

MEETING RECORD

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

NAME OF GROUP:	MPO OFFICIALS COMMITTEE MEETING
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	May 19, 2026, 12:30 p.m., City Council Chambers, County-City Building, 555 S. 10 th Street, Lincoln, NE
MEMBERS AND OTHERS	Tom Beckius, Jon Carlson representing Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird, Ryan Huff, Chelsea Johnson, Matt Schulte and Sändra Washington. Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent
IN ATTENDANCE	Paul Barnes, Rachel Christopher, Mia Haschenburger, David Cary and Kristi Merfeld of the Planning and Development Services Department; Alex Duryea, Parks and Recreation; Danae Garfield and Carla Cosier, Lincoln Transportation and Utilities; Larry Legg, County Engineering; Chris Connolly, City Attorney and other interested parties were present.

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 February 10, 2026. Washington asked if there were any comments or changes to them and there were none.

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

Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

Rachel Christopher with the Lincoln MPO and Lincoln/Lancaster Planning and Development Services Department, 555 S. 10th 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 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program \(TIP\)](#)
 - i. Lincoln Transportation and Utilities – Star Tran program: funding adjustments to Historical years, FY 2026 and/or FY 2027 to reprogram historical unused appropriations for the following projects:
 - 1. Bus Stop Amenities (Required by FTA)
 - 2. Computer Hardware and Software
 - 3. Security & Enhancements (Required by FTA)
 - 4. Shop Tools/Equipment
 - 5. Improvements: Buildings/ Ground/Land
 - 6. Multimodal Transportation Center
 - 7. Maintenance Facility Construction/Relocation
 - 8. Service Vehicles
 - 9. Revenue Vehicles

Washington asked if there were any questions or comments about the agenda items or any items anyone would like removed from the Consent Agenda. There were none.

ACTION:

Washington called for a motion to approve and the motion was made by Schulte, seconded by Beckius, and the motion carried 6-0. Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington, Johnson and Carlson voting “yes”.

Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON THE FY 2026-2029 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)**May 19, 2026**

- a. Lancaster County Engineering program:
 - ii. East Beltway – add project and program funds
- b. Transportation Planning program:
 - iii. Local Road Safety Plan Update & Safe Mobility Supplemental Action Plan – add project and program federal funds

Christopher stated that there are a couple of proposed revisions to the current adopted Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This is the four-year program of transportation projects. Both of the revisions pertain to Lancaster County. The first one proposes that the East Beltway be added to the Lancaster County program for preliminary engineering and design. This would be a new listing in their program, but it is important to note that the East Beltway is already in the Lincoln Transportation and Utilities program for right-of-way acquisition. Lancaster County funds in the amount of 5 million dollars would be programmed in Fiscal Year 2028. The reason for adding the project is to have it in place in the County program associated with an application for Congressional Directed Spending through Congressman Flood. For the application, we are encouraged to have the project shown in an approved plan to lay the foundation for the application. The desire is to ultimately fund this project with significant federal funds and not just County funds.

The second proposed amendment is also for Lancaster County. A Vision Zero grant award for planning through the Federal Safe Streets and Roads For All program would be put into the TIP for updating the County's existing local road safety plan to make it a qualifying Vision Zero Action Plan under SS4A. A Supplemental action plan and demonstration funds are also part of the award. We would be showing the grant funds in FY 2026 since that is where the funds would be obligated. Both of these TIP proposed amendments were recommended for approval by the MPO Technical Committee at their meeting on April 8.

Christopher asked if there were any questions? There were none

ACTION:

Washington called for a motion to approve, and the motion was made by Beckius, seconded by Johnson, and the motion carried 6-0. Beckius, Huff, Schulte, Washington, Johnson and Carlson voting "yes".

Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON MPO FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES TARGETS**May 19, 2026****a. FTA Safety and Transit Asset Management Performance Measures Targets**

Christopher stated that the next item is a proposed action to support Federal Transit Administration (FTA) targets that were recently adopted by Star Tran. These are federal performance measures required by the FTA that must be periodically adopted, and we have to strive to meet them. The MPO has the option to adopt those of Star Tran or set our own. We choose to support StarTran's targets since they are our transit agency. These targets are in the categories of Transit Asset Management and Safety. Christopher stated that Carla Cosier with Star Tran would speak on this topic.

