

## MEETING RECORD

*Advanced public notice of the Officials Committee meeting was posted on the County-City bulletin board and the Planning Department's website.*

<b>NAME OF GROUP:</b>	MPO OFFICIALS COMMITTEE MEETING
<b>DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:</b>	February 10, 2026, 12:30 p.m., City Council Chambers, County-City Building, 555 S. 10 <sup>th</sup> Street, Lincoln, NE
<b>MEMBERS AND OTHERS</b>	Tom Beckius; Jon Carlson representing Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird; Ryan Huff, Matt Schulte and Sändra Washington  Rick Vest and Mayor Leirion Gaylord Baird absent
<b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>	Paul Barnes, Rachel Christopher, Mia Haschenburger, David Cary and Kristi Merfeld of the Planning and Development Services Department; Pam Dingman, County Engineer; Paul Tunakan, Pedestrian Bicycle Advisory Council; Alex Duryea, Parks and Recreation; and other interested parties were present.

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

Washington then called for a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held January 9, 2026. Washington asked if there had been any comments or changes to them and there were none.

Schulte made a motion for approval, which was seconded by Beckius and carried 5-0; Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting "yes."

Vest and Gaylor Baird absent.

**Election of committee officers**

Vice-Chair Washington stated they would move to the election of officers and according to the bylaws committee officers consist of a chair and a vice-chair, elected annually from the members of the committee.

Beckius said they would like to nominate Sandra Washington for chair, Schulte seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0; Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting “yes”.

Vest and Gaylor Baird absent.

Washington asked for nominations for Vice-Chair and nominated Matt Schulte. Beckius seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0; Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting “yes” .

Vest and Gaylor Baird absent.

Members Present: Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson representing Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird.

Vest and Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

**Rachel Christopher with the Lincoln MPO and Lincoln/Lancaster Planning and Development Service Department, 555 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street** came forward and asked Merfeld to read the items that were included in the Consent Agenda below.

**CONSENT AGENDA (PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION)**

- a. **Review and action on revisions to the FY 2026 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** **February 10, 2026**
  - i. Transfer funds of \$18,403 (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Planning (PL) funds -\$14,722, Local Funds- \$3,681) from Metropolitan Transportation Planning Activity 6500 to Transportation System Planning Activity 6600
  - ii. Add Section 5303 carryover funds from FY 2025 to FY 2026 in the Transit Planning Program

b. **Review and action on revisions to the FY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Federal Transit Administration Section 5310/5311 program:

1. Madonna -Lincoln-Remove project funds have been awarded
2. Section 5310 Program- FY 2023 Allocation- Remove project as funds have been awarded
3. Section 5310 Program- FY2024 Allocation- Reprogram Funds to FY 2026 and update funding amount
4. Section 5310 Program- FY 2025 Allocation – Reprogram funds To FY 2027 and update funding amount

Washington asked if there were any questions or comments about the agenda items or any items anyone would like removed from the Consent Agenda.

Washington asked the name of the 6500 program and the title of the 6600 program.

Christopher replied that 6500 is called the Metropolitan Transportation Planning. 6600 is Transportation Systems Planning.

Washington asked if the revision will move money to focus on something different.

Christopher stated yes, 6500 includes our Long Range Transportation Plan and any mobility planning, which includes our ongoing effort to update the LRTP. Our modeling activity needs to be split out from 6500 and invoiced under 6600.

**ACTION:**

Washington called for a motion to approve and the motion was made by Beckius, seconded by Schulte, and the motion carried 5-0. Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting “yes”.

Vest and Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

**REVIEW AND ACTION ON REVISIONS TO THE FY 2026-2029 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) February 10, 2026**

a. Lancaster County Engineering program:

- i. Saltillo Intersection Improvements – Add project and program federal funds

- b. Pedestrian, Bike and Trails program:
  - i. Rock Island Trail Undercrossing at Old Cheney Road – Reprogram Construction/CE costs from FY 2026 to FY 2027, increase funding amounts for the same phase, and update project description
  - ii. Rock Island Trail Widening - A Street to Boosalis Trail – Reprogram Construction/CE costs from FY 2026 to FY 2027 and reduce funding amounts for the same phase

Christopher stated that this item is for several amendments to our Transportation Improvement program that contains upcoming transportation projects. The first revision is to the Lancaster County program for Saltillo Road from 27<sup>th</sup> to 68<sup>th</sup> Streets is already in the TIP as a programmed project. This is being funded with Federal Highway Safety Improvement funds with County match. This includes roundabouts at 40<sup>th</sup>, 54<sup>th</sup> and 56<sup>th</sup> Streets. It is proposed to update the design of the project to include additional roundabouts at 38<sup>th</sup>, 47<sup>th</sup> and 65<sup>th</sup> Streets, and the State prefers two separate listings in the TIP. The proposed funding would ultimately be Surface Transportation Block Grant funds. Christopher added that she would turn it over to the County Engineer for additional comments.

