



MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

MEMBERS

Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC
Alex Strawn, MSB **(Chair)**
Ben White, Alaska DOT&PF
Bob Charles Jr., Knik Tribe
Brian Winnestaffer, Chickaloon Native Village
Chris Bentz, Alaska DOT&PF
Crystal Smith, MSBSD
Dan Tucker, RSA Representative
Erich Schaal, City of Wasilla **(Vice Chair)**
Jennifer Busch, Public Transit
Jude Bilafer, City of Palmer
Kate Dueber, ARRC
Lawrence Smith, Trucking Industry Advocate
Randy Durham, MSB TAB
Stuart Leidner, Mobility Advocate
Tom Adams, MSB

Microsoft Teams Meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app
[Click here to join the meeting](#)
Meeting ID: 273 292 962 535 5
Passcode: ff9my6oM

Dial in by phone
+1 (689) 223-3510
Phone conference ID
954 438 135#

Agenda

Technical Committee

Tuesday, November 4th, 2025
2:00 – 4:00 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 is adjacent to the south.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Consent Agenda **(Action Item)**
 - a. Approval of the November 4th, 2025, Agenda
 - b. Approval of the October 14th, 2025, Minutes
3. Staff Report
 - Staff Report
 - a. Schedule of topics
4. Voices of the Visitors (Non-Action Items)
5. Policy Board October 22nd Action Items
 - a. *Motion to approve the MTP Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives for a 30-day Public Comment Period. Motion to approve (Winnestaffer), seconded. Item raised for discussion by Mike Brown, Motion to amend goal 1 and objectives (Brown), seconded. No objection. Motion to approve as amended (Winnestaffer), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*
 - b. *Motion to adopt the Public Participation Plan as presented Motion to approve (Winnestaffer), seconded. Item raised for discussion by Mike Brown to add ATV users to stakeholders. Motion to adopt as amended (Winnestaffer), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*



MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

- c. *Motion to Approve MVP's Annual FFY 26 Budget Motion to approve (Cooper), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*
 - d. *Approval of a professional services agreement with Altman, Rogers & Co. for IRS Form 990 preparation and FFY 2025 Annual Audit services. Motion to approve (Bowland), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.*
 - e. *Executive Session Director Evaluation*
6. Action Items
 - a. Officer Elections Recommended Motion: *Motion to Approve (Member) as TC Chair and Motion to approve (Member) as TC Vice Chair*
 - b. FFY26 December 2025-November 2026 Technical Committee Meeting Dates. Recommended Motion: *Move to approve TC meeting dates as presented.*
 - c. MTP Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook (Action Item)
 - Activity: We will run two projects through the criteriaRecommended Motion: *Move to Approve the MTP Project Evaluation Criteria as Presented.*
7. Old Business
 - a. MTP Update
 - Review Interactive Project Map (MSB GIS & RESPEC)
 - Review Project Filter, Nomination Form, and Nomination Process (MSB GIS and RESPEC)
 - Special Meeting November 12th, 10 am via Teams:
 - a. Existing Conditions Report
 - b. System Deficiency Report
 - c. Preview of the Model
 - d. RESPEC MTP Team Project List based on the data: problem area and project idea/solutions
 - b. 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 MPV's suballocations without consultation.
 - MVP FFY 24,25,26 funding and project documentation update requested by the Technical Committee
 - c. 26-29 STIP Update (None)
 - d. Alaska DOT&PF SAFEROADS initiative (speaker?)
8. New Business
9. Other Issues
 - a. Transit update
 - Valley Transit Request: Change the Alaska DOT Transit Management Plan to allow providers to access both Rural and Urban Funding if the region includes both designations.



MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

- Valley Transit Request: Ask for 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.

