



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#

Minutes

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

Meeting called to order at 2:00 pm.

Members Present:

Bob Charles – Knik Tribe (Secretary)
Brian Winnestaffer - Chickaloon Native Village
Chris Bentz – AK DOT&PF
Adam Bradway (proxy for Ben White) – AK DOT&PF
Tom Adams – MSB
Andrew Reynolds (proxy for Kate Dueber) – ARRC
Alex Strawn – MSB
Dan Tucker – RSA Representative
Erich Schaal – City of Wasilla
Jude Bilafer – City of Palmer
Lawrence Smith – Trucking Industry Advocate
Adeyemi Alimi – ADEC
Stuart Leidner – Mobility Advocate
Randy Durham – MSB TAB

Visitors Present:

Kim Sollien – MVP, Executive Director
Anjie Goulding - MVP
Carrie Cecil - MVP



MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

Pat Cotter – RESPEC
Nathaniel Outzts – City of Palmer, Community Development Director
Emily Haynes – FHWA
Elise Blocker – RESPEC
Bianca Zibrat – MSB Planning Department
Luke Bowland – AK DOT&PF
Kristina Huling – MSB Planning Department
Mackenze Origer – MSB GIS
Lauren Little – AK DOT&PF

2. Consent Agenda (**Action Item**)
 - a. Approval of the November 4th, 2025, Agenda
 - b. Approval of the October 14th, 2025, Minutes

*Motion to approve the consent agenda and meeting minutes from October 14, 2025 (**Winnestaffer**), seconded. No edits. Motion is approved.*

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

Kim Sollien gave staff report:

- Thank you to all TC members for continued support on the heavy lift of the MTP and especially Dan Tucker for assisting with the MTP informational video shoot.
- Request for all to please look at the monthly events as there is a lot coming up as the MTP process ramps up.

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

Kristina Huling introduced herself – MSB planner attending

Nathaniel Ouzts introduced himself in meeting chat – new Community Development Director for the City of Palmer.

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.*

Kim Sollien provided notes from discussion with the Policy Board on this item.

- MVP staff with Policy Board engagement worked on adjusted language for Goal 1 (coordinating land use planning and transportation planning) to better reflect the distribution of roles and responsibilities of MPO/ authority. This updated language is included in the version of the Vision, Goals, and Objectives currently out for public comment.

- b. *Motion to adopt the Public Participation Plan as presented Motion to approve (Winnestaffer), seconded. Item raised for discussion by Mike*



MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

Brown to add ATV users to stakeholders. Motion to adopt as amended (Winnestaffer), seconded. No further discussion, no objection. Motion is approved.

Kim Sollien provided notes from discussion with the Policy Board on this item.

6. Page 19 edited to include off-road and all-terrain vehicle users among list of interest parties to provide reasonable opportunities to be involved in the MTP process. While this is not a required/ typical group as directed by federal planning regulations, the MSB has many such user groups that have an interest in transportation planning.
 - 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*

Kim Sollien provided notes from discussion with the Policy Board on the topic of a letter to the AK DOT&PF Commissioner.

- As discussed during the last Technical Committee meeting, MVP had prepared a draft letter to DOT commissioner regarding the lack of 3C process adherence. The Technical Committee in turn requested MVP staff to compile information about projects and where funding ended up going. This was presented to the Policy Board who indicated a preference for DOT partners on the Technical Committee and Policy Board to instead encourage the DOT commissioner's office to send a letter to MVP acknowledging process adherence issues. The draft letter is included in the packet for this meeting along with the accounting of project expenditures.
- *Discussion:*
 - There is some concern among members about the position such a request places on DOT partners.
 - DOT partners summarized several actions being taken within DOT to clarify processes and communications.
 - Item will remain a target for discussion in future meetings.

7. Action Items

- a. Officer Elections Recommended Motion: *Motion to Approve (Member) as TC Chair and Motion to approve (Member) as TC Vice Chair*

Kim Sollien gave overview of requirements. The MVP by-laws require written nominations be received 24 hours in advance of an election. No written nominations were received. In such cases, the by-laws then allow for nominations from the floor. Roll-call vote with majority win.



MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

Nominations:

- Dan Tucker and Brian Winnestaffer nominate Alex Strawn for Chair. Nominations do not need to be seconded. Alex does not object. No other nominations, no objections.
- Tom Adams and Adam Bradway nominate Eric Schaal for Vice Chair. Eric accepts nomination.
- Brian Winnestaffer nominates Chris Bentz. Chris accepts nomination.

Discussion:

- Eric did an excellent job but is not always able to attend in person whereas Chris is able to (this could change in the future with possible new location). Leading in person is advantageous.

