding FFY26 Funding Allocations

This memorandum is intended to document and express concerns regarding the lack of coordination and consultation by the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) with MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation (MVP) related to critical funding and planning processes.

1. Lack of Consultation on FFY26 STBG, TAP, and CRP Carryover Funds

MVP was not consulted regarding the carryover balances or the annual allocation of Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funds anticipated for Federal Fiscal Year 2026 (FFY26) prior to October 1st. This absence of communication hinders MVP's ability to make informed planning decisions, adjust programming strategies, and adequately prepare for project development in our Program of Projects for FFY26.

2. Utilization of MVP STBG FFY24 for a Repaving Project for Bogard Road from Trunk Road to Wasilla Fishhook

It has come to our attention that $2,000,000 of MVP's FFY24 STBG 50-200 funds were utilized by DOT&PF for a repaving project on Bogard Road. Though the Policy Board has prioritized funding for this corridor, MVP was not notified or engaged in any discussion regarding the reallocation of these funds. This use of locally programmed funds without coordination undermines MVP's role in regional project prioritization and the federally mandated planning process.

3. Utilization of MVP's CRP funding for Fleet Conversion

STIP Amendment #2 documented that DOT&PF utilized MVP's FFY25 CRP allocation for Fleet Conversion. MVP was not notified or engaged in any discussion regarding the allocation of these funds. This use of locally programmed funds without coordination undermines MVP's role in regional project prioritization and the federally mandated planning process.

Furthermore, the federal requirements for MPO consultation regarding Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funding are established under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law

(BIL), and codified in Title 23 of the U.S. Code and Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). 23 U.S.C. § 175 Carbon Reduction Program

This section creates the CRP and outlines how funds are to be apportioned, obligated, and programmed, specifically referencing the role of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs).

23 U.S.C. § 175(c)(1):

(4)Coordination in urbanized areas.

"Before obligating funds for an eligible project under subsection (c) in an urbanized area that is not a transportation management area, a State shall coordinate with any metropolitan planning organization that represents the urbanized area prior to determining which activities should be carried out under the project."

4. Lack of Engagement on Draft STIP 2026–2029 Prior to Public Release

DOT&PF did not involve MVP in the development or review of the Draft Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for 2026–2029. As a Metropolitan Planning Organization, MVP is a required planning partner under federal regulations (23 CFR 450.314). Early and meaningful consultation is essential for ensuring alignment between state and regional priorities and to maintaining the integrity of the collaborative planning process. Additionally, because MVP does not have a TIP and is programming annual allocations directly to projects listed in the STIP, the lack of consultation undermines MVP's role in prioritizing and planning for projects important to the region.

5. The 3C Planning Process and Required MPO Coordination

Under federal transportation planning law, the development and implementation of transportation plans and programs must follow the 3C process—Continuing, Cooperative, and Comprehensive as outlined in 23 U.S.C. § 134 and 23 CFR Part 450. This process is the foundation of the relationship between state DOTs and MPOs and is essential to ensuring that transportation investments reflect both state and regional priorities.

Federal regulations, including 23 U.S.C. § 134, 23 CFR § 450.314(a), and 23 U.S.C. § 175(c)(1) affirm the MPO's central role in transportation decision-making within its urbanized area. Bypassing MVP in funding decisions or planning document development is inconsistent with the 3C process and compromises the integrity of federally mandated regional transportation planning.

Consultation and Communication Expectations

To improve coordination and uphold federally mandated processes, MVP respectfully outlines the following expectations for consultation and communication moving forward:

- Advance Notification of Funding Decisions: DOT&PF leadership must provide MVP with timely and detailed notice prior to any obligation or reallocation of STBG, TAP, CRP, or other MPO-allocated funds.
- Formal Consultation on Project Programming: All projects utilizing MVP-managed funds must be discussed and agreed upon with the MVP Policy Board prior to inclusion in the STIP or obligation.
- Involvement in Draft STIP Development: Prior to having a TIP and after, MVP must be given the opportunity to engage in the development of any future STIP with adequate opportunity to review and comment on proposed projects impacting the MPO region before public release.
- Transparent Communication Channels: DOT&PF leadership and MVP should establish routine, formal communication protocols—including regular coordination meetings and shared documentation—to ensure alignment in project planning and funding allocation.
- Adherence to Federal Requirements for MPO Engagement: DOT&PF leadership must comply with the consultation requirements of 23 U.S.C. § 134, 23 CFR 450.314, and 23 U.S.C. § 175(c)(1), particularly for CRP and other federally regulated programs.