10. Informational Items

- a. Element Agency – MTP Video
- b. Possible Call for Project Launch November 21st
- c. Vision, Goals, and Objectives public comment period closes November 24th
- d. Reminder about the December 3rd Open House for the public

11. Technical Committee Comments

12. Adjournment

Next Scheduled MPO Technical Committee Meeting – Tuesday, December 9th, 2025, from 2:00-4:00 pm to be held via Microsoft TEAMS and at the Alaska DOT MatSu District Office at 500 S Seward Meridian Pkwy, Wasilla, Alaska.



**Technical Committee Action Item Cheat Sheet
November 4th**

Purpose: To guide the Committee's discussion and action on key agenda items.

Action Item A. Officer Elections

- **Nominations Review- submitted in writing**
 - Nominations- from the floor**
 - **Nominations for Chair**
 - **Nominations for Vice Chair**

Draft Motion for Chair:

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

Seconded by:

Yes

No

Abstain

Staff Summary:

Per the committee's bylaws, officer elections are held annually to select a Chair and Vice Chair for the upcoming calendar year. The Chair presides over meetings and represents the Technical Committee at Policy Board 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.

Action Item B. FFY26 Technical Committee Meeting Dates (December 2025 – November 2026)



Draft Motion:

"I move to approve the Technical Committee 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 Technical Committee meeting schedule. Meetings are generally held on the [day of week, e.g., first Wednesday] of each month at [time] at the [location/agency]. Adjustments have been made to avoid holidays and major conferences. Approval of the schedule provides consistency for members and the public.

Action Item D. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Project Evaluation Criteria

Draft Motion:

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

Seconded by:

Yes

No

Abstain

Staff Summary:

Staff has prepared updated MTP Project Evaluation Criteria based on the TC work session on October 23rd, for use in scoring and prioritizing projects nominated for inclusion in the next 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.



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

MEMBERS

Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC
Alex Strawn, MSB **(Chair)**
Ben White, Alaska DOT&PF535
Bob Charles Jr., Knik Tribe
Brian Winnestaffer, Chickaloon Native Village
Chris Bentz, Alaska DOT&PF
Crystal Smith, MSBSD
Dan Tucker, RSA Representative
Erich Schaal, City of Wasilla **(Vice Chair)**
Jennifer Busch, Public Transit
Jude Bilafer, City of Palmer
Kate Dueber, ARRC
Lawrence Smith, Trucking Industry Advocate
Randy Durham, MSB TAB
Stuart Leidner, Mobility Advocate
Tom Adams, MSB

Microsoft Teams Meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app
[Click here to join the meeting](#)
Meeting ID: 273 292 962 535 5
Passcode: ff9my6oM

Dial in by phone
+1 (689) 223-3510
Phone conference ID
954 438 135#

Agenda

Technical Committee

Tuesday, October 14th, 2025
2:00 – 4:00 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 is adjacent to the south.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
 - a. Introduce new staff

The meeting was called to order at 2:00PM.

Members Present:

Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC
Alex Strawn, MSB (Chair)
Ben White, Alaska DOT&PF
Brian Winnestaffer, Chickaloon Native Village
Chris Bentz, Alaska DOT&PF
Crystal Smith, MSBSD
Dan Tucker, RSA Representative
Erich Schaal, City of Wasilla (Vice Chair)
Jude Bilafer, City of Palmer
Lawrence Smith, Trucking Industry Advocate
Brad Schwartz (substituting for Stuart Leidner)

Members Absent:

Bob Charles Jr., Knik Tribe
Jennifer Busch, Public Transit
Kate Dueber, ARRC
Randy Durham, MSB TAB
Tom Adams, MSB



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

Visitors Present:

Carrie Cecil, MVP Senior Planner (new staff)
Kim Sollien, MVP Executive Director
Anjie Goulding, MVP Transportation Planning Manager
Patrick (Pat) Cotter, RESPEC
Adam R. Bradway, DOT

2. Consent Agenda (**Action Item**)
 - a. Approval of the October 14th, 2025, Agenda
 - b. Approval of the August 12th, 2025, Minutes

*Motion to approve the Consent Agenda and Meeting Minutes (Tucker), seconded.
Approved unanimously.*

3. Staff Report
 - Staff Report
 - a. Schedule of topics

Kim Sollien provided a staff report introducing **Carrie Cecil**, the newest MVP staff member joining as a Transportation Planner. *Carrie* comes to MVP from the Bureau of Land Management where she worked for five years as a project manager and NEPA compliance coordinator. Her background includes a master's degree in archaeology and a focus on community-centered problem solving.

