



MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Formal Project Nomination Process Information



**January
2026**

Introduction

MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation (MVP) is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) Valley.

A key responsibility of the MPO is the preparation of a long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The MTP looks at current transportation system conditions and future needs over the next 20+ years and establishes goals and objectives to ensure that the development of the Mat-Su's transportation systems is responsive to the community's vision for economic development, sustainability, and quality of life.

Central to the MTP process is the creation of a prioritized list of transportation projects to guide the investment of federal funds across the Mat-Su's transportation network, including roads, transit systems, freight, and nonmotorized facilities. Projects must be included in the MTP in order to be eligible for federal funding.

This packet provides project nominators with the information needed to successfully navigate the formal project nomination process. Projects received during the formal project nomination period will be reviewed, evaluated, and prioritized by MVP for potential inclusion in the MTP.



What's Included in this packet?

Attachment 1

Vision, Goals, and Objectives

Developed as part the MTP process, the vision, goals, and objectives provide the framework for what we want to achieve with our transportation system and how we plan to get there.

Attachment 2

Nomination Form Questions

Summarizes the required questions that project nominators must answer as part of the project nomination form.

Attachment 3

Project Evaluation Scoring Guide

Outlines the process and methodology that MVP will use to evaluate and score projects nominated for inclusion in the MTP.

Key Information

When:

The formal project nomination period opens on **January 28, 2026** and will run for a minimum of 30-days.

Where:

All project nominations must be submitted through the online project nomination form to be considered. The project nomination form can be accessed at this link:

[Project Nomination Form](#)

Who:

Anyone may submit a project for consideration.



What:

The MTP can and should include a range of different types of projects. Projects eligible for federal funding might include but are not limited to road and bridge rehabilitation projects, road extension projects, improvements and facilities for nonmotorized users (e.g., bike paths and crosswalks), transit improvements, and transportation studies.

Successful projects must clearly explain what is being proposed, how the project would help address current transportation challenges or community concerns raised during the MTP process, and how it fits with existing transportation and land use plans in the Mat-Su.

At this point in the project nomination process, it is not necessary to know exactly how much a given project will cost or when it would occur. However, federal regulation requires the MTP project list to be fiscally constrained so including a rough cost estimate will help MVP to prioritize projects.

Questions?

For additional information and 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 at Mackenze.origer@matsugov.us.

Attachment 1

Vision, Goals & Objectives



Vision

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

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 investment 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

Attachment 2



MVP MTP Project Nomination Questions

This document summarizes the required questions that project nominators must answers as part of the project nomination form. Questions are categorized by general topic and generally correlate to the evaluation criteria developed by MVP for the purposes of scoring and prioritizing projects to be included in the MTP.

All project nominations must be submitted using the online form:

<https://survey123.arcgis.com/share/687f471e7665469aa9bb6b2e51fe2b8b?portalUrl=https://msb.maps.arcgis.com>

Please note that a form must be submitted for each unique project. Only projects that are 1) located with the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary and 2) eligible for FHWA funds will be considered for potential inclusion in the MTP.

Project Location

A point location must be provided for all projects. The point must be within the MPA boundary and should reflect the approximate location of the proposed project area.

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

Submitter Information

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

Contact Name:

Contact Phone:

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

1. Estimated project cost (enter 0 if unknown or not available).
2. Are there existing identified funding sources for this project?
 - If yes, please provide a narrative description of the source of funding.
3. Project Phases Being Nominated:
 - Planning/Study
 - Preliminary engineering
 - Right-of-Way
 - Construction
 - Operations/Maintenance
4. Anticipated Schedule

Land Use Integration

5. Is the project included in an existing land use or transportation plan?
 - If yes, please enter the name of the plan.
6. Does the project include or is it contained within a corridor identified in an access management plan?
7. Provide a brief description of how your project would improve access to employment, education, healthcare, or other key destinations.

Improving Network Safety

8. Is the project included in an existing safety plan?
 - If yes, please provide the plan name.
9. Does your project implement safety design features (e.g., improved lighting, signage, speed reduction, or crossings) or address documented safety issues?
 - If yes, please provide details.

Supports System Maintenance

10. Does your project address pavement or bridge condition issues?
 - If yes, please provide details.
11. Does your project improve operations?
 - If yes, please provide details.
12. Does your project directly address an area with a known record of public complaints?
 - If yes, please provide details.

Supports More Diverse Transportation Options

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

14. Does your project support multi-modal transportation?

- If yes, please provide details.

15. 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

16. Does your project reduce user group conflicts?

- If yes, please provide details.

Supports Network Resiliency and Environmental Considerations

17. Does your project reduce the vulnerability of transportation facilities?

- If yes, please provide details.

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

- If yes, please provide details.

19. Does your project improve emergency response?

- If yes, please provide details.

Public Agency Support

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

- If yes, please attach a document¹ of endorsement.

¹ File size limit of 100 mb.

Attachment 3

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. **Data Compilation:** MPO staff or consultants collect datasets, modeling outputs, and plan references.
2. **Project Submission:** Sponsors submit proposals with supporting documentation.
 - a. **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.
3. **Criteria Scoring:** Each project is scored by each member of the MTP scoring committee using standardized scales (e.g., 1–5).
4. **Composite Scoring and Weighting:** Scores are weighted and summed to produce a total score.
5. **Review and Validation:** Scores undergo internal and committee review. Evaluators may reach out to sponsors for clarification.
6. **Ranking and Recommendation:** Projects are prioritized for inclusion in the MTP and for TIP programming.
7. **Public Review:** 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: 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)

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

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/intersection with an EPDO score in the top 20th percentile
- 3 points if the project is on a road/corridor/intersection with an EPDO score in the 60th-80th percentile
- 1 point if the project is on a road/corridor/intersection with an EPDO score in the 40th-60th percentile
- 0 points if the project does not have an associated EDPO score (i.e., not applicable to the project type)

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
- 0 points if the project is not 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
- 0 points if the project does not include safety features

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)
- 0 points if the project does not meet the criterion

❖ **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
- 0 points if no 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
- 0 points if the project does not address 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
- 0 points if there no 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 is not in the BPP but would add or improves other transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities
- 1 point if the project is not in the BPP but would maintain existing facilities
- 0 points if the project does not add or improve non-motorized 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
- 0 points if the project would result in no change

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
- 0 points if the project would not improve or maintain 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
- 0 points if the project would not reduce 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
- 0 points if the project is on LOS A or B roads
- 0 points if the project does not have an associated LOS rating (i.e., not applicable)

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%
- 0 points if the project does not have an associated truck volume (i.e., not applicable)

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
- 0 points if the project would result in no change

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
- 0 points if the project would result in no change

Project sponsor does not provide any information concerning the 100-year floodplain. Project sponsor shall describe how the project reduces vulnerability. Examples may include increasing culvert sizes to accommodate larger floods or moving a road away from a 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
- 0 points if the project provides no specific means of improving 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
- 0 points if the project would not improve emergency access

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/destinations
- 0 points for projects that only reach a single neighborhood/destinations

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
- 0 points if the project is on a local road

MVP staff will evaluate this criterion using the roadway functional classifications GIS layer from AK DOT&PF.

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	--	5	5	Documentation
Population reached	--	5	5	GIS analysis of adjacent parcel data
Functional class	--	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.