MINUTES
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
JANUARY 10, 2019

These minutes are prepared in compliance with NRS 241.035. Text is in summarized rather than verbatim format. For complete contents, please refer to meeting recordings on file at the Regional Transportation Commission.

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS ON JANUARY 3, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City of Henderson</th>
<th>CC Regional Justice Center</th>
<th>RTC</th>
<th>RTC Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Government Center</td>
<td>500 S. Grand Central Pkwy.</td>
<td>240 Water Street</td>
<td>200 Lewis Ave.</td>
<td>600 S. Grand Central Pkwy.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rtcsnv.com">www.rtcsnv.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89155</td>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89155</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89155</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Henderson</td>
<td>Office of the City Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Henderson</td>
<td>240 Water Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, NV 89015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Regional Justice Center</td>
<td>200 Lewis Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>600 S. Grand Central Pkwy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Public Notice</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rtcsnv.com">www.rtcsnv.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Larry Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:18 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Clark County Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Larry Brown, Chair, Clark County
Isaac Barron, City of North Las Vegas
George Gault, City of Mesquite
Jim Gibson, Clark County
Carolyn Goodman, City of Las Vegas
Rudy Malfabon, Nevada Department of Transportation (ex-officio)
Lois Tarkanian, City of Las Vegas
Rod Woodbury, City of Boulder City

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Debra March, Vice Chair, City of Henderson

RTC STAFF:
Tina Quigley, General Manager
Fred Ohene, Deputy General Manager
M.J. Maynard, Deputy General Manager
Greg Gilbert, Outside Legal Counsel
David Swallow, Senior Director of Engineering and Technology
Angela Castro, Senior Director of Government Affairs and Media Relations and Marketing
John Peñuelas, Jr., Director of Engineering Services – Streets and Highways
Aileen Magnera, Advertising and Creative Supervisor
Theresa Gaisser, Principal Project Engineer
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst

INTERESTED PARTIES:
Joe Damiani
Havander Davis
Aleta Dupree
Sergio Guerrero
Monique Hammond
Yin Nawaday
Stephanie Vrsnick

RTC Item #5
February 14, 2019
Consent
## Item: 1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

### Comments:
Chair Larry Brown opened the first comment period for citizens participation. He called on Mr. Joe Damiani, who made the following comment:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, Joe Damiani, Manager of Engineering for Streets and Highways. I am requesting Item 43 be pulled from the Consent. Basically, if I could hand these out, I have a one-page summary of the issues. I was employed with the RTC as of September 25, 2017. Prior to that, I was employed with Clark County from 2008 until my employment here. When I was hired, I was instructed that I wasn’t eligible for longevity. I wasn’t really given a reason to why, I just took it as I didn’t get longevity. So, when I finally got my management compensation plan, I reviewed it and I looked at the longevity section, and if you can see in the handout, the current language, which was in place as of September 11, 2008, basically states, the highlighted sections are credible service includes RTC and Clark County service time. And then the other highlight section, which is important, which basically says, if you are hired after June 30, 2007, you’re not eligible for longevity, which would have included me. But then there is the exception. And the exception says, for those new hires who have previously received longevity with either the RTC or Clark County. Since I was hired with Clark County in 2008, in 2016, I received my first longevity check, in 2017 I received my second longevity check, which was in September of 2017 and then I hired on here on September 25, 2017, right after. I was previously receiving longevity prior to. Now, what HR was telling me, is that they were enforcing it the way the proposed language is. Prior to October 1, 2008, Clark County service is not considered credible. All I kept asking them was that, that’s fine, but that’s not what the document says. This language was put in in September 11, 2008. And it wasn’t changed in April 2009 when it got acted on at the Board. And it wasn’t changed in September 2013 when it was acted on at the Board. So, I am just requesting that the Board authorize HR to reinstate my eligibility for longevity.