Kim reported that she and *Anjie* attended the AMPO (Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations) National Conference in Providence, Rhode Island. *Anjie* attended workshops focused on Complete Streets policy and blending federal funding for transit. *Kim* attended workshops on small MPO operations and sustainable transit funding, noting that resources may be available for Valley Transit.

Kim took personal time in September and reported that the organization is entering a busy period with thick packets and multiple action items requiring careful review prior to meetings. She is conducting the organization's first annual audit and will present the first full budget report to the Policy Board on October 23rd.

No questions were raised from committee members.

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

None.

5. Policy Board August 27th Action Items
 - a. *Motion to postpone action on the letter to Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities Commissioner Ryan Anderson, Deputy Commissioner Katherine Keith, and the STIP Team outlining MVP's FFY24, FFY25, and FFY26 funding allocation questions documented in STIP Amendment #2 until the next Policy Board meeting (**Holland**), seconded. Passed unanimously.*



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

Kim Sollien provided an overview of this postponement. The Policy Board deferred action to allow for further review, and a new letter will be considered at this meeting.

6. Action Items

- a. MTP Vision Statement, Goals and Objectives Recommendation for Public Comment Period (Action Item)

Recommended Motion: Motion to recommend the Policy Board approve the MTP Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives as presented for a 30-day Public Comment Period.

Kim Sollien provided background on the September 2nd special work session where the Technical Committee and Policy Board members participated in collaborative activities to develop the MTP Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives. Consultants from RESPEC and Joni Wilm from Hanum Consulting facilitated the session, guiding the group through activities to identify transportation network vision, problems, and opportunities, ultimately developing draft goals and objectives.

Staff reviewed the memo documenting the activities and refined goals and objectives for presentation.

Motion to recommend the Policy Board approve the MTP Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives as presented for a 30-day Public Comment Period (Winnestaffer), seconded. No discussion. Approved unanimously.

- b. Public Participation Plan Recommendation for approval (Action Item)

Recommended Motion: Motion to recommend that the Policy Board adopt the Public Participation Plan as presented

Anjie Goulding presented the final Public Participation Plan (PPP) following restructuring based on feedback from the 45-day public comment period. Changes included reorganization for reader accessibility, consolidation of legal framework requirements, improved transitions between topics, and question-based headers to address community questions directly. No substantive wording changes were made; modifications were structural and transitional.

The organization received minimal public comments during the comment period, with most concerns focused on project involvement rather than PPP content. All comments were addressed and all were offered opportunity to attend this or future October Policy Board meeting where this plan will go through final adoption.

Motion to recommend that the Policy Board adopt the Public Participation Plan as presented (Tucker), seconded. No discussion. Approved unanimously.

- c. STIP Amendment #2 Carryover Funds and Utilization of MVP funding without MVP coordination- Memo (Action Item)

Recommended Motion: Motion to recommend that the Policy Board approve and send the memo to Alaska DOT &PF



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

documenting 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.

Kim Sollien presented a detailed memo documenting coordination challenges regarding MVP's funding utilization and carryover. The memo identifies five key issues:

1. MVP was not consulted regarding sub-allocations for STBG, TAP, and CRP funds prior to October 1st, nor informed of carryover funding.
2. Two million dollars of MVP's FY24 STBG funding was used for the Bogard Road repaving project (Trunk Road to Road to Wasilla Fishhook) without consultation, despite the Policy Board prioritizing the corridor for funding.
3. MVP's CRP funding was utilized for fleet conversion without consultation; federal law requires formal consultation and MPO sign-off for CRP utilization in urbanized areas with an MPO.
4. The FFY26-29 STIP is in development, and MVP has not been consulted despite not yet having an MTP or TIP in place. MVP's funding is being programmed directly into the STIP.
5. The 3C process (Consultation, Coordination, Cooperation) required by federal regulation is not being followed in a timely manner.

