



Representatives:

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

Microsoft Teams meeting

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

Minutes

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

Meeting Location

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

1. Meeting called to order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:30PM.

Members present:

Bob Charles – Knik Tribe
Brian Winnestaffer - Chickaloon Native Village
Edna DeVries, Mayor - MSB
Jim Cooper, Mayor – City of Palmer
Mike Brown - MSB
Sean Holland - DOT&PF

Members absent:

Glenda Ledford, Mayor – City of Wasilla

Visitors Present:

Adam Bradway – AK DOT&PF
Anjie Goulding – MVP
Ben White – AK DOT&PF
Carrie Cecil – MVP
Kim Sollien – MVP
Kolby Zerkel – City of Palmer
Kristina Huling – AK DOT&PF
Luke Bowland – AK DOT&PF
Mark Eisenman – AK DOT&PF
Pat Cotter – RESPEC
Tom Adams - MSB

2. Consent Agenda (**Action Item**)

- a. Approval of November 19, 2025, Agenda
- b. Approval of October 22nd, 2025, Minutes



*Motion to approve the consent agenda and meeting minutes (Winnestaffer), seconded.
Approved unanimously.*

3. Committee/Working Group Reports
a. Staff Report

Kim Sollien gave a staff report highlighting the following key items:

Outreach and Communications:

- MVP has established an email distribution list with over 140 recipients including community councils, RSAs, social service agencies, transportation agencies, DOT staff, transit providers, and bike/pedestrian advocates
- Regular email updates are being sent to drive traffic to the MVP website and the December 3rd open house
- Public comments are being received on the vision, goals, and objectives, as well as general comments about the transportation network

Project Management Tools:

- Staff has been researching project management tools in response to requests from Brian Winnestaffer and Bob Charles for a dashboard or tracking tool
- Staff has identified Smartsheets as the preferred platform
- A dashboard showing the MTP timeline, deliverables, dates, UPW timeline, policy board meetings, and public engagement activities should be available by next month

MTP Development Focus:

- The primary focus this month has been developing the Call for Projects nomination form and scoring criteria
- Staff has been reviewing data from RESPEC on the transportation network, existing conditions report, and deficiencies report
- A first model run has been completed

GIS Support:

- Staff gave recognition to the MSB GIS team (Kenny and his staff, particularly Mackenzie) for their excellent work standing up the interactive comment map and the project nomination portal using Survey 123
- MSB GIS has also migrated all potential projects from past regional transportation plans into a map to assist the cities and borough with project nominations

Office Space:

- After the last meeting, Sean Holland suggested MVP consider co-locating with DOT at the Mat-Su District Office for the winter months
- DOT has space available upstairs (previously used by summer construction crews)
- Staff toured the space today and this arrangement will provide a temporary solution while staff continues to look for permanent office space
- Discussions with Palmer Senior Center have not progressed due to apparent internal transitions



- The CBB (new Gateway Visitor Center) has indicated they could host Policy Board meetings once the building opens

No questions from the board.

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

Introductions included:

- *Kristina Huling* – DOT Area Planner for Mat-Su
- *Ben White* – DOT Planning Chief (based in Anchorage, working to spend more time in Mat-Su)
- *Pat Cotter* – RESPEC, Fairbanks

No other visitors had comments or questions.

5. Technical Committee October 14th Action Items

a. Officer Elections Recommended Motion:

Motion to Approve Alex Strawn for Chair (Tucker), no further discussion. Motion approved.

Motion to Approve Chris Bentz, as Vice Chair (Winnestaffer).

Motion to approve Erich Schaal for Vice Chair (Adams) seconded, Roll call vote.

- Alex Strawn was re-elected as Chair
- Eric Schaal was re-elected as Vice Chair

b. FFY26 December 2025-November 2026 Technical Committee Meeting Dates

Motion to approve as presented (Tucker) seconded. No discussion, motion approved unanimously.

c. MTP Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook Recommended for approval to the Policy Board

The Technical Committee held a special workshop to review and develop the scoring criteria. At their November 4th meeting, they made amendments to three criteria.

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

Motion to amend Criterion 5.2 to remove the scoring criteria "5 points if the project makes a new non-motorized connection of greater than 0.5 miles" and instead assign "5 points if the project connects two facilities or extends a facility" (Winnestaffer), seconded. Motion approved.