Vote for Vice Chair:

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

Results:

- Alex Strawn will serve another term as Chair to the Technical Committee
- Eric Schaal will serve another term as Vice Chair to the Technical Committee

b. FFY26 December 2025-November 2026 Technical Committee Meeting Dates. Recommended Motion: *Move to approve TC meeting dates as presented.*

*Motion to approve the proposed FFY26 December – November 2026 Technical Committee Meeting Dates (**Tucker**), seconded. No discussion, no objections. Motion is approved.*

c. MTP Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidebook (Action Item)
• Activity: We will run two projects through the criteria
Recommended Motion: *Move to Approve the MTP Project Evaluation Criteria as Presented.*

Kim Sollien gave overview of the activity and documents included in the packet. The Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Scoring Guide, and Nomination Form were informed by the Technical Committee working session on Oct. 23. The guidebook is intended to aid both project sponsors in submitting and evaluators in reviewing.



MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

Pat Cotter (Respec) provided additional information about the Scoring Guide based around goal areas and associated criteria.

- The criteria helps to delineate what makes a good project for each goal area.
- Seven goal areas, each criteria numbered for easy reference.
- Weighting established based on mentimeter from the work session.
- Stepwise process to assign scoring.
- Note that there was a change to criteria under transit section from the work session – included in transit plan (not ready yet) so changed to support transit.
- Qualitative vs quantitative scoring – quantitative would be done in GIS to greatest extent possible, qualitative would go in front of the evaluating committee

Adam Bradway walked through the test project: Herman Road extension project CTP project.

- From Herman on Parks near Lowes – upgrading portion that exists and then extending towards Palmer – Wasilla HWY
 - To support capacity, maintenance, also supports non-motorized. Anticipate high score because it addresses a lot of criteria.

Notes on each Criterion:

- Criterion 1.1 – This will require staff validation to confirm inclusion in an existing plan.
- Criterion 1.2 – This criterion requires the project nominator to write a narrative to explain how project would accomplish expansion of access – i.e., it is subjective. At the core of the question is whether employment/ access the primary reason for the project or secondary to it?
 - Bentz feels that subjectivity would balance out as MTP gets redone and notes that subjectivity can be advantageous.
 - Strawn considers applicability to the Hermon Rd. project. It is possible to argue that someone who lives on Palmer-Wasilla highway could get to their job a few minutes faster; however, the project would open up potential for new businesses to be established on the new segment of road.
 - Tucker notes that H5 would push senior housing development in that project area. Depending on the timing of that announcement, this could change the metrics of the project. That said, is there a means to flag a project that *would* be needed?
 - Bradway acknowledges that the MTP is intended to be a wider pool of projects (25-years), and projects will be subject to review with MTP iterations.
 - Schaal notes that this project also includes a pedestrian connection that would lend points to this as well.
 - Adams expresses concern over the use of the term expand and questions if the term improve should be used instead? Improving access may be an equal measure to expanding.
 - Bradway provides examples of projects that would get 5 points:
 - A brand new road to senior center
 - Port Mac road
 - West-Su road



MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

- Criterion 1.3 – Note that most projects in the Bogard plan would receive points. Assigning more points to projects in plans encourages the development of access management plans which are needed.
 - Bradway raises consideration as to whether to categorize access development permits as access development plans.
- Criterion 2.1 – Will use EPDO (equivalent property damage only) scores to assess in GIS.
 - Equivalent Property Damage Only is a means of weighting crashes based on severity to define metrics for comparing (assigns cost assignment to crash). E.g., a fender bender vs. fatality (est. on 3 mil). It weights the human cost to property damage. This means that roads not typically included in safety screening will show up.
 - Bentz notes that the EPDO data currently appears to be based on percentile which avg. at state level so would it make sense to evaluate based on MPA boundary. Essentially, data could potentially be skewed/normalized? Pat to look into the percentiles.
 - Adams notes that this would favor the higher volume roadways. However, isn't an objective of MPO to also focus energy on lower volume roads? Noted though that we lack data on many of the lower functional class roads overall reducing ability to assign scores.
- Criterion 2.2 – The project under review was not included in a safety plan at the time of development.
- Criterion 2.3 – The project would include signals, ped-path, so would score a 3.
- Criterion 2.4 – This criterion is GIS-based.
- Criterion 3.1 – This criterion helps to push those projects that are ready to go to the top to get them prioritized in near term.
- Criterion 4.1 – This criterion was initially intended to also incorporate review of pavement condition data in GIS; however we currently lack pavement data for all roads, but that is getting developed.
- Criterion 4.2 – This is another subjective criterion that will require project nominators to provide a narrative description. This criterion is also weighted to be of higher value consistent with the ranking of goals by the Technical Committee in the working session. The focus of this criterion is really to prioritize the improvement projects rather than new projects, thereby balancing it out.
- Criterion 4.3 – The Hermon Rd project was informed by public complaints. One potential opportunity is to use the MSB problem reporter.
- Criterion 5.1 – This project was not in the Bike and Pedestrian plan.



MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

- Criterion 5.2 – This project would create new multi-modal connection more than .5 mile.
 - Bentz flagged that the language needs review – closes gap vs. creates connection and making sure that language choice matches intent.
 - Tucker suggested that the .5-mile distance should be looked at carefully.
- Criterion 5.3 – This project would not support transit.
- Criterion 5.4 – This project would reduce user conflicts by providing separate pedestrian and non-motorized facilities from from motorized facilities.
- Criterion 6.1 – LOS (have both segmental and intersection). Noted that the model lines out 2050 LOS for segments only.
 - Bentz asked how an intersection project would be scored?
 - Bradway answered we would pick the worse LOS of roads intersecting.
- Criterion 6.2 – Adam noted that we used data to try to reduce subjectivity.
 - Tucker noted that this project in question would be hugely helpful for supporting freight refueling but that may not be captured in data alone.
 - Bentz noted that we are scoring against existing data rather than projecting for improving conditions.
 - Bradway noted that existing GIS data was used in the interest of keeping it simple. Reduce the qualitative analysis about future conditions.
 - Strawn suggests considering a qualitative/ description based in addition to the quantitative.
 - Smith notes that this is traditionally one of the highly overlooked areas and would really suggest including qualitative and maybe require less rework in the future.
- Criterion 6.3 – Discussion over intent and meaning of the criterion, specifically whether only new roads over 1 mile in length would receive full points.
 - Adams – What does connect roadway gap mean? Notes that one mile of new road is very expensive in urban areas. Consider reducing road length. Senses that the criteria are very much weighted towards DOT scale projects.
 - Bradway notes that the DOT does not intend to nominate projects, but needs the projects to be in the MTP in order to coordinate STIP.
- Criterion 7.1 – The criterion will rely on GIS analysis of projects within 100-year floodplain data because that's the data we have available. This project is not in 100-yr floodplain.
- Criterion 7.2 – This project was not intended to, or includes measures to enhance the natural environment.
- Criterion 7.3 – This project would improve network redundancy and improve emergency access.
- Criterion 8.1 – This project did have public agency support.



MatSu Valley Planning for Transportation

- Criterion 8.2 – This project would be categorized as regional because connects two major roads.
- Criterion 8.3 – This project is a minor collector.
- Total Score – 776 (This would be considered a good score overall).

Motions:

*Motion to approve with minor staff edits as required and discussed which would be presented at the November 12 Special Technical Committee meeting (**Bradway**), seconded. Discussion raised by Adams on Criteria 1.2, 5.2 and 6.3.*

Discussion:

- *Criteria 1.2*
 - *Adams suggests that the word improve is more appropriate than the term expand in the context of this Criterion.*
 - *Billafer notes that the words are entirely different in intent and the suggested edits is more appropriate.*
- *Criteria 5.2*
 - *Adams expresses concern over the intent of the criterion and whether this prioritizes large scale projects over smaller projects.*
 - *General concern over the appropriateness of the .5 mile suggested distance and how many projects would in fact meet that threshold.*
 - *Leidner does not want to see the criterion removed in its entirety.*
- *Criteria 6.3*
 - *Adams expresses concern over the intent of the criterion and the appropriateness of the 1-mile threshold which would be expensive to meet.*
 - *Bradway notes that the intent of the threshold was to further stratify project.*
 - *Tucker asks if the distance is intended as distance between existing roads (i.e., one mile of new road) or if the distance could also apply as the crow-flies (i.e., one mile of road between two facilities due to existing accessibility issues).*

*Motion to amend Criterion 1.2 to replace the word "expand" with the word "improve" throughout (**Adams**), seconded. Discussion: Billafer notes that the words are entirely different in intent and the suggested edits is more appropriate. No further discussion. No objections. Motion to amend Criterion 1.2 is 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. No further discussion. No objections. Motion to amend Criterion 5.2 is 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. No further discussion. No objections. Motion to amend Criterion 6.3 is approved.*



MatSu Valley Planning *for* Transportation

*Motion to approve the MTP evaluation criteria as amended by prior motions (**Bradway**), seconded. No further discussion, no objections. Motion is approved.*

*Motion to extend meeting until 4:20 pm (**Winnestaffer**), seconded. No further discussion, no objections. Motion is approved.*

*Motion to postpone remaining agenda items 7-9 to December Technical Committee Meeting (**Bradway**), seconded. No further discussion, no objections. Motion is approved.*

8. 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

Topic will be moved to next meeting, not time sensitive.

c. 26-29 STIP Update (None)

Topic will be moved to next meeting, not time sensitive.

d. Alaska DOT&PF SAFEROADS initiative (speaker?)

Topic will be moved to next meeting, not time sensitive.

9. New Business

10. 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.

11. 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
12. Technical Committee Comments
13. Adjournment

Meeting is adjourned at 4:14 pm.

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.