Discussion:

Dan Tucker questioned whether issues stem from MVP's recent formation and catching up.

Brian Winnestaffer asked why DOT&PF does not have a designated TIP Coordinator for MVP, similar to other MPOs, to facilitate regular communication.

Adam Bradway (DOT) responded that he and *Ben White* previously filled this coordination role, but current staffing and process changes have reduced their involvement. He noted that DOT planning staff historically managed the STIP, but it has moved to the Commissioner's office, creating communication gaps. At the most recent MPO quarterly meeting, DOT committed to providing MVP with annual funding notifications and carryover confirmation.

Ben White emphasized that once MVP has an approved MTP and TIP in place, the organization will have greater control over its funds, as other MPOs (FAST and AMATS) have experienced. He noted that the current structure makes it difficult to prevent fund reallocation without established planning documents. He stressed that establishing an MTP and TIP is the priority to resolve ongoing funding issues.

Chris Bentz noted that while the letter documents funding utilization problems, it should also recognize that projects MVP intended to fund were ultimately funded, even if through different mechanisms. He recommended including accounting of which projects moved forward and how they were funded to provide full context.



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

Following discussion, **Alex Strawn** suggested relaying to the Policy Board that the Technical Committee desires to amend the letter to include accounting information and to soften the tone by acknowledging that projects were funded as intended, while emphasizing the need for proper consultation and communication.

Kim Sollien noted that the Policy Board packet deadline is tomorrow, making amendment difficult. She offered two options: (1) postpone the letter and provide an amended version with accounting at the next meeting, or (2) move the letter forward and bring additional accounting documentation to the November 4th meeting.

New Motion to postpone the letter to the November 4th meeting to allow staff time to incorporate accounting information and refined language (Strawn), seconded. Vote: 9-Yes, 2-No. Motion passes.

7. Old Business

a. MTP Update

- Review the Project List from past planning efforts (RESPEC)

Pat Cotter provided a verbal update reporting that over 175 projects from past planning efforts have been identified and added to a GIS-based viewer. The viewer includes project attributes such as source plan, potential funding sources, and assigned priority levels. This project list will serve as the foundation for the upcoming project nomination process and will be refined to remove duplicates and verify projects are within the urbanized area boundary

- Travel Demand Model Updates (RESPEC)

Pat Cotter reported that the travel demand model recalibration is nearly complete. One component—the handling of trips between Matanuska-Susitna and areas including Anchorage and Eagle River—falls slightly outside the target acceptable error range but remains within acceptable parameters. RSG (the modeling subcontractor) is tweaking coefficients to improve performance at the screen line across the two Glen Highway bridges. Adam Bradway provided feedback on growth allocation methods, which RSG has incorporated to better reflect Greenfield development patterns typical of the Matanuska-Susitna area.

Chris Bentz requested access to the travel demand model prior to the work session to ensure recommendations align with land use and traffic demand. He requested baseline information from RSG regarding road capacity requirements (e.g., whether Bogard Road requires 4-lane or 2-lane capacity for projected 24,000 vehicles).

Pat Cotter agreed to schedule time with RSG for questions and will potentially invite RSG to the work session.

- Review Public Involvement Schedule and First Open House, December 3rd, location TBD (RESPEC)



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

Pat Cotter outlined the upcoming public involvement schedule:

- Vision, Goals, Objectives public comment: October 24 – November 24 (30-day period)
- Public Meeting/Open House: December 3rd, 4:30-6:30 pm (location being finalized; Palmer Depot and Wasilla Library were considered but not available)
- Public Survey: November 7th (designed to inform project evaluation criteria)
- Project Nominations: November 21st through end of year (following Technical Committee and Policy Board reviews)
- Publicity Plan for project nomination process currently in draft

Pat noted that detailed timeline documentation and visual tools for tracking upcoming meetings and milestones are being developed for committee and public use.