Carla Cosier, Assistant Director with Transit for Lincoln Transportation and Utilities came forward and stated that a brief overview of performance targets would be discussed today. The first one is the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan. This is a federally required safety plan that we must have in order to continue to spend the federal funds. It looks at who is designated as a chief safety officer and who within Star Tran is a member of a safety committee. It establishes the performance targets we have and documents our safety management system to explain how all of this will be tracked and how often. It outlines the process for annual reviews and how to go about approving them.

For a quick recap, the transit agency is the organization that sets the safety targets based on targets and measures at the FTA. They tell us what we have to do and that is based on a rolling 3 years of where we have been with these targets. Each agency is different depending on where the targets have been. We approve it annually, and it is adopted by the Star Tran Advisory Board. Then our safety subcommittee executive officers also review and approve this. As Rachel has mentioned, we bring it to the MPO, and they can review it and adopt it as well. Cosier displayed the safety targets on the screen and pointed out that it was for last year 2024-2025. She noted that several of the new federal targets have already been tracked when they were not yet federal performance targets, especially assault on transit work and the collision rates we have. The fiscal year 2024-2025 had very low targets, but included a few that have not been met. A few of these are a major event when multiple things that happened, such as a collision with an injury or assault with an injury. We did have two major events last year that were the result of a collision with an injury. The target was only 0.67 and so hard to meet, but it is based on a rolling 3 year average. The major event rate is based on our vehicle revenue miles and how many events we have per vehicle revenue mile. A collision is an accident that caused more than \$25,000 worth of damage. We have had more than two accidents in the last year

and that describes a collision rate. There have not been any pedestrian collisions. The collisions that have happened with other vehicles. We also experienced zero fatalities. Injury is anytime somebody seeks medical attention for whatever reason whether a transit worker or a passenger.

The definition of injury did change in the last two years to include both physical and non-physical assault. There has been an increase in that target because of the change in definition, and another big part is the culture. A report has to be created even if someone feels like there has been a verbal attack on someone. We did submit to the FTA a monthly report for this and these are the annual numbers. The report talks about how we are going to meet our targets, so things that are being worked on include increasing the safety meetings to happen every other month. De-escalation is especially big to bring down the transit work assaults. Additional training requirements have been put in place when a certain accident level has been reached. Regardless of the dollar amount, if there are minor accidents and there have been a few, additional training will be received. It is not just based on the dollar amount. This allows them to be brought down before hitting those large dollar amounts. This is for our fixed route system. We also do safety performance targets for the paratransit vans and shown here, a lot more of the targets have been met. The same training tools are being used for the fixed route. One additional target for the demand response is system reliability. This includes the number of miles that we can go in between major mechanical breakdowns before the vehicle has to be pulled. We are well above meeting that.

Next is the Transit Asset Management Plan, which is a federally required plan that we have to put together and recap annually. We also update it every 4 years and it is due this year in October. We have also been preparing for the federal audit that is coming up this summer. Every 4 years there is a comprehensive plan that looks at revenue vehicles, non-revenue vehicles and our facilities to make sure what we are providing to the public is within its useful life and is good equipment for everyone's safety. The factors that are looked at are the current number of vehicles in the fleet, and the number of vehicles that we expect to meet the ULB, or the useful life of the vehicle. It also looks at the number of new vehicles that are expected and those that will be taken out of service for the current fiscal year of 2025-2026. The factors considered when calculating vehicles is pretty easy, but facilities can be more challenging. Each facility has a useful life given by the FTA, so they will rate those from 1-5 depending on where they are at within their useful life. Everything is looked at from fire suppression systems to elevators and heating and air. They are all given a rating that is averaged out based on how much it would cost to replace that item. The overall building is sitting at a 3 or adequate. The useful life for the buses are 15 years. Our vans and paratransit vehicles have a useful life of 6 years. There are 6 vans that will exceed that mark this year and will get replaced next year hopefully. We have 16 buses coming in to replace those that have exceeded their time. The

vehicles are within their range and two large trucks for snow removal are on order and will not arrive until next fiscal year. Cosier asked if there were any questions?

Washington asked how injuries are defined.

Cosier responded that if somebody seeks medical attention for any reason, injury or not, it is counted as an injury because medical care was sought.

ACTION:

Washington called for a motion to approve and the motion was made by Beckius, seconded by Johnson; motion carried 6-0. Beckius, Huff, Johnson, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting “yes”.

Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON THE PROPOSED FY 2027 UNIFIED PLANNING

WORK PROGRAM(UPWP)

May 19, 2026

Christopher stated that this item is for adoption of our proposed Fiscal Year 2027 Unified Planning Work Program or UPWP. This is a federally required document for the MPO that is adopted annually. It outlines all of the metropolitan transportation planning activities. That is both for the MPO and Star Tran, who is our federally designated transit agency. It includes the activities we anticipate working on in the next year and the budget. The fiscal year is based on the state fiscal year from July to June, so this UPWP is for July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027. The MPO receives federal funds from the Federal Highway Administration. Any that are received as an annual allocation can be carried forward as unused funds from a prior year into the new budget. Federal funds reimburse 80% of the cost, the 20% local match is funded by the City of Lincoln. Star Tran also receives federal planning funds that are included in this document with annual allocations, through the Federal Transit Administration. Many know this already but, several of our activities carry forward from year to year. A few of the big activities that are planned for the upcoming year are shown on the screen. One of the main activities will be an update to the Public Participation Plan for the MPO. This will probably be done in the first part of 2027 to revisit this plan, following all of the engagement that has been done on the Long Range Transportation Plan. We will confirm what worked and what did not work. There have also been some federal policy changes that will need to be reflected in this document. The funding for the ClearGov software program will continue to be used to prepare the TIP. We will also be working with Lincoln Transportation and

Utilities to help them implement their Vision Zero Action Plan that was adopted by City Council.

Another activity is supporting the Lancaster County Engineering Department in their safety planning. Also, there will be some initial preparation work towards the ATIP grant the City of Lincoln was awarded. The federal ATIP grant stands for Active Transportation Infrastructure and Investment Eventually, that award will be under contract and we will be able to select a consultant. For now, the preliminary work is being done and it is going to be for pedestrian and bicycle planning and design in Downtown Lincoln. This item was also recommended for approval by our MPO Technical Committee on April 8, 2026.

Washington asked if there were any questions for Rachel? There were none

ACTION:

Washington called for a motion to approve and the motion was made by Beckius, seconded by Johnson, motion carried 6-0. Beckius, Huff, Johnson, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting "yes".

Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON THE 2026 SELF-CERTIFICATION REVIEW

May 19, 2026

Christopher stated that the self-certification for the MPO is something that is done on an annual basis. The MPO certifies to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration that we continue to meet all of the federal requirements that apply. This is something that gets signed by the Nebraska Department of Transportation as well as the Mayor, who is the executive officer of the MPO. It ends up being included in the TIP when submitted for federal approval. This is done each year and is different from certification reviews every 4 years by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. A few of the federal laws are listed and there is quite a large number of different federal laws and codes that apply to us. These talk about how MPO's need to run and operate under the Civil Rights Act. We are requesting that the Mayor be authorized by this group to sign it.

ACTION:

Washington called for a motion to approve and the motion was made by Beckius, seconded by Huff, motion carried 6-0. Beckius, Huff, Johnson, Schulte, Washington, and Carlson voting "yes".

Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON THE PROPOSED FY 2027-2030 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
May 19, 2026

Christopher stated that this item is for adoption of the fiscal year 2027 -2030 Transportation Improvement Program or TIP. Every year we adopt a new document. This is a federally required document and a program of transportation projects for all the transportation modes in the region for the upcoming 4 years. It is a large effort starting in January, and we work closely with all the different departments and agencies in our area who operate transportation facilities.

Christopher stated that the MPO is a federally required organization that conducts transportation planning and decision making for the Lincoln metropolitan area and receives federal funds for transportation and administers those funds. The planning area is all of Lancaster County, so the area within the MPO is Lancaster County. The TIP is the MPO's transportation programming document. It looks at the upcoming 4 years and follows the federal fiscal year, unlike the work program, and has a fiscal year of October 1-September 30. The projects that come into the TIP need to be found consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, which is our guiding document. So, any projects have to be found in conformance with the goals of the plan and in many cases, identified in the project lists. Those in the TIP include items that will use federal funds or state funds or are regionally sufficient. The projects are mostly organized by the department responsible for them.

