

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

MEMBERS

Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC
Alex Strawn, MSB (**Chair**)
Ben White, ADOT&PF
Bob Charles Jr., Knik Tribe
Brian Winnestaffer, Chickaloon Native Village
Clint Adler, ADOT&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 ID: 217 421 514 543
Passcode: PV9sG7Ln

Dial in by phone
[+1 605-937-6140](tel:+16059376140) United States, Sioux Falls
[+1 \(844\) 594-6237](tel:+18445946237) United States (Toll-free)
Phone conference ID: 450 802 22#

Minutes

Tuesday, March 11th, 2025
2:00 – 4:00pm

Meeting Location

Musk Ox Farm
12850 E Archie Road, Palmer Alaska 99645
Hayloft / Classroom

1. Call to Order at 2:00pm

Members present

Ben White, Alaska DOT&PF
Alex Strawn, MSB
Tom Adams, MSB
Crystal Smith, MSBSD
Erich Schaal, City of Wasilla
Alimi Adeyemi, ADEC
Bob Charles, Knik Tribe
Clint Adler, Alaska DOT&PF
Randy Durham, MSB TAB
Stuart Leidner, Mobility Advocate
Kate Dueber, ARRC

Members absent

Brian Winnestaffer, Chickaloon Native Village
Dan Tucker, RSA Representative
Jennifer Busch, Public Transit
Lawrence Smith, Trucking Industry Advocate

Visitors present

Elise Blocker, RESPEC
Kim Sollien, MVP MPO Director
Adam Bradway, Alaska DOT&PF
Donna Gardino, Gardino Consulting Services
Bianca Zibrat, MSB

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

2. Consent Agenda (Action Item)

- a. Approval of the March 11th, 2025 Agenda
- b. Approval of the February 11th, 2025, Minutes

Motion to approve the consent agenda (Adams), seconded. No objections. Passed.

Alex Strawn requested a minor administrative correction to the agenda. Item 6.C. should be revised from “MSB Transit Program Update - Letter from the MSB to Alaska DOT&PF requesting an additional **30-day** funding extension” to “MSB Transit Program Update - Letter from the MSB to Alaska DOT&PF requesting an additional **90-day** funding extension.”

3. Staff/Committee/Working Group Reports

- Staff Report
 - a. Schedule of topics

Kim Sollien provided a staff report. Sollien has begun interviewing candidates for the open positions with MVP. Sollien is going to readvertise the Transportation Planner position and may change the title from “Transportation Planner” to “Planner” to see if that results in more applicants.

Sollien has begun using QuickBooks and is working on payroll services, insurance, and other logistics to set up MVP.

Sollien, Donna Gardino, and Adam Bradway attended the Statewide MPO Quarterly Meeting in Fairbanks. Day 1 was a follow-up of Peer Exchange action items and Day 2 was focused on Alaska MPOs.

STIP Amendment #2 has been released for public comment. Sollien has been reviewing the document.

MVP has received the final indirect cost agreement from Alaska DOT&PF.

Sollien is working with Adam Bradway and Pam Golden to develop a 2-hour HSIP (Highway Safety Improvement Program) training session for MVP Technical Committee members. Bradway said that Alaska DOT&PF is trying to do a better job of reaching out to the MPOs and intends to review the HSIP, specific concerns and problem areas within the MVP MPA boundary, and the process for nominating projects. The training is planned to be a hybrid meeting on May 5, 2025. The time will be announced closer to the training date.

The executive directors of MVP, FAST Planning, and AMATS presented to the Alaska Senate Transportation Committee in February. Sollien presented on the history of MPOs and MVP’s evolution as an organization. Sollien noted that she was able to answer most questions from the committee. Ben White noted that the question she was unable to answer was meant for the FAST Planning executive director. Sollien provided an overview of the other topics discussed with the committee, including comments from the other MPOs about the STIP, the process of including TIPs by reference in the STIP, and the 3C process.

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

None

5. Action Items

- a. **Statewide Transportation Plan Amendment #2 MVP comments and questions review with Alaska DOT&PF staff and recommendation to the Policy Board to submit formal comments on MVP’s suballocations.**

Motion to allow staff to formalize the comments based on the Technical Committee discussion and recommend to the Policy Board to submit the comments as part of the STIP Amendment #2 public comment period (White), seconded. None opposed. Passed.