Conclusion

These actions represent a significant breakdown in the required coordination between the State DOT and MVP. MVP remains committed to fulfilling its responsibilities under federal law and to serving the transportation needs of the region. We respectfully request that DOT&PF reaffirm its commitment to transparency and partnership with MVP, particularly in funding discussions and STIP development moving forward.

Sincerely,

Mayor Ledford,
MVP Policy Board Chair,
City of Wasilla Mayor

CC:
Emily Hayes FHWA
Randy Warden FHWA

MVP Allocation for FFY24					
Surface Transportation Program Block Grant Program	STBG		**$7,208,849.00**		
Carbon Reduction Program	CRP		**$775,163.00**		
Transportation Alternative Program	TAP		**$426,760.00**		
Projects					
DOT MVP Projects Action	Program Description	Limitation Type	Federal Funds Change(+ or-)		
PALMER-FISHHOOK ROAD MILEPOSTS 7-17	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$181,940.00		
SELDON RD EXT PH II: WINDY BOTTOM/BEVERLY LAKES RD - PITTMAN	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$454,850.00		
HEMMER RD EXTENSION AND UPGRADE, PALMER WASILLA HWY TO BOGARD RD (MSB)	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$1,364,550.00		
BOGARD RD PAV PRESERVATION: TRUNK RD TO WASILLA-FISHHOOK RD	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$2,105,375.11		
BOGARD RD SAFETY AND CAPACITY IMPROVMENTS [PARENT][CTP AWARD 2023]	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$2,274,250.00		
	Total	STBG	**$6,380,965.11**		
		CRP	**$0.00**		
		TAP	**$0.00**		
Carryforward to FFY25					
	STBG		$827,883.89		
	CRP		$775,163.00		
	TAP		$426,760.00		
MVP Allocations FFY25					
Surface Transportation Program Block Grant Program	STBG		**$7,353,026.00**		
Carbon Reduction Program	CRP		**$790,666.00**		
Transportation Alternative Program	TAP		**$435,295.00**		
MVP FFY25 allocaitons Plus carryforward	STBG		$8,180,909.89		
	CRP		$1,565,829.00		
	TAP		$862,055.00		
Projects					
BOGARD RD PAV PRESERVATION: TRUNK RD TO WASILLA-FISHHOOK RD	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	-$471,724.92		
FY25-26 (MVP) ADVANCED PROJECT DEFINITION	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$181,940.00		
(MVP) IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FY25-27	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$454,850.00		
MATSU VALLEY PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION (MVP) PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$272,910.00		
MATSU VALLEY PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION (MVP) STREETLIGHT INTERSECTION MANAGEMENT PLAN	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$143,844.41		
MATSU VALLEY PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION (MVP) SIGN MANAGEMENT PLAN	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$363,678.05		
TAP: PALMER-FISHHOOK: TRUNK ROAD TO EDGERTON PARKS SEPARATED PATHWAY	TRANS ALTERN 50K-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$687,030.00		
SELDON ROAD RECONSTRUCTION: WASILLA-FISHHOOK TO LUCILLE STREET (PARENT) (CTP AWARD 2023)	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	Charged to Limitation	$756,974.00		
					I am questioning how to account for
Subtotal MVP expense for FFY25	STBG 50-200K POP IIJA	MVP STBG Total	**$2,174,196.46**	**$2,645,921.38**	the -471,724.92
	TAP	MVP TAP Total	**$687,030.00**		
	CRP	MVP CRP Total	$0.00		
FFY25 Funding + Carry Forward - Expense	STBG		$6,006,713.43		
	TAP		$175,025.00		
	CRP		$1,565,829.00		
MVP FFY26 Allocations					
Surface Transportation Program Block Grant Program	STBG		$7,023,041.29		
Carbon Reduction Program	CRP		$806,690.69		
Transportation Alternative Program	TAP		$446,840.15		
MVP FFY26 Allocation Plus FFY25 carryforward	STBG		**$13,029,754.72**		
	CRP		**$2,372,519.69**		
	TAP		**$621,865.15**		