**Pam Dingman, County Engineer, 444 Cherry Creek**, came forward and provided some history on the project. When we started to push to complete this project, the South Beltway Coalition contacted us and said they want to add three more roundabouts to this project and some intersections. This is not how we do federal projects, so it becomes more difficult conversations about how to make requests like this happen. We needed a way to improve this corridor so we can accommodate the equivalent of two projects, as it was always going to be a two-year project regardless. The road serves the residents of Lancaster County, who are also residents of the City of Lincoln. We also wanted to avoid tearing up the road twice and the associated cost. A way to catch this up would be to do a phase project with the first phase as Rachel described in this area. The second phase being to try to catch up with the design and the environmental review so it can be a two-phase project. The proposal is to use all the HSIP funds or STBG funds, whether that be funds from the City of Lincoln or Lancaster County, to get a solid project.

Washington commented that it makes sense to bring the project forward in phases and wished Dingman good luck negotiating with the Feds.

Dingman responded that they are where they need to be with NDOT and the Federal Highway Administration. The next will be going to City Council for an interlocal agreement for this project between Lancaster County and the City of Lincoln. We are hopeful that by discussing this today, the City Council will be excited and want to get on board with this project. There has been a lot of discussion on how

to get here, as well as discussions internally and with the South Beltway Coalition. This is a really awesome solution and is seen as a 50-year solution to this corridor.

Washington replied that she was thrilled about the safety improvements along Saltillo Road.

Christopher stated that the second part of the TIP amendment package is for the Rock Island Trail projects. One project is for widening the Rock Island Trail from A Street to essentially Nebraska Parkway, and the other is for the undercrossing at Old Cheney Road. This would primarily be shifting funding from the widening to the undercrossing project. The reason for this shift is the undercrossing becoming the primary project from a political perspective. Both are using Congestion Management and Air Quality funds. These are federal funds that the MPO administers but they are limited, as we only have a finite amount of funds through Fiscal Year 2026. There is not enough funding to cover it all, so this proposal with the idea of the widening project would be able to seek out additional funds in the future. The construction phase will also be moving out a year. We are updating the lead agency on the undercrossing to Lincoln Transportation and Utilities. Parks and Recreation is planning to move forward with the preliminary engineering for the widening project as a first phase. Christopher asked if Parks and Recreation would like to add anything else and noted that the Chair of the Pedestrian Bicycle Advisory Committee is here today.

**Alex Duryea, Parks and Recreation Department, 3131 O Street**, came forward and noted he had nothing to add but was available for questions.

Washington asked if the preliminary engineering for the widening was going to be taken care of in fiscal year 2026 or 2027.

Duryea responded that preliminary engineering is underway now.

Washington thanked Duryea for coming forward. She asked if there were any other questions on Rock Island. There were none.

#### **ACTION:**

Washington called for a motion to approve and the motion was made by Beckius ; seconded by Schulte; motion carried 5-0. Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting "yes".

Vest and Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

#### **REVIEW AND ACTION ON MPO FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS**

**February 10, 2026**

- a. FHWA Safety Performance Measures and Targets

Christopher stated that this item is a proposal to adopt to support the State's safety targets under the Federal Highway Administration. We go through this process every year. These are annual targets for safety for calendar year 2026 at the federal level for roads and highways. Back in August, the State of Nebraska adopted new targets for these performance measures. We are then proposing to adopt the State's targets as the MPO targets. This means we would be agreeing to support the targets by coming forward with safety projects in our area. MPOs and State DOTs must adopt targets and the MPO has the option to either adopt its own targets and then track them and try to meet them. Or, we can adopt the state targets. We always propose to adopt the State targets due to capacity issues. If they are not met, there is no implication to the MPO or its funding. That is not the case for the State. If they are not met at the State level, there can be some repercussions that follow. The targets are usually annual targets that look back 5 years based on a rolling average and then they measure performance against that. Christopher walked through the target tables. She emphasized that the numbers mentioned they are statewide numbers for all of Nebraska. The MPO does report on similar data locally in our annual report. We don't specifically track these targets because they are State targets and won't pertain directly to our city or county.