Kim Sollien provided a staff report. Sollien and Donna Gardino have been reviewing STIP Amendment #2 and compiled a list of questions for Alaska DOT&PF, which is included in the action item “cheat sheet” in the packet. Sollien and Gardino compared the allocation and fiscal constraint tables to document where there were discrepancies or questions regarding funding amounts for projects identified in the approved MVP Program of Projects. During the STIP Amendment #1 comment period, MVP asked very specific questions about exact dollar

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

amounts. For this comment period, Sollien has compiled broader questions about what is documented in STIP Amendment #2. Sollien reached out to the STIP team a week prior to this Technical Committee meeting to ask if someone would join the Technical Committee meeting and did not hear back. Sollien had a meeting with Lauren Little (Alaska DOT&PF) and FHWA earlier today and asked if Little was coming to the MVP Technical Committee meeting. Little said that Ben White and Adam Bradway would answer questions during the meeting. Sollien said that depending on how Alaska DOT&PF answers MVP's questions, she may rephrase or reformat the questions before bringing them to the MVP Policy Board.

Comments 1: *MVP would like an accounting of our suballocations for STBG, CRP, and TAP for FFY24 and FFY25. We want to see what projects our funds are spent on and what funds are remaining. AND Comment 2:* *In our Program of Projects, MVP asked for FFY24 funding to be carried over to FFY25. However, the narrative does not show that any of MVP's STBG, CRP, and TAP are being carried over to FFY25. Can this be explained?*

Sollien reminded the Technical Committee that the MVP Policy Board, through the approved Program of Projects, requested that Alaska DOT&PF allocate MVP's funds to specific projects and carry over all MVP FFY24 funds to FFY25.

Adam Bradway and Ben White provided a response. Bradway said that he just received confirmation that all MVP funds not spent in FFY24 will carry over into future years. He said the place to look for that information is usually the fiscal constraint tables because they show funds for each year within each suballocation for each project. In FFY24, MVP agreed to spend approximately \$2.2 million of its STBG funding on the Bogard Road Safety and Capacity Improvement Project. The remainder of MVP's FFY24 STBG funding should carry over to FFY25. Bradway said the Alaska DOT&PF Program Development group is going to provide MVP with a more detailed list of obligations to date using the MVP fund codes. White further clarified that Alaska DOT&PF is going to try to ensure the list is only MVP funds because the obligation report includes all Alaska DOT&PF obligations by default.

Sollien asked for clarification that even though STIP Amendment #2 is not showing any carryover, Alaska DOT&PF is stating that the funds will be carried over. Bradway confirmed that he just received an email to that effect and would forward it to Sollien. Bradway also stated that asking for clarification on this topic and how it is reflected in the STIP is a good thing.

Donna Gardino asked through the Teams Chat if the "obligations to date" meant FFY24 and FFY25. White confirmed that is what the list of obligations to date would include. Bradway said he anticipates it will be a short list because it will only be the fund types relevant to MVP, not all Alaska DOT&PF projects within the MVP MPA boundary. Sollien asked Bradway to clarify whether he was going to provide MVP with a list of all projects happening within the MPA boundary. Bradway said he did provide that list already but would not share the obligations to date for all those projects since they are not relevant to MVP until MVP has a TIP.

Gardino reiterated that MVP should submit this comment to Alaska DOT&PF even though it was answered in this meeting since the issue is not clear in the STIP documentation.

Comment 3: *The fiscal constraint tables contain ten projects titled Community-Driven Projects: MVP MPO. We would like to know what a community-driven project is.*

Sollien elaborated that "community-driven project" is not defined in the STIP narrative.

Bradway said it was appropriate to ask for formal clarification. He said "community-driven project" is being used in relation to FAST Planning and AMATS to show where Alaska DOT&PF is transferring funds into their STIP, but he believes that is being used as a placeholder for MVP projects that have not been established to demonstrate fiscal constraint. Bradway suggested that MVP and Alaska DOT&PF should discuss how funds should be shown in the STIP while MVP does not have a TIP. Sollien asked whether Bradway was saying that the Program of Projects was insufficient or that MVP needed to update the Program of Projects for years beyond FFY25. Bradway said that was what Alaska DOT&PF and MVP staff should discuss and that if the Program of Projects system works, it should be updated for FFY26, or alternatively MVP could direct DOT&PF to "bank" the funding for future years.

Tom Adams asked for clarification about the funds. Using approximate numbers, if MVP has \$8 million of funding in FFY24 and \$2.2 million is obligated for the Bogard Road project, then the remaining \$5.5+ million is being

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

shown as a placeholder that MVP needs to obligate so it does not disappear. Bradway said that should be the case and that MVP and Alaska DOT&PF need to ensure that the amount of funding available is clear and that it is documented that the funding will be banked for MVP's future use. MVP should clarify what the plan for that funding is.