MVP Suballocation for FFY24					
Surface Transportation Program Block Grant Program	STBG	$7,208,849.00			
Carbon Reduction Program	CRP	$775,163.00			
Transportation Alternative Program	TAP	$426,760.00			
		$8,410,772.00			
MVP FFY24 Program of Projects Nominations	**None**				
MVP Suballocations for FFY25					
FFY24 Carry forward	STBG	$7,208,849.00			
	CRP	$775,163.00			
	TAP	$426,760.00			
	Subtotal	**$8,410,772.00**			
Surface Transportation Program Block Grant Program	STBG	$7,353,026.00			
Carbon Reduction Program	CRP	$790,666.00			
Transportation Alternative Program	TAP	$435,295.00			
		$16,989,759.00			
MVP FFY25 Suballocations plus FFY24 Carryforward					
	STBG				
	CRP				
	TAP				
MVP FFY25 Program of Projects	Wasilla-Fishhook Road E Seldon to Tex-Al Drive		STBG 50-200k	$7,641,480.00	
	MVP Streetlight Intersection Management Plan		STBG 50-200k	$363,900.00	
	MVP Sign Management Plan		STBG 50-200k	$363,900.00	
	MVP Pavement Management		STBG 50-200k	$270,900.00	
	Seldon Road Reconstruction: Wasilla-Fishhook Road to Snowgoose Drive (Parent) (CTP Award 2023)		STBG 50-200k	$2,871,000.00	
	Palmer-Fishhook Separated Pathway: Trunk Road to Edgerton Parks Road (TAP Award 2023)		TAP 50-200	$595,438.00	
	FFY25 - 27 MVP Improvement Program		STBG 50-200k	$909,700.00	
	Bogard Road Safety and Capacity Improvements (Parent) (CTP Award 2023)		STBG 50-200k	$2,274,250.00	
	Inner and Outer Springer Loop Separated Path (TAP Award 2023)		TAP 50-200	$187,744.00	
	MVP Advance Project Definition		STBG 50-200k	$191,940.00	
			Total		
			STBG	**$14,887,070.00**	Over spent by 468,372.00 not sure how to account for this
			TAP	**$783,182.00**	
			CRP	$0.00	
	Subtotal MVP expense for FFY25			**$15,670,252.00**	
MVP Suballocations for FFY26					
Surface Transportation Program Block Grant Program	STBG	$7,023,041.29			
Carbon Reduction Program	CRP	$806,690.69			
Transportation Alternative Program	TAP	$446,840.15			
FFY25 Carryforward	STBG				
	CRP	$1,565,829.00			
	TAP	$78,873.00			
MVP FFY26 Allocation Plus FFY25 Carryforward	**STBG**	**$7,023,041.29**			
	CRP	**$2,372,519.69**			
	TAP	**$446,881.15**			

Conflict of Interest Policy

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to protect the interests of MVP by (a) preventing the personal interest of the Policy Board, Technical Committee, and Employees from interfering with their duties to the organization and (b) avoiding any unethical financial, professional, or political gain on the part of such individuals. The intent of this policy is to supplement, not replace, any applicable federal, state, or local laws regarding conflicts of interest. *see ARTICLE 10 of the Amended Bylaws July 2024 for the full conflict of interest policy documentation.

Persons Concerned

This statement applies to Board Members, Officers, and all Employees who can influence the governance and actions of *MVP*. This includes anyone who makes financial decisions, might be referred to as "management personnel," or has proprietary information regarding *MVP.*

Procedures

Duty to Disclose

Each Board Member, Director, Officer, Employee, and any other Interested Person is under an obligation to disclose the existence or potential existence of a Conflict of Interest as it arises.

Investigating Conflicts

When a potential Conflict of Interest is disclosed, the Policy Board will then provide the individual with an opportunity to disclose all material facts. The Board will collect all pertinent information and question the involved parties. If it turns out that a conflict does not exist, the inquiry will be documented but no further action will be taken.

Addressing a Conflict of Interest

If the Board determines that a conflict of interest exists, they will take the appropriate actions to address the conflict. This may include (but not be limited to):

(a) prohibiting any Interested Parties from voting on any matter related to said Conflict of Interest or (b) terminating employment with *MVP.*

Affected parties both within and outside of *MVP*, including directors, employees, and independent contractors, will be notified. If the Conflict of Interest in question involves a member of the Board, that individual will be excused from deliberations.