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

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

The Technical Committee also had to extend their meeting time and postpone Items 7 through 9 to the December 10th meeting.

Kim Sollien noted that the next Technical Committee meeting is December 10th and will include presentations on the interactive public comment map, existing conditions report overview, and travel demand model overview.

No questions from the board.

6. Action Items

a. Officer Elections: Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer, and Secretary: **Election Process on Page 3 of the Packet.**

Kim Sollien reported that she received a written nomination from Sean Holland for Mayor Jim Cooper as Chair.

Floor nominations:

- Bob Charles nominated Edna DeVries as Vice Chair
- Brian Winnestaffer nominated Bob Charles to continue as Secretary
- Brian Winnestaffer nominated Sean Holland to continue as Treasurer

Motion (Charles) to close nominations and elect the slate as presented, seconded. No objections. Passed unanimously.

Results:

- Chair: Jim Cooper, Mayor – City of Palmer
- Vice Chair: Edna DeVries, Mayor - MSB
- Secretary: Bob Charles – Knik Tribe
- Treasurer: Sean Holland – DOT&PF

Mayor DeVries noted her appreciation for the board's confidence in her.

Mayor Cooper thanked the board for their confidence and stated he will do his best and is looking forward to serving as Chair.

b. December 2025-November 2026 Policy Board Meeting Dates (Action Item) **Recommended Motion to approve as meeting dates as presented.**



The proposed schedule maintains meetings on the 4th Wednesday of each month from 1:30-3:00 pm, with adjustments for holidays:

- December 17th (one week early for Christmas)
- November 18th (one week early for Thanksgiving)

Discussion:

- Confirmation that the 4th Wednesday schedule does not conflict with other MPO meetings
- FAST Planning meets on the 3rd Wednesday, so there should not be regular conflicts

Motion to approve meeting dates as presented (Winnestaffer), seconded. No discussion or objections. Motion passes unanimously.

c. Personnel Policy Update to Annual COLA policy (Action Item)

Recommended Motion to approve the annual COLA policy as presented.

Kim Sollien explained that the previous policy averaged the second half of the current fiscal year and the first half of the following fiscal year to calculate COLA. The board requested at the October executive session that the COLA calculation instead follow the federal fiscal year update based on what the Social Security Administration announces.

Discussion:

- *Mayor Cooper* asked for clarification on whether this is an average or just follows the federal announcement
- *Kim Sollien* confirmed it simply follows the Social Security Administration's announced percentage (e.g., if SSA announces 3.2%, then MVP staff receives 3.2%)
- *Brian Winnestaffer* asked if there is a motion needed
- *Mayor Cooper* confirmed a motion is needed

Motion to approve the annual COLA policy as presented (Winnestaffer) seconded. No discussion or objections. Motion passes unanimously.

d. Personnel Policy Update to Annual Performance Evaluations (Action Item)

Recommended Motion to approve the amendment to the annual performance evaluations as presented.



Kim Sollien gave a brief report noting that during the October closed session, the board requested that MVP add a numeric scoring system to the annual performance evaluation process. The policy now includes evaluation on five key performance areas using a 1-5 scale:

- Job knowledge and quality of work
- Productivity and timeliness
- Communication and teamwork
- Problem solving and critical thinking
- Professional conduct and relationship building

The evaluation includes both narrative feedback and numeric scores that will be placed in personnel files.

Motion to approve the amendment to the annual performance evaluations as presented (Winnestaffer), seconded. No discussion, motion passes unanimously.

- e. MTP Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook Approval (Action Item)
Recommended Motion to approve MTP project evaluation criteria and scoring guidebook as presented.

Kim Sollien invited Carrie Cecil to present on the evaluation criteria and scoring guidebook. *Carrie* provided context on how the evaluation criteria were developed.