Sollien asked Bradway to confirm that he was going to send an email stating that MVP's funding would be rolled over to future years. Bradway confirmed he would send that email to Sollien. Adams stated that MVP still needs to submit the comment because that information is not reflected in the STIP. Sollien confirmed she would still submit the comment. White clarified that the funds are shown in the STIP and that it does not need to be specified that the funds will roll over and that the funds will remain until MVP obligates them. The funds generally have a window within which they need to be obligated, but as long as those requirements are met, they can be obligated by MVP. For example, funds programmed in FFY24 can be obligated in later years. Alaska DOT&PF allows the MPOs to bank funds, as well; for example, FAST Planning spent several years programming low volumes of funds to spend more in future years. Sollien said that she saw how it was shown for FAST Planning and AMATS and was confused why it was not shown in the same way for MVP. Bradway agreed that there is no consistency in how the information is shown across the MPOs and that Alaska DOT&PF should be consistent.

Comment 4: *In the fiscal constraint table, 5307 Urban Transit funding appears to be going to the Railroad within MVP's boundary. It is unclear where those funds come from. We would like to know if a split letter between MVP, FAST Planning, and the Alaska Railroad was completed and where the MVP 5307 funding that is going to the railroad is coming from.*

Kate Dueber stated that ARRC is working on a split letter and is hoping to share it with the other entities very soon. Sollien asked if the amount shown in STIP Amendment #2 was requested by ARRC. Dueber said that it was not. Bradway said that in FFY25 there is \$460,000 designated for railroad 5307 projects within the MVP MPA boundary. He was not able to get information about where those funds came from, but that it does appear that MVP's transit funding is whole. Bradway suggested that this issue should be followed up on.

Comment 5: *The fiscal constraint tables for MVP's STBG show no planned obligations in FFY26. We are wondering how MVP can continue to work with the STIP team on our Program of Projects for FFY26 if there is no funding.*

Sollien elaborated that STIP Amendment #2 shows MVP STBG funds for FFY24, FFY25, and FFY27, but shows no STBG funds for FFY26.

Bradway said he was told by the STIP team that this was done in anticipation of MVP having a TIP in FFY26. Sollien said that did not make sense. Bradway agreed and said how much is being obligated should be a line item in the table. Sollien said the tables for AMATS and FAST Planning show all four years for their STBG suballocations. Bradway said that the other MPOs will be shown differently than MVP, but this is likely another case of Alaska DOT&PF being unsure of the timeline for MVP's TIP and how to show it. Bradway said FFY26 should likely also have a placeholder until a TIP or new Program of Projects is approved. Bradway reiterated MVP should decide what to do with the funding so Alaska DOT&PF can move from showing placeholders to showing obligated funds. White suggested reviewing the table again because it is possible the STIP team combined FFY25 and FFY26 funds in FFY25.

Comment 6: *MVP's FFY26 and FFY27 Metro Planning funds show zero, while AMATS and FAST Planning allocations are shown in each year of the STIP. Can the STIP Team explain why our funding is being displayed differently?*

Bradway said that the fiscal constraint table is showing obligations. Planning projects are obligated in two-year programs, but MVP obligated theirs in one year. Bradway said that AMATS and FAST Planning look different because Alaska DOT&PF is transferring and obligating funds for metropolitan planning projects every year. Sollien asked if the MVP UPWP was being treated differently from the other MPO's UPWPs. Bradway said no, the way funds are being transferred to the MPOs is different but the UPWP projects do not need to be in the STIP. White said that Alaska DOT&PF will vary how they obligate their own funds for their Annual Work Program and may obligate the whole program at once rather than one year at a time. White said that since MVP does not have a TIP, Alaska DOT&PF has more control over where the funds go and when, but once MVP has an approved TIP their funds should look more like AMATS and FAST Planning in the STIP.

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

Sollien stated that she has additional questions that were not ready in time for the packet, but she would include them in writing for the Policy Board. Sollien's questions were related to Alaska DOT&PF's online STIP dashboard. The first question was related to the charts showing Projects & Programs by Strategic Investment Area for Amendment #1 and Proposed Amendment #2. The charts show that Amendment #1 had a total of 290 projects, 32 of which did not align with any strategic investment area, and Proposed Amendment #2 has a total of 300 projects, 15 of which do not align with any strategic investment area. Sollien said there is no search feature for the projects listed as N/A and wanted clarification for what the projects are. White said that this is a good question to ask. Gardino said she reviewed every project in the STIP and could not find any that were not attached to a strategic investment area. Bradway said he asked the Data Modernization Unit, which built the dashboard, to include an option to filter by N/A projects in the next iteration of the dashboard. He said the team said their best guess was that the N/A projects are statewide programs like the civil rights program or a planning project that is not tied to an investment area.

