

BRIEFING NOTES

Advanced public notice of the Planning Commission briefing was posted on the County-City bulletin board and the Planning Department's website.

NAME OF GROUP: PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, February 18, 2026 12:00 pm, City Council Chambers, County-City Building, 555 South 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Dick Campbell, Maribel Cruz, Gloria Eddins (arrived at 12:08 p.m), Brett Ebert and Cindy Ryman Yost, Bailey Feit (arrived at 12:50 p.m.)

ATTENDANCE: Christy Joy, Rich Rodenburg and Lorenzo Ball absent

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Paul Barnes, Andrew Thierolf, Rachel Christopher, Mia Haschenburger, and Kristi Merfeld of the Planning and Development Services Department; Greg Youell and Jenny Young(via zoom) Felsburg, Holt & Ullevig and other interested parties.

STATED PURPOSE: Briefing on **“Long Range Transportation Plan Update, Lincoln Mobility Plan, and Comprehensive Plan Update”**

Paul Barnes, Planning and Development Services Department, 555 S 10th Street, Lincoln, NE came forward and stated that he was going to talk about

some plans and projects that we have been working on. The activity today is going to be super fun and exciting, as Andrew noted last month. We are going to be asking you to use your cell phone or smartphone, as we go through a Mentimeter exercise, to get your input. Barnes stated he was going to turn it over to the consultant team of Greg Youell and Jenny Young is joining on zoom.

Greg Youell, FHU (Felsburg, Holt and Ullevig) came forward and stated it was good to be here again and Jenny Young is joining us remotely on the screen. She will be taking over the first part of this presentation after he finishes. Youell proceeded to say that it has been a couple months since we have been here. We are steadily making progress across the project timeline. It is now well into the second phase of planned development. We are looking forward going out into the public again this spring with project information for people to make comments. The mobility plan portion of this project should get wrapped up later spring or early summer, and then the LRTP to get adopted by the end of the year. The final drafts should be ready by the fall of 2026. This is where we are at according to the schedule.

Jenny Young, FHU (Felsburg, Holt and Ullevig) via zoom stated that we were going to focus on the Long Range Transportation Plan and then that will be the Mentimeter exercise. Also Greg will have some updates on the mobility plan as well. This chart shows all the different project categories that will be included in the LRTP. They do not need to go through in detail, but just a little bit of an orientation to let everyone know a few things. The categories are listed by NDOT, live district housing projects, Lincoln projects, Lancaster projects and alternative posts. We are adding some new elements to the public libraries on the LRTP this time. They are shown in pink on the chart on the bottom. There has been zero action plans and progress. Lancaster county will be initiating the safety action plan also. We are incorporating recommendations that are coming out of the mobility plan under alternative nodes for the mobility nodes and connecting quarters and bicycle pedestrian projects. Right now the focus will be the green projects and at the top are project categories that are prioritized with the Long Range Transportation Plan. We have thought about how to develop a fiscally constrained plan where there are 3 major elements that are a project prioritization. Which projects would have the greatest impact on achieving transportation goals and this is where we are going to focus today.

We are also working on judgement forecast and understanding how much transportation funding brings them back over the next 24 years between now and 2050. There is also the resource allocation component to looking at how we should put some workers are restricted and can only use versus requirements or fixer projects, but there is also some revenue that is flexible.

We want to look at how we should use our flexible funding for different projects categories to optimize the benefits that are being brought into the community. The next slide shows how we are going a layer deeper into the project prioritization. Step one is the technical analysis of the projects. Railway projects in the City of Lincoln road work projects is unincorporated by mister county outside of the City of Lincoln. The final projects are going to be the 3 project categories that are focused on. From all the projects that have been worked on, the technical committee would feel on developing a evaluation process where we'll score the projects based on how well they achieve the transportation goals and also the component for public support. The second step is how each goal area will be rated based on the relative importance across the 8 goals. The activity for today is to be thinking about how we should rate these different evaluation criteria as we go about scoring the projects. It will be about allocating 100% to different areas. We will take the score for each goal and take different coverage and multiply the score for each goal by the weight for the associated goal. These will show up, as the total score for each progressing range from 0 to 100.

There can be different rates for Lancaster County versus City of Lincoln versus the trail projects. To recognize some goal areas are more important in the urban versus rural context. Some are more important when thinking about the code project versus a roadway. This is going to be what we are going to be thinking for today. Before we start, we just want to refresh on the goals. This is the basis of the criteria and how they are rated. There are 8 goals and the first one that is trying to be achieved is transportation system. Next is mobility and system reliability and efficient reliable resilience. Then it is well connected transportation system that leverages innovation and technology for moving people in place. Liability and travel choice of multimodal system that provides convenient and affordable travel options. This supports a more compact healthy livable urban environment. This one is really about providing choice

safety and security in a safe and secure transportation system. Frontality of the transportation system that promotes economic vitality and sustainable growth for residents and businesses. Environmental sustainability transportation system that minimizes negative impacts and strives to enhance the natural cultural and built environment funding and cost effectiveness of collaboration and funding transportation projects that maximize reviews user benefits. Global funding and reversus innovative funding approaches and last but not least is access and opportunity along with our transportation system that expands access to opportunities and enhances connections for communities.

