



Lincoln MPO 2050 LRTP Update & Lincoln Mobility Plan Project Oversight & Planning Committee (POP-C) Meeting #4

January 22, 2026 at 10:00

Lincoln-Lancaster Co. Building (555 S. 10th St.)
Bill Luxford Studio - Room 113

Attendees:

Rachel Christopher, Paul Barnes, Andrew Thierolf, Mia Haschenburger (Lincoln-Lancaster Planning); Danae Garfield, Robert Partida (Lincoln Transportation & Utilities); Stephanie Rouse (Lincoln Urban Development); Alex Duryea (Lincoln Parks & Recreation); Kim Morrow (Lincoln Sustainability); Larry Legg, John Linbo (Lancaster County Engineering); Kaine McClelland (Nebraska DOT); Carla Cosier (StarTran)

Consultant Team: Greg Youell, Jenny Young

Agenda:

1. Transportation & Mobility Needs

Jenny reviewed the proposed Transportation & Mobility Needs infographic. Kim said it would be helpful to have something that speaks to the sustainability goals. Climate Action Plan commits city to GHG reductions and Transportation is the #2 source of emissions. She would like to see something added in about reducing emissions.

Alex said that #6 not sure that the wording in bold reads right. It sounds backwards, but might be seen as an oddly worded goal

2. LRTP Project Categories

Jenny reviewed the project categories and how they reflect funding sources. Green shading represents categories that will be prioritized through the LRTP, others may be prioritized separately. She reviewed NDOT and Lancaster County project categories.

Larry said that the key is the funding forecast, last time it was off. Also how we prioritize the projects will be important. There is a need to use different factors for the County vs. the City of Lincoln; they have a different context. Another key point is how to forecast the grants, but overall this approach looks good.

Jenny reviewed Lincoln Roadway project categorie. The Safety Projects is a new

category to relate to the Vision Zero effort. Two Plus Center Turn Lane can be removed as per Roadway Subcommittee.

Alternative Modes – The trail projects will be prioritized through the LRTP. New categories to reflect Mobility Nodes & Bike-Ped projects that will come through the Mobility Plan.

Jenny clarified that project included in the Bike-Ped plan will still be referenced and potentially eligible for federal funding

Paul said that the framework makes sense and he likes the changes.

We will end up with a list of Roadway & Trail projects that are included in fiscally-constrained plan and will update the Travel Demand Model to run the model

3. Project Prioritization Methodology

Using 8 goals + public support as a 9th element. each project will receive a 0 to 1 score, with 1 meaning the most “ripe for investment.” Then we weight each goal area as some are more important than others (percentage to 100), which we will do at the next POPC meeting. Different weights can be used for urban and rural context. Then a project will have a 0 to 100 project score

Larry said that the weighting will be important and how you actually score the project and what data you’re using

We could look at whether we want to group the projects by tiers vs. doing a rank-order of every single project. This would help reduce the number of amendments; also help with public perception where the projects might not be developed and constructed in the exact sequence of the rank-order.

1. Maintenance

Jenny explained the proposed metric.

Larry asked how we rate gravel road conditions? Jenny was not sure how we did this last time, need to review.

Danae – Could you do a project that is not in bad pavement condition, but might be driven by capacity or other factors (safety)

Larry asked if Federal funds are being used for Rehab projects. Do we need to show that as a strategy? He would like to have maximum flexibility to utilize the federal funding. This is something that should be looked into. Greg noted that MAPA just forecasts bundled amounts of preservation costs, does not list individual projects in the LRTP, and that this is fine for programming federal funds for resurfacing packages. Rachel said that LTU’s balance is back up to \$20 million or so they will be looking at the best way to utilize it.

2. Mobility & System Reliability

Jenny explained the proposed metric.

Roberto – NW 48th Street is over built because we projected for future congestion Does the model account for bike-ped trips, or is it assuming vehicular traffic?

Rachel – could we add a second metric here to reflect are the bike projects

attached to the roadway project?

Paul – could we look at other options to capacity improvements for enhancing mobility

Roberto- congestion does tie back to carbon emissions, but if there is a way to correlation to congestion; Kim agreed that there are problems there.

