

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: November 8, 2018, 1:30 p.m., Conference Room 113, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St., Lincoln, NE

MEMBERS AND OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: David Cary - Planning Dept., Pam Dingman – County Engineering, Paul Barnes and Kellee Van Bruggen – Planning Dept., Gary Bergstrom – Health Dept., Lonnie Burklund and Randy Hoskins – Public Works & Utilities, Michael Davis – StarTran, Tom Goodbarn and Mark Fischer – Nebraska Dept. of Transportation (NDOT), Sara Hartzell – Parks & Recreation, Chad Lay – Lincoln Airport Authority, Larry Legg – County Engineer and Roger Figard – Railroad Transportation Safety District (RTSD); (Miki Esposito – Public Works & Utilities and David Landis – Urban Development absent).
Mike Brienzo and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Dept., Brian Pillard of StarTran, Rick Haden of Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, Thomas Shafer and Kris Humphrey of Public Works & Utilities, and other interested parties.

Vice-Chair Pam Dingman called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

Dingman then requested a motion approving the minutes of the meeting held April 19, 2018. Motion for approval made by Hoskins, seconded by Cary and carried 10-0: Barnes, Burklund, Cary, Davis, Dingman, Fischer, Hoskins, Lay, Legg and Van Bruggen voting ‘yes’; Bergstrom, Goodbarn and Hartzell abstaining; Figard absent at time of vote; Esposito and Landis absent.

REVIEW OF THE TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT (TAM) PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Brian Pillard appeared. MAP-21 was started in July 2012 which directs the FTA (Federal Transit Administration) to establish Transit Asset Management (TAM) requirements. This requires the development of a performance driven and outcome based program. There are four different categories of capital assets. Tier 1 is Rolling Stock. This covers assets such as rail vehicles and buses. Facilities is passenger facilities such as a rail station. Infrastructure and Equipment are the other two.

We did an Inventory of Capital Assets and Condition Assessment. Decision Supports Tools were used to support our investments and then the Investment Prioritization. Our needs are

changing and growing. Technology is moving forward. We are growing and are somewhat land locked. We are working on securing funding to relocate our facility.

Brienzo stated that we would like to incorporate this into the LRTP on the next agenda item. It will be part of the coordination and planning process.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON THE NEBRASKA DOT/MPO HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT MEASURES AND REVISIONS TO THE LINCOLN MPO 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) AND FY 2019-2022 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) TO INCORPORATE PLANNING SUPPORT:

Brienzo stated this is the coordination of performance measures with the NDOT and the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization). We initially went through the safety measures. Those were adopted by the MPO last February and included in the LRTP to support safety measures in May. We also include the requirement to coordinate with the NDOT in a Memorandum of Agreement adopted in May as well. The State evaluates pavement and bridge conditions and they have provided guidance. The State has come up with targets and submitted those to the Federal Highway Association (FHWA). Mark Fischer confirmed they were formally accepted last week.

Brienzo continued that these are performance measures for Safety, Infrastructure, System Performance and Transit Asset Management. Since we have already agreed to support the State targets for safety, our requirement going forward is to update as the State updates.

The second item regards a state of good repair. The Lincoln MPO has agreed to support the State measures. We include this process in our planning documents, the LRTP and the TIP.

Dingman questioned what happens when we are not able to make these targets. Brienzo replied it is the State responsibility to report if they are unable to make the target. We can State our intention to not support the State target, or set our own. The targets become part of a national reporting system to Congress. All the states will report their targets and whether or not they are meeting the targets. If they are not meeting the targets, they need to state what they will do to address any deficiencies. They are focused on the National Highway System. The City and County have their own systems. That may come at some point. There is a lot of data that support this. He has attended numerous workshops on this topic.

The PM-3 was issued by the FHWA in 2017. We are at 100 percent in terms of operation. The State target is 98 percent. We are exceeding the State target. We also look at the truck travel index. The State completed a statewide freight plan. We are meeting or exceeding the targets already set. It also looks at Class A rails, bridges, airports, etc. A summary sheet was included in the agenda.

For the Transit Asset Management plan, we are saying we support StarTran in their planning targets and wish to incorporate that into our planning process as well. Some language was added in the plan already. Some changes are being proposed.

Some of these targets are annual and some are bi-annual. We will continue to work with the State on an ongoing basis.

ACTION:

Barnes moved approval for the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan – 2016 Update and the FY 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program to reflect MPO support for the newly adopted Performance Management Measures, seconded by Goodbarn.

Schroeder questioned why heavy truck traffic and why Highway 2 and the South Beltway doesn't appear yet. Brienzo responded that it is not built yet, is why it doesn't appear. Last he heard, it could be breaking ground in spring of 2020. Once the beltway is in place, we'll have real data.