### Motion:
No motion was necessary.

### Vote/Summary:
No vote was taken.

## Item: 2. APPROVE THE AGENDA (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

### Comments:
No comments were made.

### Motion:
Mayor Pro Tem Lois Tarkanian made a motion to approve the agenda.

### Vote/Summary:
7 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.

Ayes: Larry Brown, Isaac Barron, George Gault, Jim Gibson, Carolyn Goodman, Lois Tarkanian, Rod Woodbury

Nays: None

Absent: Debra March
### Item:
3. RECEIVE THE GENERAL MANAGER’S REPORT

#### Comments:
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Ms. Tina Quigley, General Manager for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), gave the General Manager’s Report. She began by welcoming two new RTC Board of Commissioners (Board) members – Clark County Commissioner and City of Mesquite Councilman George Gault. Ms. Quigley briefly highlighted their backgrounds before welcoming them to the meeting.

Next, Ms. Quigley recognized several transit operators, starting with Ms. Monique Hammond of Transdev. Ms. Quigley shared Ms. Hammond’s operator history, noting that Ms. Hammond had received more customer compliments in 2018 than any other operator. Ms. Hammond thanked the Board for its recognition. Then, Ms. Quigley recognized Mr. Sergio Guerrero of AlliedUniversal. She recounted how Officer Guerrero rose to the rank of supervisor, highlighting a recent instance where he reacted quickly when a passenger at the Bonneville Transit Center experienced a medical episode. His quick action helped the customer receive the care needed. Mr. Guerrero thanked the Board for its recognition.

From there, Ms. Quigley requested that the Board hold the rest of the General Manager’s Report due to some of the Board members needing to leave the meeting early. No members expressed objection. [The RTC Board held this Item until after discussion of Items 5-44, at which point they resumed their discussion of the General Manager’s Report.]

Ms. Quigley announced that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) had awarded the RTC and the City of Las Vegas with a $300,000.00 grant to develop a transit-oriented development (TOD) plan for Maryland Parkway. This project will evaluate the potential of TOD along Maryland Parkway from Sahara Avenue through Downtown Las Vegas to the Las Vegas Medical District. She noted that this was a highly competitive grant program, so it was great that the RTC was one of the recipients.

From there, Ms. Quigley introduced Mr. John Peñuelas, Director of Engineering Services – Streets and Highways for the RTC to update the Board regarding Fuel Revenue Indexing (FRI). Mr. Peñuelas spoke to provide an update on the progress of the RTC’s FRI program, both the initial three-year FRI funding and the 10-year extension. He reminded the Board that when Assembly Bill (AB) 413 was passed in the 2013 Legislative Session, it gave the RTC the ability to fund up to $700 million in projects. Local agencies developed a list of 225 critical roadway projects, all of which had been awarded. He noted some key statistics for the Board, stating that 171 projects were completed and 54 projects were under construction. Through those projects, 78 local small businesses were put to work. Approximately $628 million was awarded in FRI funding, creating nearly 8,101 jobs. Mr. Peñuelas added that all 225 projects were expected to be completed by the end of the year.

Furthermore, Mr. Peñuelas continued, the extension of FRI, through Question 5 in 2016, allows the RTC to fund an additional $3 billion in projects and create 25,000 new jobs. He gave an overview of where those projects are at, noting that there are 59 design and construction projects with agencies. Approximately $141 million has been awarded in FRI extension funding, creating nearly 1,228 jobs. Of those projects, 16 local small businesses were put to work.