So again, in January we created draft programs with funds rolled forward a year and sent them to the agencies for review. At this point they can remove projects, add projects or change around any funding or amounts. The projects have to be found consistent with the LRTP and have funds available before we can program those funds. Transportation projects tend to take multiple years to execute and are carried forward year to year on any given TIP. We went to the MPO Programming and Funding Committee back in March, which is a subcommittee of our staff committee called the MPO Technical Committee. They recommended approval on April 8, and the annual TIP the went to the Planning Commission on April 15, with a briefing two weeks prior. Now, it is before you today at the Officials Committee. If this is approved today locally we would then submit it to the State DOT so they can include it in their proposed statewide program which gets advertised. Then it will move on to the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration who must approve it prior to the new fiscal year starting October 1st. We are again using ClearGov software to prepare the TIP and this is a platform that is also used by the City Finance Department for the CIP. ClearGov has an interactive online version. We also have a traditional PDF that we generate and send on to the state and the Feds.

Christopher noted that ongoing projects in the TIP are shown on the slide. For Lancaster County, we have the 98th Street Project and the local road safety plan and Vision Zero Grant. Star Tran has the Multimodal Transportation Center in the works. They also have a future maintenance center that would like to find a spot. LTU has

several big projects ongoing as listed. Parks and Recreation has a couple of major trails including Beal Slough and Waterford. For Urban Development, there is the Downtown Corridors project, which is basically west of Project O Street and focused on 9th and 10th Streets. The Railroad Transportation Safety District has the 33rd and Cornhusker rail project underway now. Then, there are a couple of projects highlighted on the state side which are the interchanges on the West Beltway at Pioneers and Warlick. Also, there is the Adams Street bridge that goes over I-80 located west of the Belmont Neighborhood. This year's TIP includes some new projects. Several projects came from the Nebraska DOT and a couple of projects have been split. The 33rd and Cornhusker project is one of them. It has been split into 4 or 5 phases, because it is so large. Splitting Project O Street and Music District from the Downtown Corridors project was also done because Downtown Corridors is the recipient of some federal funds. Parks and Recreation did have one project removed, but just temporarily which was the Wilderness Hills Trail. It has been delayed far enough out, that the schedule was outside the scope of the proposed TIP. . It will be coming back in the future. The Airport Authority had one project removed that was completed. Christopher asked if there were any questions?

Washington asked how long they are being delayed on the Wilderness trails?

Christopher referred the question to Parks and Recreation for comment and an updated schedule.

Alex Duryea, Trail Manager, Lincoln Parks and Recreation Department; came forward and stated that this TIP runs until 2030, so based on the obligation of funding for the project, it would fall outside of this TIP. It will probably come in the 2032 timeline range.

Christopher continued by explaining that other changes to this year's TIP include a new section for revenue estimates. This came up during our federal review, that we needed to not only look at all of the expenditures for projects but the anticipated revenue and try to reconcile them. So, there is a new section that breaks down a number of different funding sources and how much we anticipate to receive through the four years of TIP. There is also a new project identifier called federal performance measures and this helps pull together the TIP with the Long Range Transportation Plan that includes performance measures. The LRTP and TIP are two documents that talk to each other so we are getting better at tying in our actual projects that come online with the goals we adopt through the Long Range Transportation Plan. This is one way we are connecting the two. One or more measures might apply to any given project. Christopher showed the list of the new NDOT projects that would be within Lancaster County.

There have also been some revisions to the TIP since going through the Technical Committee and after publishing this agenda. We have worked with Star Tran and decided to remove the Transit Development Plan which is the major plan that guides Star Tran capital improvements. This project will still be happening, but FTA did not want to show it in the TIP this time. It is only shown in the Work Program. In addition, the 70th and Nebraska Parkway project had some bids come in recently that were higher than anticipated, so the construction cost estimates were increased in the TIP. Christopher asked if there were any questions?

Beckius asked to see the NDOT project list again.

ACTION:

Washington called for a motion to approve and the motion was made by Beckius, seconded by Schulte, motion carried 6-0. Beckius, Huff, Johnson, Schulte, Washington, and Carlson voting "yes".

Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird absent.

OTHER TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

Christopher said the next topic was to discuss substitute representatives for absent MPO officials at meetings. There have been questions about who could stand in for an elected official. Chris Connolly from the Law Department will discuss his analysis of the bylaws and give a legal opinion.