Background:

- The criteria were developed through a Technical Committee workshop followed by refinement at the November 4th TC meeting
- The seven goals from the vision, goals, and objectives serve as the starting point for the evaluation criteria
- Staff, RESPEC, and Technical Committee members focused on creating objective criteria where possible to streamline the scoring process
- Some subjective criteria will require narratives from project submitters and evaluation by the scoring committee

Scoring Mechanics:

- Each criterion has a score, and different goal areas have assigned weights based on priorities
- The scoring guide helps evaluators understand the intent of each criterion, what data will be used, and how to score projects consistently
- Projects will receive both numeric scores and rankings

Criteria Types:

- Programmatically scored criteria (marked with calculator icon): MVP staff will score using GIS and other analytical tools without requiring submitter input
- Submitter-provided criteria (marked with document icon): Project sponsors must provide narrative evidence

Discussion Highlights:



Bob Charles asked Carrie to explain the difference between programmatically scored criteria and submitter-provided criteria. Carrie explained the programmatic scoring uses GIS analysis of existing data layers (such as crash data/EPDO scores) while submitter-provided criteria require written descriptions from project sponsors.

Mayor Cooper commented that the Technical Committee put significant work into developing these criteria through multiple work sessions and thoughtful deliberation.

Brian Winnestaffer asked whether there could be a criterion that gives points for "protecting the livability of the landscape" and asked if this is something the policy board would be interested in adding.

Adam Bradway noted that the policy board will have additional opportunities beyond the scoring criteria to influence how projects are prioritized and ranked.

Sean Holland asked about criteria 8.2 (Population Reached) and how it connects to the goals.

Carrie Cecil explained that criteria 8.1-8.3 are not attached to the seven main goals and are not weighted, but staff and the Technical Committee felt these criteria were important to include in the evaluation. She explained that the scoring guide helps evaluators understand how to score all criteria, not just these additional ones.

Kim Sollien addressed Brian Winnestaffer's livability question, noting that scoring criterion 1 addresses livability by looking at diverse modes and ensuring improvements for all aspects of the network. She reminded the board that this is MVP's first MTP and the organization will begin revisiting the plan in about 2 years with more knowledge to drive potential changes.

Mike Brown raised concerns about the \$8 million project cap in the scoring guidebook eligibility criteria, noting that it would screen out important projects like the Hemmer Road Project and another road project. He emphasized that with the urban area designation, the region will no longer qualify for Community Transportation Program (CTP) funding within the boundary, which has been crucial for funding larger connector projects. He advocated for removing the threshold to keep the process more inclusive upfront and let the policy board make decisions about project selection rather than screening projects out entirely.

Carrie Cecil responded that the intent would be to remove the \$8 million cap from the scoring guide for this current round. If this is something MVP wants to include in the future, it can be reconsidered when starting the second MTP.

Kim Sollien explained that the \$8 million figure came from roughly MVP's annual allocation and was intended to prevent projects from being too large (which might require pooling funds across multiple years). However, after discussion, removing the threshold for this round makes sense to see what projects are submitted. Larger projects could potentially be programmed in our years while smaller projects are completed early on.



Mayor Cooper asked for clarification on whether the eligibility criteria (including the cap) would be removed before the public meeting on December 3rd. Kim confirmed it would be removed.

Mike Brown agreed with the approach of keeping it wider open initially and then narrowing down later based on evaluation.

Mayor Cooper asked about DOT projects and whether they need to go through the scoring criteria.

Adam Bradway explained that DOT will provide their project list to MVP and these projects will be reviewed together, but they won't go through the scoring process. This approach was chosen because it's the first time doing this process, and DOT projects are typically at a different scale than MVP-funded projects. The key is ensuring MVP is aware of all DOT projects in advance to avoid the communication issues experienced by other MPOs like FAST and AMATS.

Mayor Cooper asked about prioritization when MVP has a scored list and DOT has their STIP list, expressing concern about potential conflicts and ensuring MVP's priorities aren't overridden by the state.

Adam Bradway clarified that the scoring criteria are directed toward MVP's allocation of funding for community-driven projects. DOT projects are entirely funded outside of MVP's allocation and prioritized separately. However, everything within the MVP boundary must go into the MVP TIP, and the policy board has final say on the TIP. The intent is not for DOT projects to supersede MVP's community-driven projects.

Discussion ensued about how the two processes run concurrently:

- MVP has federal funds allocated directly (not routed through the state)
- DOT has separate federal funding routed through the state STIP
- All federally funded projects within the MVP boundary must go into the MVP TIP
- The policy board approves the TIP
- The 3C process (Continuing, Cooperative, Comprehensive) requires that there be no surprises and all parties should be in agreement on the TIP

Brian Winnestaffer asked about what happens if there's a conflict between what DOT wants to do and what the community wants.