- Review Gap Analysis (RESPEC)

Pat Cotter reported that the gap analysis will compare the existing Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) against federal MTP requirements (23 CFR 450). Initial findings show that LRTP goals align well with MAP-21 national goals, with only one LRTP goal (wayfinding strategies for transit and trails) falling outside national goals, and one national goal (reducing project delivery delays) missing from the LRTP. The gap analysis will be included in the Existing Conditions and Traffic/System Analysis report, with a full presentation expected at the November 4th meeting.

- Evaluation Criteria Work Session October 23rd Location and time TBD

Pat Cotter confirmed that a work session is scheduled for October 23rd from 10:00 am to 1:00 pm at the Menard Center to develop project evaluation criteria and corresponding

weights/rankings. The session will follow the same collaborative format as the September Vision, Goals, and Objectives work session.

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

Ben White reported that Lauren Little was unable to attend due to storm response duties. The FFY26-29 STIP remains behind schedule; the target for October release has slipped to November due to the recent severe weather on the West Coast. DOT&PF may attempt to release the draft for the 45-day public comment period by end of October, but it remains uncertain.

8. New Business
 - a. None
9. Other Issues
 - a. Transit update

Alex Strawn reported that Valley Transit and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough have reached agreement on a services contract (*not yet signed*). Borough match funding is



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

currently sustaining Valley Transit operations while federal funding remains in flux due to the federal government shutdown and staffing reductions. Federal grant applications and awards are delayed.

10. Informational Items

a. UPWP Quarterly/Final Report

Kim Sollien flagged that the annual audit process is underway and the annual UPWP final report will be submitted to DOT. The report will document accomplishments and expenditures for the fiscal year.

b. Element Agency Branding Update

Anjie Goulding presented the new MVP website and branding developed in partnership with Element Agency. The presentation included the new logo, brand guide, website design, and social media strategy.

New Website Features:

- Streamlined navigation with simplified, community-focused copy
- Landing page featuring embedded introductory video
- Staff bios and contact information
- Meeting information and public involvement opportunities
- Project library (coming soon)
- Plans landing page with document links for all 4 major plans
- Contact and comment submission page
- Get Involved section emphasizing community engagement

Branding Elements:

- Logo and brand guide (colors, fonts, usage guidelines)
- Professional photography and videography (5 edited videos, approximately 60 photos and B-roll)
- Canva templates for flyers, PowerPoints, and other materials
- Branded agendas (new packet includes branded example)
- Additional branded items in development (stickers, coffee cups, beanies)

Social Media:

- Instagram and Facebook accounts (@MVPMPPO)
- Series of introductory posts featuring short videos
- QR code available for Instagram access
- Upcoming posts will introduce Policy and Technical Committee members
- Closed captions available on videos (note: some minor caption accuracy issues, particularly with "MPO" abbreviation)

Future Plans:

- MTP 101 educational video
- Seasonal photography and B-roll for diverse content
- Website translation capabilities for accessibility
- Website browser icon/favicon

The website was praised for professional appearance and user-friendly design. It is currently in round two of review and will be launched following final updates.



Technical Committee Board Meeting MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

c. MVP Facebook/Instagram Review

Social media accounts launched with growing followers. Committee members encouraged to follow and share with their organizations.

d. Transportation Alternatives Program Public review and comment are open until Friday, Oct. 17, 2025 [Link to the TAP Guidebook](#)

Alaska DOT has released a new Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) guidebook for public review and comment, open until Friday, October 17, 2025. MVP will develop its own criteria for TAP fund allocation.

11. Technical Committee Comments

Dan Tucker expressed appreciation for a productive and lively meeting that generated substantive results.