Chris Connolly, Attorney, City Law Department came forward and stated that he was asked to research and provide an opinion on substitutes when someone on the committee who is an elected official is absent from the meetings. First he looked at federal statutes. There are references that there should be elected officials on the MPO committees. Federal statutes don't drill down into it and it would not be expected for the federal government to look at the detail of how meetings are run. Then this was researched down to the next level which is the state level and the Nebraska Administrative Code. There was nothing found that mentions how the meetings themselves are to be conducted. So, what we are looking at is the bylaws generated by this committee. It states that there can be a substitute by someone of the same affiliation. That leads to a bit of an interpretation. My research and opinion really means that an elected official can find someone else on their board or council to substitute and that would be the affiliation. This would not be a permanent replacement as the bylaws indicate that sending a substitute should not be a regular occurrence.

The members of the committee are not elected to the committee and is not a governing body, but a policy making committee. It seems easier for non-elected officials who serve on the committee as they can use their own rules. For council members and county board members, there is a source of substitution available. Unlike the Mayor, there is only one and there is not a Vice-Mayor. Based on the circumstances there can be times when the Mayor can have a substitute sit in for them. This substitution allowance should be used sparingly and that applies to all the elected officials. Sending a substitute should be looked at in terms of what impact there will be if a committee member is absent. If they are needed for a quorum and do not feel strongly about something on the agenda then go ahead and have a substitute. If there is already a quorum and not something of significant interest, to be voted on, then it could be acceptable to be absent or not find a substitute. This is still respecting what the federal law is stating, which intends to have the elected official in attendance regularly.

Schulte asked if that doesn't require it.

Connolly replied that the federal rules don't say that you can substitute with anyone so that is the reason. It won't be said that there can't be another substitute, and this committee can change the rules and bylaws. Connolly stated that he interpreted the bylaw as it sits right now. The committee can look to make changes that can allow substitutes for other circumstances. But if changes are considered, it needs to be looked at the fact that the federal law still anticipates that the elected official would be there.

Schulte stated that Mr. Connolly is choosing to interpret the word "affiliated" in a very different way than the County is choosing to interpret it.

Connolly responded that he was unsure how the County is choosing to interpret.

Schulte mentioned that it has been asked why this is happening? We believe affiliation is more by the entity so the State can send whoever they would like, and they have a history of doing that.

Connolly replied that it might be different.

Schulte said the Mayor can send somebody else in their place, and there is another executive branch, so the County should be able to send a different affiliate as well.

Connolly questioned when you say different affiliate, what did you have in mind?

Schulte stated that it is clear that there are a number of people who are logical and knowledgeable that could step in if needed. We have a director and a deputy director or someone from the County Engineer's office.

Connolly responded that his first thought for an elected official is other County Board members, but it could be that other elected officials within the County could qualify also?

Schulte replied that it is being said that an elected official could step in for us?

Connolly stated another elected official is correct.

Schulte responded that he wasn't sure why Mr. Connolly was choosing to interpret this differently from what the County Attorney's office has understood this to be.

Connolly mentioned that he has not talked with the County Attorney's office on this subject and has not seen any opinions from them. He is not sure of what they have said and is not in the position to reconcile with what they have said. Connolly added that he chose to take a position and stay as close to the federal law as possible.

Schulte stated that the interpretation of affiliation seems incredibly restrictive in the way it is being applied here. The term affiliation is a very broad one. With the information that is being provided, it would be reasonable to ask why we couldn't send somebody else who is affiliated with the County. They are knowledgeable and can act on our behalf. We have a history of doing this at the County, and it seems incredibly reasonable to me.

Washington commented that she appreciates this topic coming up and bringing the County Attorney's opinion in as well. She added that Councilman Beckius would like to enter the conversation.

Beckius responded that he was unsure where this line of questioning is coming from and asked the MPO Committee to bring him up to date about what is bringing this conversation forward today. Beckius stated he was unaware of this or any concerns about it.

Schulte proceeded to state that in November, he was unable to attend at the last minute and asked one of the executives from the leadership team to attend on his behalf. The Chief Administrative Officer was going to come in his place and Mr. Barnes and the City Attorney said that they did not qualify. The meeting was then cancelled and delayed. Some projects were delayed then as well. This is where the question comes from.

Connolly replied that he was not aware of that and that maybe Mr. Barnes can answer.

Paul Barnes with the Lincoln MPO and Lincoln Lancaster County Planning and Development Service Department came forward and stated that Commissioner Schulte had mentioned it was a very last minute attempt to get a quorum at a meeting last year. We were approached by Mr. Durbin, and he was recommending a staff person from their department sit in on the meeting. We did not have a lot of time for legal opinion, so it was my judgement call to say no and that is where this is coming from. This is why we are digging into this to get answers.