Motion for approval carried 13-0: Barnes, Bergstrom, Burklund, Davis, Dingman, Figard, Fischer, Goodbarn, Hartzell, Hoskins, Lay, Legg and Van Bruggen voting 'yes'; Cary absent at time of vote; Esposito and Landis absent.

Brienzo noted that oversight will be by the Tri-Chairs of the Technical Committee, with initial review by MPO staff.

BRIEFING ON THE NORTH 33RD GRADE SEPARATION AND CORNHUSKER HIGHWAY SUBAREA PLANNING PROJECT:

Kris Humphrey represents the RTSD. This is a brief overview of 33rd and Cornhusker Hwy. A PEL study was started. That study was done around June July of 2016. This project roots itself in safety. Objectives are to improve traffic and congestion. About 65 trains come through the region every day. There is about 20,000 vehicles every day. NDOT looks at an exposure rating of 50,000 for grade separation. This is a significant issue. At the end of the PEL study, two transportation alternatives were developed. One question we couldn't answer was would these improvements uphold the future land uses in this area. We decided we needed to do a subarea plan. Early in 2018, we contracted with Olsson Associates on the subarea plan. In working with the City, we added a corridor plan as well. We are expecting to receive the draft next Tuesday. This will appear before Planning Commission in January 2019 and then on to City Council in February 2019 for formal action. We are meeting with various committees to give them an overview. Since 2015, we have had a lot of public involvement. There have been two public meetings and an advisory committee. We have talked to a good cross section of people who live and work in the area. We wanted to work with some guidelines. We did a three day charrette and came up with a list of guidelines. There are transportation considerations and subarea plan/corridor plan considerations. A list was developed and then we looked at the PEL

study and came up with some basic consensus items. We need to conform to the subarea plan. There is a high need for north/south connectivity from 33rd St. up to Superior. There is the LRTP component, closure of railroad crossings and Adams Street to take into consideration. Some items we couldn't address right now was access to businesses.

One alternative shows 33rd St. swinging west and connecting north of Cornhusker Hwy. around 31st St. We would propose to create some kind of at-grade pedestrian feature at 44th St. There is an LRTP project for the Salt Creek Roadway extension to Cornhusker Hwy. that would become a T intersection. The PEL study has a lot of different alternatives we looked at. The Adams St. connection at 40th St. goes up and over Cornhusker Hwy.

Another option shows 33rd St. would swing to the west. Dead Man's Run Bridge would need to be reconstructed. Adams St. would connect on the north side. The 33rd St. Bridge over Deadman's Run is part of a Corp of Engineers study. There are a lot of different components to that. Another option is to close the Adams St. crossing and traffic would be diverted. The third option is a reverse S curve. Adams St. would come up and over Cornhusker Hwy. and connect west. The last option is that Adams St. would be connected to a realigned 33rd St.

We are talking to the FHWA. It will take about three to four years. Then will be final design, followed by right-of-way acquisition and construction.

Bergstrom questioned the first alternative and the impact to the grain elevator. Humphrey responded that the LRTP would have the Salt Creek Roadway extension technically on the south side. The subarea plan is a footprint, we aren't forcing them out. There could be a better location for the grain elevator. We have talked with a lot of these businesses.

Figard wanted to reinforce that the driving action is completing and revising the land use plan. It is important for the community and City Council to weigh in. If the land use plan is revised or changed significantly, it would be time for us to take another look.

BRIEFING ON THE LINCOLN MPO ON-STREET BIKE FACILITIES STUDY:

Kellee Van Bruggen stated that a lot of work has been done on this over the summer. The draft plan is on the web: <https://www.lincolnbikeplan.com/>. We looked at the existing bike network. We have 248 miles of trails, 140 miles of designated bike routes, 2.34 miles of bike lanes and 1.31 miles of two-way bike tracks. There are various types of people who bike. We need to accommodate all ages and abilities. We also looked at what the greatest opportunities might be. We want to build on the strong trail network that we already have, connect people with places and add dedicated on-street bike lanes. We identified ten goals at the beginning of the process. We took all those into consideration while developing this process. We heard from the public that culture, respecting the rules of the road and connected were top priorities.

One of the first things we did was talk about bicycle demand factors. This is connecting people with places. We combined the information and layered it and came up with a composite map.

There is a high demand downtown. We looked at it in two different ways. Some factors that played into this were speed, is there a bike facility and the number of travel lanes. We also looked at the intersection and the crossing such as speed of cross traffic and number of lanes to cross. All that information was applied to the entire transportation network. Most were low traffic streets and local streets that do not have a high rate of speed. FHU put together a Bicycle Facilities Design Guide. Separated bike lanes can be either one-way or two-way. This provides a physical barrier between the bike and car. There are buffered bike lanes and bike lanes. This provides a little more comfortability. We also talked about the concept of bicycle boulevards. This allows vehicles to be on the street, but slows traffic down. Side paths are another big one along a lot of arterials. They provide more protection and visibility.