Ben White reported receiving a federal letter regarding Safe Roads coordination with MPOs. DOT&PF has been given 60 days to compile a list of safe road issues to be addressed by end of FY26. A preliminary list is due Friday, and Kim should expect email communication.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:47PM

Next Scheduled MPO Technical Committee Meeting – Tuesday, November 4th, 2025, from 2:00-4:00 pm 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



MATSU VALLEY PLANNING *for* TRANSPORTATION

- 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



MATSU VALLEY PLANNING *for* TRANSPORTATION

- 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



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



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, 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 System Deficiency Report Review and Gap Analysis with the TC and PB



MATSU VALLEY PLANNING *for* TRANSPORTATION

- Review Travel Demand Model Run presentation with Consultant projects with TC and PB
- External Call for Projects and comment on the internal projects interactive map review
- Presentation about MTP Project Eligibility Criteria Travel Demand Model Run presentation with Consultant projects discussion with staff
- External Call for Projects and comment on the internal projects discussion with staff
- Special TC meeting to review project nomination form, LOS and System Deficiency Report, and Interactive Map
- Launch Interactive Map
- Launch Call for Projects and project nominations
- MTP Scenario Analysis
- TC and PB Officer Elections
- FFY26 Meeting Schedule and Location
- Discussion on Transit Planning
- Launch survey

December 2025

- 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 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
- Presentation about complete streets/link to federal regulation 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
- Tribal Coordination Meeting MTP and Call for Projects
- Reach out to Mat-Su Delegation about MVP and our MTP call for projects



MATSU VALLEY PLANNING *for* TRANSPORTATION

- 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

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

February 2026

- Public engagement to review nominated projects
- ADOT provide planning-level cost estimates for projects

March 2026

- Finalize MTP Project list
- Present final 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



MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

- 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- Technical Committee Follows Policy Board 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

Technical Committee FFY26 Proposed Meeting Dates
Second Tuesday of each month from 2 pm-4 pm

Month	Date	Notes
December	9 th	
January	13 th	
February	10 th	
March	10 th	
April	14 th	
May	12 th	
June	9 th	
July	14 th	
August	11 th	
September	8 th	
October	13 th	
November	10 th	

MVP MTP Goal Areas			
Goal area	Criteria	Evaluation Metric	Assigned Score
TOTAL POSSIBLE			
Ensure transportation improvements align with land use patterns & connect housing to employment	consistent with adopted plans and local land use plans/policies	included in an adopted	3
		not included in any plan	0
	expands access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations including tourism and recreation	project is focused on expanding access	5
		expands access somewhat	3
		does not expand access	0
	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
TOTAL POSSIBLE			
Improve transportation safety for all modes	addresses a high crash location / issue	project is on a road/corrdior in top 20th percentile EPDO	5
		project is on a road/corrdior in 60th-80th percentile EPDO	3
		project is on a road/corrdior in 40th-60th percential EPDO	1
	identified need in a safety plan (e.g., Safe Routes to School, Walking Routes, CSAP)	project is in a safety plan	3
		project is not in a safety plan	0
	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
	addresses vulnerable users (e.g., school x-ings, senior housing)	within 1/2-mile of a school, senior center, senior housing	1
		not within within 1/2-mile of a school, senior center, senior housing	0
TOTAL POSSIBLE			

Leverage all available funding resources	Project has some funding allocated	no funding	0
		match funding secured	3
TOTAL POSSIBLE			
Maintain the system in a state of good repair	improves asset condition (e.g., pavement or bridge condition ratings)	addresses pavement/ bridge condition	5
		does not address pavement/ bridge condition	0
	improves operations (e.g., replaces lights)	yes	5
		no	0
	addresses public complaints	record of public complaints	3
		no record of public complaints	0
TOTAL POSSIBLE			
Create opportunities for more diverse transportation options	upgrades/adds non-motorized facilities	adds a project in MSB Bike and Ped plan	5
		project adds or improves other transit, bike, ped facilities	3
		maintains existing facility	1
		does not add or improve non-motorized	0
	closes a gap in the multimodal network	new connection where gap of 1/2 mile or more	5
		new connection between two existing facilities	3
		no change	0
	supports transit	project adds or improves transit facilities	5
		maintains existing facility	3
		does not improve transit facilities	0