Schulte asked if these are all targets and not the actual numbers.

Christopher answered yes.

Washington asked if we are still just looking at the target for 2018 to 2022. Do we know if they were met?

Christopher replied that in the staff report, there is a memo attached that includes the actuals for which we have data, for actually all the federal performance measures. In the memo if the number is in red, the target was not met. It has been met if it is green. The State of Nebraska Department of Transportation (NDOT) shared with us how they decided upon targets. One of the things they base it on is National Highway Traffic Safety administration requirements, which say that constant or improved performance must be set. Christopher went on to describe various other inputs cited for how NDOT set the new targets.

Schulte asked if we adopt them, does that mean there is no consequence for not meeting them?

Christopher responded that the MPO is simply required to adopt performance measures either way.

Washington commented that how we perform can help the State locally.

Christopher added that all the safety work locally and in the MPO region is going to help towards meeting that goal.

Washington called for a motion to approve and was approved by Schulte; motion seconded by Beckius and carried 5-0. Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting “yes”.

Vest and Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

#### **OTHER TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:**

**Paul Barnes with the Lincoln MPO and Lincoln Lancaster County Planning and Development Service Department** came forward with updates to the 2050 Long Range Transportation and Lincoln Mobility Plan. We are in Phase 2 and it can be seen on the graphic that this time frame will carry us through most of mid year 2026 and then looking at final approval of the LRTP will be the end of 2026, which will come before this group. In our Phase 1 public engagement, which was towards the end of 2025, we completed over 2000 engagements with people. We attended many festivals and events that were happening across Lincoln and Lancaster County. So in total we had 9 community events including some trunk or treats. The Hickman event was very well attended. We really tried to get out to different things and then we also did promotional items. We did direct mailers, email blasts, social media for our city and county communications teams as well as some of the smaller cities and villages that have social media accounts. We also set up library kiosks across Lincoln that directed people to online engagement and commenting.

We also held a series of 10 focus groups that last week of October. A lot of the positive things that came out of those conversations were maintenance goals, the South beltway being completed, and the trail systems. There were some challenges to note. Some of the things are recurring like keeping pace with the growth of the community and putting in needed improvements, looking at other funding opportunities, and commute times across town. There is a lot of construction that happened in 2025 also which may have played into the commute time comments. The expanded transit was mentioned by several people and is typical when we do engagements like this. We also received comments about e-bikes, their increase in usage, and their usage on facilities where they don't belong. A good comment about e-bikes was that the rules and enforcement are not aligned. We also asked the folks in the survey to rank the transportation goals. These are 8 goals that are in the Long Range Transportation Plan that are to be used for a number of things including projects and prioritization. Our committee will be weighting these goals and then using them to develop the project score for all of our projects. At the top is access and opportunity that was formerly known as transportation equity, but it has been updated. Livability and travel choice are a close second and then on down. I think an interesting thing is safety and security was kind of down towards the bottom. Not in all the surveys but this one yes.

We also asked people to give one word of what they would like transportation to be like in 2050? The top score of responses was the word "other". Safe was a top response for this question. Also looking at the system that's connected by friendly, walkable areas and roundabouts. Roundabouts was a response that we got in terms of theme where some people like them and others do not. People want a free flowing system that is not congested. We did get quite a few comments about the use of trains between Lincoln and Omaha, just in the community, or light rail and more recreational experiences. Looking at land use theme, having places that are more walkable or dense and well planned is desired. There is just a whole group of others as you can see, that refer to the community as kind, better, and diverse. Another question that was asked is what you like best about your community? There were a lot of advocates for trails and biking as the top item. Second was safe neighborhoods, parks, green space and walkability. Then there was access and convenience, neighborhood character all the way down to our strong economy as the last response.