Discussion clarified:

- Every federally funded project within the MVP boundary must go into MVP's TIP
- The policy board has final say on the TIP
- There shouldn't be surprises on what projects are included
- MVP and DOT should all be in agreement for the TIP
- The goal is to set things up to avoid the same conflicts experienced by FAST and AMATS



Kim Sollien explained the MTP timeline: MVP will get community-driven project nominations, DOT will provide their project list, and all projects will be included in the MTP with its 20-year horizon. The board will have a chance to discuss all projects. The nomination period will be at least 30-45 days, and by the time it closes, DOT should be ready to provide their list. A Technical Committee subcommittee will score and rank the community-driven projects, then the board will review everything together - both the scored community projects and DOT's projects - likely in early spring.

Adam Bradway noted that DOT projects will have less detailed information than the full nomination form requires, but enough to understand location, cost, and timeline. He also noted that DOT projects are scored internally using their own criteria, which is why they're ranked in the STIP.

Motion to approve MTP project evaluation criteria and scoring guidebook as presented (Winnestaffer), seconded. No further questions. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Old Business

a. MTP Update

Carrie Cecil shared the project nomination form, explaining:

- The form will be made public through Survey 123
- The intended audience is cities, MSB, community councils, and similar entities
- Staff has run several test submissions to ensure correct data collection and make administrative tweaks
- The form is designed to collect all necessary information for evaluation

Discussion:

Mayor Cooper asked how difficult it is to draw a line for linear projects. *Carrie* demonstrated that it is straightforward in the system.

Interactive Comment Map and Nomination Process:

Carrie Cecil demonstrated the Interactive Comment Map, explaining:

- This will be made public and is largely intended for public engagement
- The map will capture the "lived reality" of the transportation network that may not be reflected in data
- Users can submit points of interest, opportunity, or concern related to transportation
- Comments are categorized by mode (bike, pedestrian, motorized, or bus)
- Users can submit either points or lines (e.g., for a corridor that needs improvement)
- All comments will be visible to everyone
- Other users can "like" comments to show support
- The system was kept simple (likes only, not additional comments) to ease back-end data processing



Discussion:

No questions were raised about the interactive map.

Both the nomination form and interactive comment map are expected to go live around the time of the December 3rd public open house, though the date is still somewhat fluid as staff awaits additional data.

Special Meeting the week of Nov 18th with TC subcommittee to review the Travel Model Assumptions.

Kim Sollien provided an update:

- MVP had a first look at the travel demand model data at a Technical Committee meeting
 - Questions were raised about whether the data was accurate based on the lived experience of Technical Committee members
 - Specifically, there were questions about whether the base data included all completed road projects for the base year and all expected projects by 2040
 - DOT and MSB submitted project lists that should have been included
 - This data was sent to RSG (the model developers)
 - A special meeting is scheduled for Friday to review the updated model run
 - Staff needs to verify that all the right projects were included, or determine if another model rerun is needed
 - This data verification is part of what staff is waiting on before officially launching the call for projects
- b. STIP Memo about MVP FFY 24&25 Funding Allocations, Carryover, and FFY26 Funding Award
- Policy Board Request: DOT reps on the PB and TC, engage their leadership in documenting improvements that could be made with the 3C process, STIP involvement, and usage of MVP's suballocations without consultation update from Ben White, Alaska DOT Planning Chief
 - MVP FFY 24,25,26 funding and project documentation update requested by the Technical Committee for review

Kim Sollien reminded the board:

- Last month the board discussed issues with the 3C process and communication with DOT
- The packet includes a letter drafted by staff flagging some of the process and communication issues
- Two spreadsheets document all projects MVP wanted funded versus what was actually funded by DOT
- At the October meeting, the board asked if DOT could draft a letter acknowledging communication missteps and potential fixes

Ben White reported:

- He has been tasked with drafting a letter from DOT and routing it through headquarters for vetting



- He does not have the letter ready today (he had kidney stone surgery a week ago and fell behind)
- He is working with headquarters to do a final accounting of fiscal year 25 funding and where it went
- The letter should be ready in the next week or two for review at the December meeting

Discussion:

Mayor Cooper questioned whether a letter from the Commissioner to MVP is the appropriate approach. He suggested it might be better for MVP to send a letter to DOT outlining problems rather than requesting an apology from the Commissioner.