Disciplinary Action

All conflicts of interest will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The board has full discretion to deem what disciplinary action is appropriate and necessary for disclosed conflicts of interest.

If the governing officers reasonably believe a member or staff member failed to disclose an existing or possible Conflict of Interest, it shall inform the individual of the rationale for such belief and grant the individual an opportunity to explain the alleged failure to disclose the Conflict of Interest.

After hearing the individual's response and investigating further as warranted by the circumstances, the governing officers may take appropriate disciplinary action, including removal from the position at the organization.

Notice of Annual Statements

Every Member, Director, Officer, Employee, and any other Interested Person must sign a Conflict of Interest Certification upon said individual's term of office, employment, or other relationship with *MVP* and must do so annually. Failure to sign does not nullify the policy.

Acknowledgment

By signing, the individual named below understands what constitutes a Conflict of Interest and understands the procedure for addressing them with *MVP*, including their duty to disclose any known or potential conflicts of interest.

The signee agrees to abide by the procedures set forth by this policy for the duration of their relationship with *MVP*

Name (printed): ______________________ Date: __/__/20__

Signature: ______________________

The Conflict-of-Interest Policy Certification form was adopted by the MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation Policy Board on August 20, 2024 and updated in February 2025.

Altman, Rogers & Co.
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

November 8, 2025

Kim Sollien
Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation
PO Box 2587
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Dear Ms. Sollien,

Enclosed is the engagement letter to provide audit services for the year ending September 30, 2025. We will address our engagement letters to the Audit Committee or Chairman of the Board of Directors; however, they may authorize anyone to sign this contract.

After this engagement letter is signed and returned please either call or email me at josephb@altrogco.com with your preferences for fieldwork dates. Please feel free to contact me with any questions at (907) 274-2992.

Sincerely,

ALTMAN, ROGERS & CO.

Joseph Bergene, CPA
Principal

Enclosures

3000 C Street N. Suite 201 Anchorage, Alaska 99503 Phone 907-274-2992 Fax 907-274-2993
Offices in Juneau and Soldotna A Professional Corporation

November 8, 2025

Audit Committee or Chairman of the Board of Directors
Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation
PO Box 2587
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Dear Audit Committee or Chairman of the Board,

We are pleased to confirm our understanding of the services we are to provide for Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation for the year ended September 30, 2025.

Audit Scope and Objectives

We will audit the financial statements of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation, which comprise the statement(s) of financial position as of September 30, 2025, the related statements of activities, functional expenses, and cash flows for the year then ended, and the disclosures (collectively, the “financial statements”).

The objectives of our audit are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and issue an auditor’s report that includes our opinion about whether your financial statements are fairly presented, in all material respects, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance but is not absolute assurance and therefore is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with GAAS will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. Misstatements, including omissions, can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if there is a substantial likelihood that, individually or in the aggregate, they would influence the judgment of a reasonable user made based on the financial statements.

Auditor’s Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements

We will conduct our audit in accordance with GAAS and will include tests of your accounting records and other procedures we consider necessary to enable us to express such an opinion. As part of an audit in accordance with GAAS, we exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit.

We will evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management. We will also evaluate the overall presentation of the financial statements, including the disclosures, and determine whether the financial statements represent the underlying transactions and events in a manner that achieves fair presentation. We will plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether from (1) errors, (2) fraudulent financial reporting, (3) misappropriation of assets, or (4) violations of laws or governmental regulations that are attributable to the Organization or to acts by management or employees acting on behalf of the Organization.

3000 C Street N. Suite 201 Anchorage, Alaska 99503 Phone 907-274-2992 Fax 907-274-2993
Offices in Juneau and Soldotna A Professional Corporation

Because of the inherent limitations of an audit, combined with the inherent limitations of internal control, and because we will not perform a detailed examination of all transactions, there is an unavoidable risk that some material misstatements may not be detected by us, even though the audit is properly planned and performed in accordance with GAAS. In addition, an audit is not designed to detect immaterial misstatements or violations of laws or governmental regulations that do not have a direct and material effect on the financial statements. However, we will inform the appropriate level of management of any material errors, fraudulent financial reporting, or misappropriation of assets that comes to our attention. We will also inform the appropriate level of management of any violations of laws or governmental regulations that come to our attention, unless clearly inconsequential. Our responsibility as auditors is limited to the period covered by our audit and does not extend to any later periods for which we are not engaged as auditors.