Looking at the mobility plan in terms of what we are doing with our goals. We asked people to select the top 3 goals out of 7 that have been developed. Safety, connected network, and access and options were at the top of the list. We have 4 additional goals that are still going to be used for developing the plan as well as selecting projects. This is similar to the LRTP but more focused on the mobility plan. In terms of the LRTP process today, we are developing our financials so we can project the revenues that will anticipate up to the year 2050. We are also creating project lists with all of our departments and agencies which we will then score. So, this is a graphic of how all that comes together. Project prioritization will be an effort that our committee undertakes. We will use those 8 goals for projects to be listed in the LRTP, and in addition we will use public input for scoring. If certain projects get a lot of input from the public we can actually bump that up with that criteria. We will also be doing our revenue forecast and then we do have some flexible funding with the MPO funds. We can play around with different scenarios to land on how we allocate the resources.

There is maybe more focus on maintenance or another category.. These are inputs to our fiscally constrained plan, so we can eventually have a list of projects we expect to construct by 2050. Barnes mentioned he would not explain all of this content but there are projects listed by agency that will be scored and prioritized in the Long Range Transportation Plan. We are looking at the state projects, county's roadway and bridge capital projects, the City of Lincoln's capital projects and trails. We also want to point out how we develop some of the performance based planning decisions. These show socioeconomic data across Lincoln and Lancaster County. We use a vulnerable populations index based on aging population, single car households and a number of other factors to come up with this map. This is used to score it as a piece of that kind of access and opportunity criteria. If projects land

within or adjacent to some of these areas that are in red or orange then they would get a higher score. This is an example of how we use data for scoring. We talk about house affordability and cost burden households. We don't want to have people spending more than 30% of their income on housing. There is also a housing plus transportation index, and if you put the 2 together, we don't want to see more than 45 % spent on housing and transportation together. In our area we are at 44%. This is not something we have really tracked before and is interesting to bring up and should probably track.

Washington asked if housing includes the utilities? Yes.

Barnes showed an example of what a scoring matrix should look like. The goals are on the left. The community input is at the bottom. We will have a score that is compiled with all these different data sets, and our consultants are working with us on that. The committee that we have with staff will be weighting all of those and then we will get a project score at the end. This will shake out the project list.

On the mobility plan, we are working on identifying what we call nodes and corridors and also identifying priority projects. This is coming from past work that has been completed with the transit development plan, the 2019 bike plan, BikeLNK, bike share facilities plan and our Comp Plan. We also had a 2013 bike and pedestrian capital plan. During this input there are different node types that have been identified that will be a part of this mobility plan. The past planning efforts have not focused much on the edge growth for some good reasons. It is not as dense and it does take time to build out. However, this plan is going to be looking at how we can incorporate facilities on the edge as the community does grow out. That is an exciting piece with this plan. Eventually this would be implemented and developed as an active transportation network by connecting the existing trails to destinations to commercial centers through these nodes and corridors. There are different ways that this can be done. There are a couple of examples over on the right that can be as simple as bike lanes, like what is on 13<sup>th</sup> Street and Q Streets or bike boulevards and bikeways. We do have a bike boulevard like 4<sup>th</sup> and F Street in that neighborhood. This is really to identify where these bicyclists are on the road and how they can traverse the city safely. Signage and wayfinding is a key piece to this type of plan. There is a map of our draft efforts, and we are starting to map out where those nodes should be located in the community.

If you don't want to take a vehicle to get somewhere then there should be an option of walking or biking. As was stated we are in phase 2 and there will be an open house on April 1 at the Lincoln Commercial Club in Kindler Hotel. Throughout the month of April, we will have a virtual open house available online. Anyone can go to that, if they don't make the public open house. Phase 3 will really be wrapping up

with drafting the rest of the plan and the comprehensive plan. The final open house will be in September at Auld Pavilion.

Washington asked do you have a date for the open house in September?

Barnes stated, there was a date but unsure what it was at the moment.

Washington replied, she wanted to get it on the calendar right now.

Barnes responded the facility has been reserved, so we can let you know at the next meeting or send out an email.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Washington asked if anyone wished to address the committee on a matter not on this agenda, and not planned to appear on a future agenda, may do so.

There was no public comment.

The motion was made to adjourn by Washington; motion for approval made by Beckius and seconded by Schulte; motion carried 5-0. Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting "yes".

Vest and Mayor Leirion Gaylord Baird absent.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:22 pm.