Gardino said she did not understand how there is \$2.2 billion to obligate in FFY25, as shown in the Projects & Programs Total Budget by Year chart for Proposed Amendment #2. Gardino stated that she believes Alaska DOT&PF had only obligated \$93 million as of February and that contractors would have a hard time completing the work if the rest were to be obligated this late. Bradway said that the STIP is a planning document and that the number shown is what they intend to obligate but that there is usually slippage. Gardino asked if that meant Alaska DOT&PF was overprogrammed. White said he was still trying to determine if it was Advanced Construction being programmed or funds left over from FFY24. He said he noticed that in the FFY24 column, Alaska DOT&PF was taking credit for FFY23 August redistribution and that there seem to be issues with how the graphs are being generated in the dashboard. He said he is unsure where the data is being pulled from but that there are oddities and the \$2.2 billion in FFY25 seems high. He said it's possible the dashboard is pulling in data about aviation or ferry projects or discretionary funding that has not yet been received. White suggested that MVP submit a comment about this table and request that the data be double checked.

Sollien noted that the dashboard shows that between Amendment #1 and Proposed Amendment #2, 10 projects and \$500 million were added. Sollien asked for clarification about how much federal funding the State of Alaska receives for highway transportation projects each year. White said Alaska DOT&PF receives approximately \$704 million in apportionment and another \$100 million in discretionary funds and allocations, for a total of approximately \$800 million in highway funds. Sollien stated that would work out to approximately \$3.2 billion for a four-year STIP and the dashboard shows that Proposed Amendment #2 shows a budget higher than that. White said that Alaska DOT&PF is programming approximately \$400 million a year in Advanced Construction each year. Sollien said the budget shown is still \$1.5 billion over those estimates. Bradway said the dashboard might include funding from other, non-highway funds. White said that the Tustumena replacement project is \$400–500 million alone, and ferry funding is being shown in this dashboard. Gardino asked for a list of what the 10 new projects are.

Sollien said she has no more questions but will refine the comments and format them with tables and graphics from the dashboard for the Policy Board packet. Adams asked for clarification on what was being asked of the Technical Committee for this agenda item if they are not seeing what will be presented to the Policy Board. Sollien said that she will be providing these questions in writing with additional context to the Policy Board and that the Technical Committee could make a motion recommending to the Policy Board that MVP submit these formal comments to Alaska DOT&PF. Sollien stated that the Policy Board meeting was moved to March 19 to allow the Policy Board to review the comments and vote on submitting them before the public comment period closes on March 20. White said that the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee will often go through a similar process of reviewing something and then allowing staff to clean it up before presenting it to the Policy Board.

Adams stated that he would prefer to see comments in a more structured format if they are being asked to make a recommendation to the Policy Board. Sollien agreed that would be preferable in the future. Strawn noted that Sollien has been sick and had limited time to prepare. Sollien noted that each time she prepares comments for the STIP there is a learning curve because she has not done this before. Adams added that the STIP also changes every time Alaska DOT&PF releases an amendment. Bradway noted that the lack of formalized, formatted comments is partially on Alaska DOT&PF as 1) the public comment period is short and 2) Bradway had requested the comments in advance to allow Bradway and White to find answers, but Bradway only received responses to some questions today and there was not time to prepare a more formal letter. Adams said he recognizes the importance of getting comments in before the deadline and added that from the MSB's perspective, they are learning how to navigate their role in the MPO. MSB is also interested in submitting comments about STIP Amendment #1 and would like clarification on how to navigate that. White said it is good

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

for MSB to submit their own independent comments. Gardino said it is appropriate for each MVP member organization to submit comments as each entity's priorities may be different.