As we develop the network, we looked at it from a multi-level approach, higher density in downtown to lower density at the City edge. Collector streets are preferable, four lane streets, address barriers, direct access to BikeLNK and a preference for bike lanes to flow in same direction as traffic are some consideration.

For the bike network, we looked at all different facility types and are proposing different types. We now look at how we can combine these into projects. We went through a process and identified 135 projects. Prioritization and phasing, we look at barriers, bicycle demand, safety, connectivity and social equity. From there, we looked at cost. We also looked at the ease of implementation. We also took a look at policy recommendations such as the Complete Streets Program, Vision Zero, public participation, Bicycle Friendly Community application and Ordinances. For community engagement, we have had a website available and a public commenting was available. We have sent information to our email distribution list, social media, posters and postcards, open houses, and LES (Lincoln Electric System) Sustainable Living event, farmers markets and coffee shops. We worked with StarTran, libraries, Matt Talbot Kitchen and Lincoln Bike Kitchen for our survey. Once we receive all comments, we will refine the bike network and develop an implementation plan. We are looking at a draft bike plan review through November 30, 2018, with an adoption process in December 2018 or January 2019.

Cary commended Van Bruggen and everyone for a very good plan. He likes that it is based on demand and the system being proposed is based around that. It makes sense to build up around where the need is the greatest. The majority of network proposed is what we already do, as well as more side paths and trail system where we have a good start. It builds off our strengths. It is a great plan.

Davis thinks this is a great asset to get the word out. That is another aspect that is helpful.

Lori Bruner is interested in side paths. It seems like a good alternative. She wondered if they would be on just on one shoulder. Legg replied that in the County, they would be on both sides. Bruner wondered if this would be necessary. Legg replied yes. Bruner drives a lot of county roads and is happy to see Folsom Rd. is a target for a side path. She would suggest just one shoulder for a bike path. She is glad to see this.

Hartzell stated that Folsom Rd. is planned for more of a trail along the side of the roadway. She believes it would be on the west side, just one side where the sidewalk would normally be.

BRIEFING ON THE LANCASTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY REPORT:

S. 68th St. Study and S. 148th St. Study

Pam Dingman stated that Olsson Associates was contracted with for transportation infrastructure committees. Burklund represented the City, she represented the County. Some main goals were maintenance, mobility and system reliability, safety and resiliency. This task force met for about six months and talked about many things. Based on a number of surveys and discussions, we decided reliability should be main the focus. We wanted to focus on getting bridges back open. Lancaster County spends about \$18,000 a mile, a year, compared with peer counties who spend \$28,000 to \$32,000 a mile, a year. We are underfunded. She has said our funding gap is \$5 million a year to get to a more workable point. Olsson Associates says bridge funding alone needs \$9 million a year. We need and additional \$15 million a year to work on paving. The County Commissioners and she have asked the County Attorney for an option on what additional funding sources are available. We believe those to be road tax, sales tax, property tax or a combination thereof. We have removed 49 bridges from the critical list, but another 28 were added. We are unable to do any new pavement projects this year. In 2006, RUTS was put in place. There should have been a part two for wheel tax. The City approved it and Lancaster County did not. She thinks there is an equity problem. We are looking forward to the County Attorney opinion. The report in its entirety is available on the Lancaster County Engineer or County Commissioner's website. Cary and Burklund participated. We are trying to find a creative way to get caught up with our funding. There are a lot of areas that are significantly underfunded

Davis understands that if these are deferred, they will just cost more in the future. Dingman stated there are a number of discussions to be had. Behind the scenes, we talk if the City continues to grow, and the City annexes streets that are still gravel with no improvements or some old very bad bridges, these are things to take into consideration. Our problems eventually become the City problems.

There was a request by the public for a safety study of S. 68th Street. She also asked for funding to study 148th St. We hear from constituents all the time that they want shoulders on the road. We are trying to figure out how we implement one mile of shoulders. The study recommends safety improvements, operational improvements and systemic improvements. Rumble strips and shoulders on one mile of S. 68th St. would be \$9 million dollars. The corridor from Old Cheney into Waverly was studied for N. 148th St. This corridor meets the warrants to be a four lane divided road. This is a significant corridor. On both of these corridors it was determined we have a speeding problem. There were also a number of operational recommendations on N. 148th St. We will look at a number of items in the future. There is a funding gap.

The reality is that we have to start moving ahead and being progressive with the East Beltway Corridor. She doesn't think we can make it 15 years. There is a definite need for it now. Waverly is the fastest growing small city by the number of lots. Hickman is the fastest growing by a percentage. Growth has its concerns.

Brienzo noted that the East Beltway is on the State radar for the next generation of the Build Nebraska Act. Goodbarn added that it is included as a study. Dingman believes that given traffic projections, we need to start having discussions.

Cary stated that the funding gap is in the entire State. Studies are useful in identifying needs. We need to have those discussions and how to bridge that gap.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.