	reduces user group conflicts	yes	3
	does not reduce user group conflict	no	0
TOTAL POSSIBLE			
Shorten commute times & improve mobility	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
	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
	addresses a gap in the transportation network	new connection where gap of 1 mile or more	5
		new connection between two existing facilities	3
		no change	0
	TOTAL POSSIBLE		
Build a resilient transportation network	improves resiliency of at-risk infrastructure	addressed infrastructure in an identified 100-yr flood zone	5
		reduces the vulnerability of transportation facilities	3
		no change	0
	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
	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

Additional Criteria			
	Public Support	Resolution of support from organized governing body (e.g., community council, city, RSA)	5
		Documented public support/letters/petitions	3
	Population Reached	Regional/areawide users	5

		Less than areawide; single community	3
		Multiple neighborhoods/destinations	1
		Single neighborhood/destination	0
	Functional classification	Arterial or greater	3
		Major Collector	2
		Minor Collector	1
		Local	0
	Project Readiness	no criteria at screening level	

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 not 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 not 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: Expands access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations



How to score:

- 0 points if the project would not expand access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations
- 3 points if the project would minimally expand access (the project sponsor should provide evidence of how the project meets this criterion)
- 5 points if the project focuses on expanding 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 expanded 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 features¹ / addresses a documented² 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

¹Project 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.

²Project 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 makes a new non-motorized connection of greater than ½ mile
- 3 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 users. 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 a roadway gap of 1 mile or greater
- 3 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 shall 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	7	140	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		96	1,190	

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

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 contact Kim Sollien (kim.sollien@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

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

Contact Name:

Contact Phone Number:

Contact Email:

Project Information

Project Name:

Project Type:

(Check the best fit focus of your project)

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

Please attach any documentation related to cost estimates or funding support

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 expand 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?

- 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 (attach letter of support)
- No

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	
	Subtotal	\$8,410,772.00	
MVP FFY24 Program of Projects Nominations		None	

FFY24 Carry forward	STBG	\$7,208,849.00
	CRP	\$775,163.00
	TAP	\$426,760.00
	Subtotal	\$8,410,772.00

MVP Suballocations for 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 Suballocations plus FFY24 Carryforward		\$16,989,759.00	

MVP Program of Projects Policy Board Approved

Wasilla-Fishhook Road E Seldon to Tex-Al Drive	STBG 50-200k	\$7,641,480.00	Funded but not with MVP suballocations
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	funded but not with MVP suballocations
MVP Advance Project Definition	STBG 50-200k	\$191,940.00	
	Total	\$15,670,252.00	

Over spent by \$325,195 not sure how to account for this do we subtract but since DOT programmed things

STBG	\$14,887,070.00	differently I guess it does not matter	\$14,561,875.00	-\$325,195.00
TAP	\$783,182.00			
CRP	\$0.00			

MVP Suballocations for FFY26

Surface Transportation Carbon Reduction Program	STBG	\$7,023,041.29	
Transportation Alternative Program	CRP	\$806,690.69	
	TAP	\$446,840.15	
FFY25 Carryforward	STBG	\$0.00	
	CRP	\$1,565,829.00	
	TAP	\$78,873.00	
MVP FFY26 suballocation Plus FFY25 Carryforward		\$7,023,041.29	
	CRP	\$2,372,519.69	
	TAP	\$446,881.15	