Ben White responded:

- The letter format is intended to capture where funding went for tracking purposes
- It may require follow-up from the board
- The key commitment he's seeking from DOT is to communicate with MVP before programming funds in the future
- DOT is working to have financial conversations earlier in the federal fiscal year (not waiting until June-August when there's a rush to obligate funds)
- An example is coming in December where DOT wants to use federal funding for vehicle purchases - they'll present the proposal to the Technical Committee and Policy Board first to get concurrence
- The intent is to demonstrate where funding went and get a commitment for better communication going forward

Mayor Cooper expressed support for this positive approach that focuses on moving forward constructively rather than assigning blame, noting the importance of not creating tension with the Commissioner.

Ben White agreed and noted:

- DOT has been discussing at quarterly MPO meetings how to improve coordination earlier in the year
- They used to do "banking" with MPOs (carrying forward funds)
- There are ongoing conversations about how to ensure MPOs are held whole if DOT needs to program money quickly
- He's working to make the letter positive and focused on collaboration
- He wants to provide a reckoning of where funding went and how to make MVP whole in future years

Mayor Cooper thanked Ben for his work on this approach.

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

Lauren Little was in a FAST Policy Board Meeting, so *Adam Bradway* reported on her behalf:

STIP Delay:

- The STIP has been delayed due to storm response in western Alaska



- Most of the STIP team has been deployed to help with storm response
- DOT is planning to release something to create a 26-29 STIP (no specific date yet)

Fairbanks Conformity Freeze:

- Fairbanks has been under a conformity freeze
- Projects had been pulled out of the STIP
- These projects will be going back into the STIP as the freeze is lifted
- MVP may see some projects getting delayed as DOT works to fit Fairbanks projects back in
- Impacts are not fully determined yet

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

Adam Bradway reported on behalf of Lauren Little:

Background:

- This is a federal initiative from the Secretary of Transportation
- DOT coordinated with MPOs to compile a list of safety and operational issues
- The list focuses on arterial roadways and includes bridges, roads, freight, and congestion issues
- MVP received and reviewed this list a few months ago

Next Steps:

- DOT is supposed to put together a plan to address the identified issues
- Several major Mat-Su roadways are on the list
- DOT is beginning to develop ideas for fixes
- DOT wants to know how MVP wants to be coordinated with as they determine solutions

Coordination Options:

- Provide information to MVP as DOT develops solutions
- Set up coordination meetings for more MVP involvement
- Present at MVP meetings
- Other approaches

Discussion:

Mayor Cooper requested that DOT provide information and present at MVP meetings.

Adam Bradway asked if DOT should involve MVP staff first.

Mayor Cooper confirmed yes, start with staff.

The board agreed to this approach.

8. New Business
a. None

No new business.



9. Other Issues

a. Transit update

No update at this time.

10. Informational Items

a. Annual Conflict of Interest Policy Signatures

Kim Sollien asked board members to sign the conflict of interest policy and return it to her.

b. Audit and 990 prep Engagement Letter from Altman, Rodgers Co.

The engagement letter is included in the packet starting on page 58. *Kim Sollien* and *Mayor Cooper* will determine who needs to sign the letter (either can sign it).

c. Vision, Goals, and Objectives public comment period closes November 24th

Public comment is still open through November 24th. MVP is receiving comments both specific to the vision, goals, and objectives, and general comments about the transportation network.

d. Reminder about the December 3rd Open House for the MTP will be held at the MSB Assembly Chamber from 4:30 pm-6:30 pm

The open house will be held at the MSB Assembly Chamber from 4:30 pm-6:30 pm. Board members are encouraged to attend.

The event will feature:

- Different information stations
- Food
- Prizes
- MVP promotional items

11. Policy Board Comments

Sean Holland: Clarified that his MVP comments during the meeting were not meant to be critical, just to ensure all necessary conversations are happening.

Mayor DeVries: Expressed appreciation for the board's confidence in electing her as Vice Chair.

Mayor Cooper: Thanked the board for their confidence in electing him as Chair and stated he will do his best and is looking forward to the role.

12. Adjournment



MATSU VALLEY
PLANNING *for*
TRANSPORTATION

The meeting was adjourned at 2:58pm.

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

DRAFT