We will obtain an understanding of the Organization and its environment, including the system of internal control, sufficient to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to error or fraud, and to design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks and obtain evidence that is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentation, or the override of internal control. An audit is not designed to provide assurance on internal control or to identify deficiencies in internal control. Accordingly, we will express no such opinion. However, during the audit, we will communicate to you and those charged with governance internal control related matters that are required to be communicated under professional standards.

We have identified the following significant risks of material misstatement as part of our audit planning:

1) Improper revenue recognition.
2) Management override of internal controls.

We will also conclude, based on the audit evidence obtained, whether there are conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about the Organization's ability to continue as a going concern for a reasonable period of time.

Our procedures will include tests of documentary evidence supporting the transactions recorded in the accounts, tests of the physical existence of inventories, and direct confirmation of receivables and certain assets and liabilities by correspondence with selected individuals, funding sources, creditors, and financial institutions. We will also request written representations from your attorneys as part of the engagement.

We may, from time to time and depending on the circumstances, use third-party service providers in serving your account. We may share confidential information about you with these service providers but remain committed to maintaining the confidentiality and security of your information. Accordingly, we maintain internal policies, procedures, and safeguards to protect the confidentiality of your personal information. In addition, we will secure confidentiality agreements with all service providers to maintain the confidentiality of your information and we will take reasonable precautions to determine that they have appropriate procedures in place to prevent the unauthorized release of your confidential information to others. In the event that we are unable to secure an appropriate confidentiality agreement, you will be asked to provide your consent prior to the sharing of your confidential information with the third-party service provider. Furthermore, we will remain responsible for the work provided by any such third-party service providers.

Our audit of the financial statements does not relieve you of your responsibilities.

Responsibilities of Management for the Financial Statements

Our audit will be conducted on the basis that you acknowledge and understand your responsibility for designing, implementing, and maintaining internal controls relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, including monitoring ongoing activities; for the selection and application of accounting principles; and for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. You are also responsible for making drafts of financial statements, all financial records, and related information available to us; for the accuracy and completeness of that information (including information from outside of the general and subsidiary ledgers); and for the evaluation of whether there are any conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about the Organization's ability to continue as a going concern within one year after the date that the financial statements are available to be issued. You are also responsible for providing us with (1) access to all information of which you are aware that is relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements, such as records, documentation, identification of all related parties and all related-party relationships and transactions, and other matters; (2) additional information that we may request for the purpose of the audit; and (3) unrestricted access to persons within the Organization from whom we determine it necessary to obtain audit evidence. At the conclusion of our audit, we will require certain written representations from you about the financial statements and related matters.

Your responsibilities include adjusting the financial statements to correct material misstatements and confirming to us in the management representation letter that the effects of any uncorrected misstatements aggregated by us during the current engagement and pertaining to the latest period presented are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the financial statements taken as a whole.

You are responsible for the design and implementation of programs and controls to prevent and detect fraud, and for informing us about all known or suspected fraud affecting the Organization involving (1) management, (2) employees who have significant roles in internal control, and (3) others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements. Your responsibilities include informing us of your knowledge of any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud affecting the Organization received in communications from employees, former employees, grantors, regulators, or others. In addition, you are responsible for identifying and ensuring that the Organization complies with applicable laws and regulations. You are responsible for the preparation of the supplementary information in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. You agree to include our report on the supplementary information in any document that contains, and indicates that we have reported on, the supplementary information. You also agree to include the audited financial statements with any presentation of the supplementary information that includes our report thereon.

Other Services

We will prepare the federal and state information returns for the year ended September 30, 2025 based on information provided by you. We will also prepare the financial statements of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America based on information provided by you.

We will perform the services in accordance with applicable professional standards, including the Statements on Standards for Tax Services issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The other services are limited to the financial statement and tax services previously defined. We, in our sole professional judgment, reserve the right to refuse to perform any procedure or take any action that could be construed as assuming management responsibilities. We will advise management with regard to tax positions taken in the preparation of the information return, but management must make all decisions with regard to those matters.

You agree to assume all management responsibilities for the tax services, financial statement preparation services, and any other nonattest services we provide; oversee the services by designating an individual, preferably from senior management, with suitable skill, knowledge, or experience; evaluate the adequacy and results of the services; and accept responsibility for them.