6. Old Business

a. MSB Pass through Grant Agreement Update

Kim Sollien provided a staff update. MVP compiled comments on the pass-through agreement and sent them back to MSB via Alex Strawn. Strawn has shared the comments with the borough attorney's office. Sollien said that MVP does not yet need all the funds in its bank account but will soon.

b. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Contract Update

Adam Bradway provided an update. Alaska DOT&PF is writing the final contract. Bradway had asked the contracting team to complete the contract prior to today's meeting but it was not finalized in time. Bradway suggested that once the contract is underway, there would be an internal kickoff with the staff working on the project followed by a kickoff with the Technical Committee. Sollien said that depending on the agenda for next month, the kickoff may happen during the regular meeting. Bradway said he anticipates a fair amount of time needed from the Technical Committee members throughout the MTP process. Sollien agreed and said that if the kickoff meeting is focused on introducing staff and providing a high-level overview of the timeline and process, it would be appropriate to include that as part of the regularly scheduled meeting, but work sessions would need to be scheduled separately.

c. MSB Transit Program Update - Letter from the MSB to Alaska DOT&PF requesting an additional 90-day funding extension.

Alex Strawn provided an update. The packet includes a letter from Mike Brown, Borough Manager, requesting a 90-day extension of the borough's 5311 funding. MSB intended to advertise an RFP for transit services on March 11 and is likely 2 days away from publishing the RFP, so they are on a tight schedule and trying to avoid disruption of service.

Adam Bradway asked who at MSB he should direct Alaska DOT&PF transit staff to in order to coordinate split letters between FAST Planning and MSB for urban transit funds. Strawn suggested Jason Ortiz, Planning and Land Use Deputy Director.

7. New Business

None.

8. Other Issues

None.

9. Informational Items

a. Transit Roundtable March 12th at noon via [Teams](#)

Kim Sollien received confirmation from three out of four providers that they will be in attendance. The meeting last month only had one provider.

b. Statewide MPO Quarterly meeting and Peer Exchange Review March 3rd and 4th.

Kim Sollien elaborated on her staff report. Day 1 of the Statewide MPO Quarterly Meeting focused on the action items from the Peer Exchange, most of which were assigned to Alaska DOT&PF. The main action item for the MPOs was developing a clear schedule for their TIP development processes and timelines. Additional conversations covered the 3C process and training. The Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) has an "MPO College" with various trainings, including a federal funding module and MPO 101 module. Each module is 40 hours long and costs \$800. Once MVP has hired staff, all staff will complete the modules. Depending on budget constraints, Sollien may invite Technical Committee members to also complete the modules.

c. Staffing update

Kim Sollien has received applications and conducted interviews, as stated in the earlier staff report. Tom Adams asked how the positions were being advertised. Sollien said both positions were advertised on the Foraker website. Because MVP is not fully formed, Sollien was unable to advertise through the State of Alaska. Sollien intends to post the Transportation Planner position on Indeed and possibly through the American Planning Association and AMPO but was hoping to focus efforts locally. MVP does not yet have a LinkedIn account, otherwise Sollien would advertise there. Garret Verbeek, a former MSB employee, requested to be notified when

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

the position was readvertised so he could share with his network. Adams suggested advertising through the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). Adam Bradway said that ITE has a planning component. White suggested reaching out to AMPO for their assistance in advertising. Sollien said she was unsure if she could because MVP is not yet a member of AMPO.

d. Index of Authorities Governing National Highway System Facilities in the Metropolitan Planning Area – Letter Alaska DOT&PF to FAST Planning.

Kim Sollien discussed this letter and the letter in Item 9.e. together. She explained that the Alaska DOT&PF Commissioner's Office and the State Attorney General's Office are challenging the MPOs' authority within their MPA boundaries. The State of Alaska is seeking to reopen their operating agreements with the MPOs to assert that MPOs cannot deny projects that the State wants to put forward within an MPO's MPA boundary. Sollien said she has been told MVP will receive a similar letter soon.

Sollien clarified that the operating agreement is an agreement signed by the borough, cities, tribes, and the State of Alaska acknowledging that the function of an MPO is to manage planning for transportation infrastructure within the MPA boundary following the 3C process. As an MPO develops its MTP, there may be projects that are not unanimously supported, and the Policy Board ultimately has the authority to decide whether projects are included in the MTP. AMATS and FAST Planning have exercised this authority in the past. Sollien clarified that the State can still move forward with projects within the MPA boundary using State funds, though the MPO can express disapproval. If federal funds are being used, however, the project must go through the MPO processes for approval. The letters from the State of Alaska assert that 1) the MPOs do not have the authority to deny a project that the State wants to move forward on the National Highway System (NHS) and 2) federal regulations define "regionally significant projects" and every NHS project is regionally significant, therefore the MPO cannot deny NHS projects within its MPA boundary.