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

FFY 24 Projects**DOT MVP Projects**

Program Description	Limitation Type	Federal Funds Change(+ or-)
PALMER-FISHHOOK ROAD MILEPOSTS 7-17	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation \$181,940.00
SELDON RD EXT PH II: WINDY BOTTOM/BEVERLY LAKES RD - PITTMAN	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation \$454,850.00
HEMMER RD EXTENSION AND UPGRADE, PALMER WASILLA HWY TO BOGARD RD (MSB)	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation \$1,364,550.00
BOGARD RD PAV PRESERVATION: TRUNK RD TO WASILLA-FISHHOOK RD	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation \$2,105,375.11
BOGARD RD SAFETY AND CAPACITY IMPROVMENTS [PARENT][CTP AWARD 2023]	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation \$2,274,250.00
Total	STBG	\$6,380,965.11
	CRP	\$0.00
	TAP	\$0.00

purple are MVP PB projects

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 allocations Plus carryforward

STBG	\$8,180,909.89
CRP	\$1,565,829.00
TAP	\$862,055.00

FFY 25 Projects

BOGARD RD PAV PRESERVATION: TRUNK RD TO WASILLA-FISHHOOK RD	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	-\$471,724.92
FY25-26 (MVP) ADVANCED PROJECT DEFINITION	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	\$181,940.00
(MVP) IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FY25-27	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	\$454,850.00
MATSU VALLEY PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION (MVP) PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	\$272,910.00
MATSU VALLEY PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION (MVP) STREETLIGHT INTERSECTION MANAGEMENT PLAN	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	\$143,844.41
MATSU VALLEY PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION (MVP) SIGN MANAGEMENT PLAN	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	\$363,678.05
TAP: PALMER-FISHHOOK: TRUNK ROAD TO EDGERTON PARKS SEPARATED PATHWAY	TRANS ALTERN 50K-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	\$687,030.00
SELDON ROAD RECONSTRUCTION: WASILLA-FISHHOOK TO LUCILLE STREET (PARENT) (CTP AWARD 2023)	STBG 50-200K POP IJA	Charged to Limitation	\$756,974.00

Subtotal MVP expense for FFY25

STBG 50-200K POP IJA	MVP STBG Total	\$2,174,196.46
TAP	MVP TAP Total	\$687,030.00
CRP	MVP CRP Total	\$0.00

I am questioning how to account for the -\$471,724.92

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

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 MTP VISION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES APPROVED

VISION STATEMENT

MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation is committed to creating a safe, efficient, and multimodal transportation system that fosters reliable and accessible options for all modes of travel, supports the economy and environment, and promotes healthy communities.

Goals and Objectives for Public Review Approved 10/22/2025

Revised Goal	Revised Objectives
Ensure transportation improvements align with local land use patterns and connect housing to employment	/ Improve coordination between transportation planning and local land use plans to ensure consistency between transportation projects and community development patterns. / Enhance multimodal connections between residential areas and employment hubs. / Prioritize transportation investments that maximize network efficiency based on local growth patterns.
Improve transportation safety for all modes	/ Utilize data-driven safety analysis to identify high-risk locations / Increase safety education programs / Reduce the number and severity of crashes at high-risk locations
Leverage all available funding resources	/ Diversify funding streams by working with local, state, federal, and tribal partners to utilize all available formula funding / Increase applications for competitive grants year-over-year / Educate MPO membership and the community about funding opportunities
Maintain the system in a state of good repair	/ Utilize data-driven asset management principles and establish a preventative maintenance program / Strengthen collaboration with maintenance entities to provide consistent, year-round maintenance / Increase public outreach to identify maintenance needs / Prioritize an annual allocation of funding for preservation and rehabilitation projects
Create opportunities for more diverse transportation options	/ Utilize transportation data analyses for gap and need assessments / Strengthen collaboration between transportation providers and stakeholders and increase public outreach and communication / Identify potential multimodal corridors and build infrastructure for all user groups / Support the implementation of the Transit Asset Management plan to guide investments in transit facilities
Shorten commute times and improve mobility	/ Identify and remove network gaps for all modes / Decrease congestion by building capacity, improving operational efficiency, and increasing transportation choices / Increase connectivity for all modes
Build a resilient transportation network	/ Provide transportation solutions that enhance the natural environment / Integrate stormwater management into infrastructure design / Increase the resiliency of the transportation infrastructure to natural and manufactured hazards