Schulte responded that this staff person was a Deputy Director, Kristy Bauer and she has stood in multiple times for different committees. It wasn't just a random staff member. It was someone intentional and who would have been knowledgeable about the MPO and things like that.

Beckius commented that he did not know that a resolution would happen today. He would be happy to have a conversation and look at the document as it reads today. The affiliation is concurrent with what the City Attorney's office has deemed. The document has been followed but can be changed.

Johnson replied that to be clear the recommendation is for one County Commissioner or City Council member to step in for us, in the event we are unable to attend. We could allow someone affiliated with the City to sit here, but then we would need to amend the bylaws.

Washington stated that there is also a little bit of flexibility in that if County Engineer Pam Dingman were a substitute, she is an elected official. This may fall into what Chris Connolly had just said. Washington responded that she was not an attorney and would like to have both City and County attorneys have a conversation about this. There are other elected officials that can represent.

Schulte agreed and stated that it was actually rejected at that time in November as well. We should be clear that if that is going to be permitted, then another elected official could be from the County.

Beckius stated that there could be a conflict of interest to having County Engineer Dingman approving plans that benefit her department. That is something to think about, and it doesn't seem like a solution will be reached today.

Washington agreed to that comment.

Beckius asked is this meeting time working for this committee. Is that what is bringing up this issue?

Schulte stated that Tuesday was chosen, because meeting on Friday was an issue.

Washington replied that she was going to be stepping aside from the committee because she was not given heads up to the time and it conflicts with something else that is on the calendar on the same Tuesday. There needs to be a work session to work through the bylaws and meeting times.

David Cary, Director, Lincoln Planning and Development Services Department stated that he agreed that it was good to provide some clarity on this topic and worthwhile to continue the discussion, as it won't be solved today. This was just an attempt to see how to best handle it. Having someone like County Engineer Dingman sit in place of a County Board member does bring in some conflict. The information that we work on includes her program, and she already sits on the Technical Committee. It should be discussed further, so to see how to best handle this situation.

Schulte responded that he agreed with Mr. Connolly in that we are talking about temporary representation, not about permanent. We are not trying to replace anyone permanently. There are times when a little emergency pops up and understanding these rules and keeping them as flexible as possible, will help the MPO go forward. The work is essential and having the flexibility to have a temporary replacement makes a lot of sense.

Washington responded that yes it does, and we can schedule some time as an MPO to talk a little bit more about this in detail.

Beckius suggested that perhaps the Chair and Vice Chair could put together a proposal and bring it forward. Maybe something that can be read prior to the meeting and a date to be determined.

Washington agreed with that idea. She also stated that with some of the previous concerns to have the County Attorney present as well to work with City Attorney Connolly.

Cary replied that to make it clear, the MPO uses Chris Connolly as the primary attorney. It is just set up that way and not an attempt to exclude the County. It is just who we have that is committed to getting this work done in an efficient manner.

Washington stated to have this conversation and include the County Attorney. Not to be disrespectful to Mr. Schulte but if we are going to quote the County Attorney, it would be good to have them present.

Schulte agreed we do not have a written agreement from the County Attorney.

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 Plan and Lincoln Mobility Plan and stated that they are in the thick of Phase 2 public engagement for these planning efforts. This evening there will be a second open house at 5:30 pm in the Lincoln Commercial Club. The first open house was back in October 2025. At that point we were really trying to engage with people to listen to them and hear what they had to say about transportation needs across the MPO. We have since digested that information with our consultant

team and are presenting some project listings and ideas tonight. We want people to react and give us additional input. The LRTP is planning for the road projects in Lincoln Lancaster County as well as trails. The Lincoln Mobility Plan is looking at multimodal connectivity across the City of Lincoln. Our staff is also updating the Lincoln Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan and will have some informational boards and activities. Barnes asked if anyone had any questions.

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 was made by Beckius, seconded by Johnson, motion carried 6-0. Beckius, Huff, Johnson, Schulte, Washington and Carlson voting "yes".

Mayor Leirion Gaylord Baird absent.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:32 pm.

<https://linclanc.sharepoint.com/sites/PlanningDept-MPO/Shared Documents/MPO/Officials Committee/Minutes/2025-2026/051926 minutes.docx>