#### Motion:
No motion was necessary.

#### Vote/Summary:
No vote was taken.
CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 5 THROUGH 53)

All items marked with asterisks (**) are considered by the Regional Transportation Commission to be routine and may be acted upon in one motion. However, the Regional Transportation Commission may discuss any consent item individually if requested by a Commission member or a citizen when the consent agenda is considered for approval.

| **5.** | APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of December 13, 2018 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **6.** | ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **7.** | RECEIVE A REPORT ON THE SUMMARY OF FISCAL ACTIONS RELATED TO THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **8.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AND APPROVE AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX DIRECT DISTRIBUTION FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CLARK COUNTY PROJECT 221A MVFT; CASINO DRIVE, NEEDLES HIGHWAY TO HARRAH’S HOTEL (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **9.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN SUPPLEMENTAL NO. 2 TO THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT TO REVISE THE SCOPE OF WORK, EXTEND THE PROJECT COMPLETION DATE, INCREASE FUNDING, AND APPROVE A REVISED AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FOR CONSTRUCTION FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR CLARK COUNTY PROJECT 099C-MVFT; HOLLYWOOD BOULEVARD, CHARLESTON BOULEVARD TO LAKE MEAD BOULEVARD (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **10.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AND APPROVE AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM FUEL REVENUE INDEXING EXTENSION FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 123E-FTI2; ALEXANDER ROAD OVERPASS AT U.S. 95 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **11.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AND APPROVE AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 178N-MVFT; PEDESTRIAN SAFETY UPGRADES FISCAL YEAR 2019 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **12.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN SUPPLEMENTAL INTERLOCAL CONTRACT NO. 4 TO INCREASE PROJECT FUNDING AND APPROVE A REVISED AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FOR ENGINEERING, RIGHT-OF-WAY, AND CONSTRUCTION FROM FUEL REVENUE INDEXING FUNDS FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 179A-FTI; 6TH STREET, BRIDGER AVENUE TO STEWART AVENUE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **13.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN SUPPLEMENTAL INTERLOCAL CONTRACT NO. 3 TO INCREASE PROJECT FUNDING AND APPROVE A REVISED AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FOR ENGINEERING AND RIGHT-OF-WAY FROM FUEL REVENUE INDEXING EXTENSION FUNDS FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 089G-FTI2; LAS VEGAS BOULEVARD, STEWART AVENUE TO SAHARA AVENUE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
|  |  |
| **14.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN SUPPLEMENTAL INTERLOCAL CONTRACT NO. 2 TO REVISE THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT, INCREASE PROJECT FUNDING, AND APPROVE A REVISED AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FOR |
| **15.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AND APPROVE AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF HENDERSON PROJECT 135AB3-MVFT; ARTERIAL RECONSTRUCTION: 2019 CITY OF LAS VEGAS MAINTENANCE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **16.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AND APPROVE AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF HENDERSON PROJECT 135AB4-MVFT; ARTERIAL RECONSTRUCTION: 2019 CITY OF HENDERSON MAINTENANCE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **17.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AND APPROVE AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF HENDERSON PROJECT 178P-MVFT; PEDESTRIAN SAFETY UPGRADES FISCAL YEAR 2019 – CITY OF HENDERSON (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **18.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AND APPROVE AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF HENDERSON PROJECT 183B-MVFT; VALLE VERDE DRIVE, HORIZON RIDGE PARKWAY TO WARM SPRINGS ROAD (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **19.** | RECEIVE A REPORT ON THE RECOMMENDATION FOR BEST BID FOR CONSTRUCTION FROM FUEL REVENUE INDEXING EXTENSION FUNDS FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 181A-FT12; COOLIDGE AVENUE, MAIN STREET TO 4TH STREET (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **20.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CLARK COUNTY PROJECTS 062F-FTI, 062F-MVFT, 062F-Q10 AND 062F-SB5; BUNKERVILLE ROADS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **21.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF MESQUITE PROJECTS 063AL-MVFT AND 063AL-SB5; 2018 STREET RECONSTRUCTION PHASE II (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **22.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 070M-MVFT; DURANGO DRIVE, GOWAN ROAD IMPROVEMENTS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **23.