Larry said that County needs will conflict with City; congestion will not occur in the County areas, but the difference between gravel / paved roadway; Model will not show congestion

Jenny noted that there is a reduced capacity for gravel roads that will show this.

Paul asked how we treat roads that will be transitioning into Lincoln, are they treated as rural/urban for scoring? Jenny says that the questions can be different; Weighting can be different.

3. Livability & Travel Choice

Jenny explained the proposed metric.

Project bundling will overlay with Vision Zero plan and Mobility Plan projects and look for opportunities to bundle roadway projects.

Roberto said that this makes sense from the VZAP perspective, which is taking corridors and identifying improvements within the corridors; Concern is with safe routes to school program where you don't know the needs until a project has started. He suggested maybe adding a land use component – is it near school or park, etc? Danae agreed that it would be good to prioritize projects by schools. SRTS components are getting included in the projects during the design process. Jenny said the focus on schools is a clear metric that can be applied consistently Kim also said this is good from sustainability because school traffic is key source of congestion / emissions.

4. Safety & Security

Jenny explained the proposed metric.

Roberto noted that the proposed criteria is consistent with the High Injury Network (HIN) from the Vision Zero Action Plan. Jenny asked if we simplify & use the HIN?

Larry said that the County will need to be different – their Safety Action Plan has not started. The Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) is dated, but could use crash data. This may need additional conversation.

5. Economic Vitality

Jenny explained the proposed metric. “Sustainable growth” is new wording in the goal here

Jenny proposed adding a metric for infill development. Andrew said that any commercial area in the city is appropriate for mixed use redevelopment. The committee discussed this proposal and some of the challenges associated with it. Larry said that the only rural areas under this are likely to be 148th or Waverly and Hickman to Lincoln.

6. Environmental Sustainability

Jenny explained the proposed metric. She said this is an area where it would be appropriate to add something to reflect emission reductions

They discussed various emissions inventory data to track, how is this done at a project level, not systemic?

Kim suggested rewording, transportation system doesn't really "enhance" environment. Alternative would be that it provides options, promotes complete streets / compact development.

Stephanie asked about "cultural" environment.

Jenny said that if it is in historic district it would rank lower because it is presumed to be a negative impact.

Roberto brought up an example of urban tree canopy removal that would be required by a bike-ped project (Leighton Ave)

Stephanie said that very specific issues should be dealt with in the Mobility Plan Pavement width – could indicate negative impacts to the environment.

Larry said this could also be a positive, such as reducing delay and congestion. He noted that this category is not as relevant to County project scoring.

7. Funding & Cost Effectiveness

Jenny explained the proposed metric. B/C Ratio in the past was simple way to do it. Jenny asked is there a way to target innovative funding, such as partnerships, public/private, any way to leverage dollars to go further.

The committee noted that it is difficult to know what future funding will be, such as the next transportation bill.

Perhaps this is more of a strategy than a metric.

Challenge is to forecast what the next highway bill will contain

Jenny said that perhaps we could have a wider spread in the points weights than we've had in the past.

8. Access & Opportunity

Jenny explained the proposed metric. Proposing a similar process with metrics This one isn't as relevant with County – would need to be something like a rural transit system

9. Public Support

Jenny explained that the public comments during public engagement would also be considered in the scoring system.

The project team will begin working on these metrics and prioritizations. Larry noted that he looks forward to seeing how this works for the rural area

Jenny showed a scoring example.

Next steps for prioritization process were highlighted.

4. Subcommittee Updates

- a. Roadway Subcommittee**
- b. Mobility Plan Advisory Subcommittee**
- c. Funding Subcommittee**

Jenny and Greg reported out on the updates from each of the subcommittees. Projects are being gathered, nodes and corridor planning is underway, and the funding sources and forecasts are under development.

5. Phase 2 Public Involvement

Greg reviewed the plans for Public Involvement, April will be the public outreach period for Phase 2, with April 1 Public Meeting. Communities and organizations will be asked to assist with marketing and dissemination prior to and during the public engagement period.

6. Next Steps

Next POP-C meeting will be held on March 26.