Engagement Administration, Fees, and Other

We understand that your employees will prepare all cash, accounts receivable, and other confirmations we request and will locate any documents selected by us for testing.

Joe Bergene is the engagement partner and is responsible for supervising the engagement and signing the report or authorizing another individual to sign it. We expect to begin our audit in January 2026.

We estimate that our fees for the audit and other services other than the preparation of the information returns will be $18,000 and $3,000 for tax preparation of the information returns. You will also be billed for travel and other out-of-pocket costs such as report production, word processing, postage, confirmation service provider fees, etc. Additional expenses are estimated to be less than $500. The fee estimate is based on anticipated cooperation from your personnel and the assumption that unexpected circumstances will not be encountered during the engagement. If significant additional time is necessary, we will keep you informed of any problems we encounter and our fees will be adjusted accordingly. Our invoices for these fees will be rendered each month as work progresses and are payable on presentation. Amounts not paid within 30 days will be subject to a late payment charge of .875% per month (10.5% per year).

Reporting

We will issue a written report upon completion of our audit of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation's financial statements. Our report will be addressed to the governing board of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation. Circumstances may arise in which our report may differ from its expected form and content based on the results of our audit. Depending on the nature of these circumstances, it may be necessary for us to modify our opinion, add a separate section, or add an emphasis-of-matter or other-matter paragraph to our auditor's report, or if necessary, withdraw from this engagement. If our opinion is other than unmodified, we will discuss the reasons with you in advance. If, for any reason, we are unable to complete the audit or are unable to form or have not formed an opinion, we may decline to express an opinion or withdraw from this engagement.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you and believe this letter accurately summarizes the significant terms of our engagement. If you have any questions, please let us know. If you agree with the terms of our engagement as described in this letter, please sign the attached copy and return it to us.

Sincerely,

ALTMAN, ROGERS & CO.

Joseph Bergene

Joe Bergene, CPA
Principal

RESPONSE:

This letter correctly sets forth the understanding of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation.

Management signature: ________________________________

Title: ____

Date: ____

You agree to assume all management responsibilities for the tax services, financial statement preparation services, and any other nonattest services we provide; oversee the services by designating an individual, preferably from senior management, with suitable skill, knowledge, or experience; evaluate the adequacy and results of the services; and accept responsibility for them.

Engagement Administration, Fees, and Other

We understand that your employees will prepare all cash, accounts receivable, and other confirmations we request and will locate any documents selected by us for testing.

Joe Bergene is the engagement partner and is responsible for supervising the engagement and signing the report or authorizing another individual to sign it. We expect to begin our audit in January 2026.

We estimate that our fees for the audit and other services other than the preparation of the information returns will be $18,000 and $3,000 for tax preparation of the information returns. You will also be billed for travel and other out-of-pocket costs such as report production, word processing, postage, confirmation service provider fees, etc. Additional expenses are estimated to be less than $500. The fee estimate is based on anticipated cooperation from your personnel and the assumption that unexpected circumstances will not be encountered during the engagement. If significant additional time is necessary, we will keep you informed of any problems we encounter and our fees will be adjusted accordingly. Our invoices for these fees will be rendered each month as work progresses and are payable on presentation. Amounts not paid within 30 days will be subject to a late payment charge of .875% per month (10.5% per year).

Reporting

We will issue a written report upon completion of our audit of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation's financial statements. Our report will be addressed to the governing board of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation. Circumstances may arise in which our report may differ from its expected form and content based on the results of our audit. Depending on the nature of these circumstances, it may be necessary for us to modify our opinion, add a separate section, or add an emphasis-of-matter or other-matter paragraph to our auditor's report, or if necessary, withdraw from this engagement. If our opinion is other than unmodified, we will discuss the reasons with you in advance. If, for any reason, we are unable to complete the audit or are unable to form or have not formed an opinion, we may decline to express an opinion or withdraw from this engagement.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you and believe this letter accurately summarizes the significant terms of our engagement. If you have any questions, please let us know. If you agree with the terms of our engagement as described in this letter, please sign the attached copy and return it to us.

Sincerely,

ALTMAN, ROGERS & CO.

Joe Bergene, CPA
Principal

RESPONSE:

This letter correctly sets forth the understanding of Mat-Su Valley Planning for Transportation.

Management signature: ________________________________

Title: ____

Date: ____