These are the eight goals, we are going to be using. It could be helpful to share what has been heard from the community in the first phase of engagement. We asked which transportation goals are important and this chart shows the results from the public input. Take this into consideration as you are rating the goals. Access and opportunity, travel liability and travel choice is the top goals of the community. It is notable that there is not a relatively even distribution you know. These are all important goals, some may be more important than others but overall the community resonated with these schools and software level of importance. We just to provide the mindset of how the information that you will be providing will be used. An example was displayed on the screen. Both the technical score in each area will range from 0 to 100, based on how well it achieves the evaluation for technical evaluation associated with each of those goals. Then there will be a weight associated with each of those 8 goals. So the goal is to multiply by the weight to get the project score and then those scores across the 8 goal areas plus public support for a total score. Are there any questions about the logistics of how the rating is used?

Young asked Greg to go to the next slide and now to open it up for discussion, because they are going to rate 3 different times for the Lincoln Projects, Lancaster County roadway and the Trail Project. The roads are important but the results can differ among the 3 prospect capillaries. There is going to be a public meeting scheduled for April 1 and also online throughout the month. We will be asking about specific projects and which projects are particularly interesting. That is where we get the information for public support and will be asking them directly about which projects they think are important and should be a priority. Young mentioned she would like to open it up for

discussion on how the global might be forgotten and might be more relative more important or relevant to the urban context versus the rural context. The trail projects evaluate certain goals more than other goals. Young responded that she would love to hear some thoughts from the group.

Ryman Yost commented that looking at the 3, she thought it would be clear to see how they are different. But only by small percentages. Everything should be safe and everything should be reliable. Environmental sustainability is also important. It is not like we don't care about safety as much in Lancaster County as we do in the city. It is the same with trails, they also need to be cost effective and safe and provide choice. There probably are differences or things that would be factors but just in a small percent.

Cruz stated, coming off of that weighted importance is going to be really helpful, because all of these factors are obviously important and things that we need to be looking at. Someone who lives in Lancaster County as opposed to the city, it can be how some of those things would be weighted differently by my neighbors. People knowing that roads are used on a regular basis and then thinking about the trail projects and the big disconnect. How great it would be to be able to connect those 2 things. This would have a different viewpoint in another part of Lancaster County where there is not a disconnect of some of the trails. What is interesting is going to be public support as more conversation is generated in terms of pushing those allocations 5% one way or 5 % another way, but again remembering that 5% of a jillion is still a lot funding wise.

Eddins responded that she agreed with Cindy that it was definitely different from county to city. Then when looking at the goals, why wouldn't a person want livability in choice for everybody, whether they're in the country or the city and why isn't safety. We have got to have everything and even getting the trail in Hickman. The trails in those crossings should be safe all the way to Hickman.

Cruz replied that if you had a trail that was connected then we are making it safer and giving people access like the cyclists and all that. Either way city or county they are safer.

Eddins commented that other than a small percentage and really talking to someone from Hickman their goals are going to be different than somebody from in the city. When we break it down into these large goals, are they really any different?

Cruz agreed yes, it might be 5% here and 5% there, but you know it's one of those yes a small number, but as it's statistically significant because there is a lot of data. A huge swing like this isn't expected. 30% city and then it is only 10%. What county would expect a variance of 5% here or there.

Stated that when we did the public outreach last fall. It was thought there would be a big difference between doing a festival at antelope park versus out at Hickman. There are different parts of the area or maybe cyclists and people at the park versus other areas. The results were pretty consistent regardless.

Grege- engagement thought would see results but pretty much same between boundaries.

Dick- county more aggressive in decisions.

Heavier contribution to mobility, security, for county. But not much different. message to county of more anticipation

Jenny – shortcoming on the menti polling will not be able to refer back to what you marked.

Think about discussion how you might divide your 100 points.

Cindy- when dividing can we see points in that category

Jenny wont be able to go back once move on.

Consider public input on goals
Consider conversation on differences
Will be combined – with bicycle advisory committee

Weighting of evaluation criteria

9 categories for 100 points 8 plus public input.
Lancaster county, city of Lincoln, trail projects

Entered points into Menti activity.

How the areas were weighted were similar
Access highest for Lincoln
Trails livability and travel choice

Combine feedback with other groups,

Mobility plan – update bike plan and nodes
Define mobility node locations, types and prototypes
Different nodes come together. Different things in different locations,

Node components
Bus stop signage
Comments
Next bus sign
ADA compliant pad
Bus and shelter
Crosswalks
Bike share station

Nodes infrastructure
Full enhanced- bus sign stoppage
Bus stop- but can always get there
Draft node concept

Connecting routes – exiting trails on street

System map

Are we on board with mobility nodes ?

The intent behind it is to bring people together

Maribel- will there be safety built into the nodes?

Phone to call police etc

People could feel unsafe

Greg- safety comes up as a theme.

Dick- more connectivity north and south than east and west

Greg- showed existing network and look at nodes and corridors and could be transit priorities. Certain areas are cross town routes,

Trail network paved trails, sidepaths

Bike lanes or bikeways

Combining terminology is one change

Emphasis – bikeways

Cant do bikeway in every neighborhood

Branding to let everyone know it is bike route

Pinchpoint – road marked that is slower speed street.

Questions or comments

April 1- kindler hotel

Follow up with focus groups

List of miles of trails that get build every year

185 miles of trails system in lincoln

Want to continue and make better for the future.

There being no further questions, the briefing was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

<https://linclanc.sharepoint.com/sites/PlanningDept-Boards/Shared Documents/Boards/PC/Minutes/2025/pcb121725.docx>