Sollien said that MVP is going to develop a policy that outlines what percentage of funds the MPO will designate to different types of projects (e.g., road, transit, bicycle and pedestrian). Sollien suggested that this policy should also include a definition of "regionally significant projects" for MVP's MPA boundary.

Sollien reiterated that MVP is not a signatory on the operating agreement with the state and that the member organizations, who are signatories, may want their lawyers to review the letters and operating agreement. Sollien noted that the federal government has repeatedly told the State of Alaska that they are misinterpreting the code and that the MPO does have the authority to deny projects on the NHS.

Donna Gardino added that the letters from the State of Alaska claim that the MPOs are claiming a new authority, which is why the State wants to reopen the operating agreements. Gardino clarified that this is not a new authority. Gardino also added that FAST Planning and AMATS were required to update their boundaries after the 2020 Census and that Alaska DOT&PF is refusing to recommend that the Governor approve their updated boundaries.

Tom Adams shared that what he heard at the Peer Exchange is very different from what the State is claiming in their letters and noted that FHWA was not copied on the letters. Adams asked if the letters were shared with FHWA by the other MPOs. He also said he was surprised to see that the STIP Amendment #2 process has not reflected the discussions from the Peer Exchange. Sollien said that the MPOs shared the letters with FHWA at the MPO Quarterly Meeting, but FHWA staff are no longer allowed to speak at public meetings and were therefore unable to comment.

Adams asked whether Alaska DOT&PF would coordinate with MVP during the upcoming MTP development process to ensure their projects are included in the MTP, which they have occasionally failed to do with AMATS and FAST Planning. Ben White said that at the staff level, there is sufficient coordination, but that problems arise when projects become a priority for the Governor's Office or Commissioner's Office that were not previously discussed or included in planning documents. White said staff will do their best to coordinate but it is possible that MVP could be in a similar situation with the State requesting new projects. Sollien stated that there is a process for amending the MTP and TIP, MVP will follow that process, and the Policy Board will be able to approve or deny new projects.

Gardino added that the MTP and TIP are fiscally constrained documents and therefore adding new projects requires funding amounts or timelines to change for other projects. White confirmed this was the case and noted that the Alaska DOT&PF Long Range Transportation Plan does not require fiscal constraint. White said that in the

MVP for Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

case of a project that the State wanted to include within the AMATS MPA boundary, the Policy Board stated that they would approve the project if Alaska DOT&PF provided written confirmation that the funding was available and would not come out of the MPO's allocations. Alaska DOT&PF has not provided that letter. Adams asked whether such a letter would state that additional revenues would be made available or that other projects were deprioritized. White said that was the concern of AMATS because they did not want the funds to be pulled from projects in the Anchorage area.

Adam Bradway noted that the State is withholding approval of the MPA boundary updates for the other two MPOs, but MVP has an approved boundary. White said this is likely why MVP has not received a letter yet, as Alaska DOT&PF has not identified an avenue for reopening the operating agreement. White noted that FAST Planning has indicated that they do not intend to reopen the operating agreement despite the State withholding approval of the MPA boundary update. He also said AMATS will meet tomorrow to discuss the matter, and that the executive director will be sharing maps that show the alternative boundaries that were possible for AMATS given the 2020 Census data, which could have expanded the AMATS MPA boundary to Girdwood.

e. **Response to January 22, 2025, Letter Regarding Anchorage Municipal Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) Boundary and Operating Agreement Revision – Letter Alaska DOT&PF to AMATS**

See discussion on Item 9.d.

10. **Technical Committee Comments**

Ben White said Alaska DOT&PF is revising the 3C document in April with the intention of bringing a revised document to the MPO Technical Committees and Policy Boards in May or June. The next MPO Quarterly Meeting is scheduled for June 3 in Anchorage and there are discussions of opening the meeting up to allow Technical Committee and Policy Board members to join. He also reminded the Technical Committee that comments on STIP Amendment #2 are due on March 20.

Bob Charles stated that the terms in the MVP operating agreement are carefully aligned with federal law and regulation and the Knik Tribe is opposed to reopening the agreement.

Crystal Smith asked who she should reach out to if she has questions about STIP Amendment #2. Adam Bradway said she should contact him.

Alex Strawn said he will not be at the April 8 Technical Committee meeting.

11. **Adjournment at 3:39pm**

Next Scheduled MPO Technical Committee Meeting – Tuesday April 8th, 2025 from 2:00-4:00pm to be held at the Musk Ox Farm and Microsoft TEAMS.