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 089L-MVFT; LAS VEGAS BOULEVARD, STEWART AVENUE TO WASHINGTON AVENUE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **24.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 093F-FTI; CASINO CENTER BOULEVARD, STEWART AVENUE TO U.S. 95 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **25.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 135K-SB5; ARTERIAL RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2011 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **26.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 142Q2-MVFT; ENTITY NON-PROJECT SPECIFIC EXPENSES, FISCAL YEAR 2018 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **27.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 146G-SB5; BUS TURNOUTS PROJECT- FISCAL YEAR 2011 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
**28. APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 146M-FTI; BUS TURNOUTS, CHARLESTON BOULEVARD TO BOULDER HIGHWAY TO NELLIS BOULEVARD (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**29. APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECTS 169C-MVFT AND 169B-SB5; MAIN STREET, U.S. 95 TO OWENS AVENUE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**30. APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 175J-FTI; MEADOWS NEIGHBORHOOD REHABILITATION (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**31. APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF MESQUITE PROJECT 191D-CSF; COMPLETE STREETS PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**32. RECEIVE NOTIFICATION THAT THE MONTHLY ENTITY PROJECT FINANCIAL AND STATUS REPORTS HAVE BEEN POSTED TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA WEBSITE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**33. RECEIVE NOTIFICATION THAT THE MONTHLY CAPITAL PROJECT TRACKING REPORT AND THE UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM PROJECT ACTIVITY STATUS REPORT HAVE BEEN POSTED TO THE RTC’S WEBSITE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**34. APPROVE AMENDMENT CLARK 19-03 TO THE 2017-2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**35. APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 06 TO CONTRACT NO. 14-011A, I-11 BOULDER CITY BYPASS – PHASE 2 DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT, WITH LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION TO ADD $184,918.68 IN FUNDING TO THE CONTRACT, ADD ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**36. APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 02 TO CONTRACT 14-068, ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS CONTRACT - DENT AND SCRATCHES REPAIR, WITH DENTPRO OF LAS VEGAS, INC. TO UTILIZE THE 90-DAY EXTENSION PERIOD, EXTEND THE CONTRACT TERM END DATE FROM DECEMBER 31, 2018 TO MARCH 31, 2019, ADD $36,000.00 IN FUNDING, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**37. APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 02 TO CONTRACT NO. 17-002, HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT PLAN, WITH NELSON\NYGAARD CONSULTING ASSOCIATES TO ADD $96,000.00 IN FUNDING TO THE CONTRACT, ADD ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF SERVICES, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**38. APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 01 TO CONTRACT 18-098, DATA ANALYSIS SERVICES, WITH APPLIED MARKET ANALYSIS, LLC, DBA APPLIED ANALYSIS, IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $100,000.00 FOR THE BASE TERM CONTRACT PERIOD OF MAY 24, 2018 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2019, FOR A REVISED TOTAL NOT-TO-EXCEED BASE TERM CONTRACT AMOUNT OF $200,000.00, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**39. AWARD CONTRACT 19-034DS, DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE SUNSET MAINTENANCE FACILITY (SMF) BUS WASH PROJECT, TO HDR ENGINEERING, INC (HDR) IN THE AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED $196,160.75 FOR THE PERIOD OF 18 MONTHS FROM NOTICE-TO-PROCEED AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE CONTRACT OR TAKE OTHER ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**40. APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 19-035DS, DESIGN SERVICES FOR PHASE VII SLIMLINE BUS SHELTER LOCATION EXHIBITS, TO INNOVA TECHNOLOGIES, INC. IN THE AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED $129,906.00 FOR THE PERIOD FROM NOTICE TO PROCEED PLUS 45 WEEKS AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
**Item:**
44. RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE RESORT CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY STUDY BEING CONDUCTED AS PART OF THE OVERALL ON BOARD PLAN

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. David Swallow, Senior Director of Engineering and Technology for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), updated the RTC Board of Commissioners (Board) on the Resort Corridor Feasibility Study (Study). He said that part of the overall On Board effort involved conducting a feasibility study on how high-capacity transit (HCT) may affect system access around the Resort Corridor. This was an important part of creating long-term projections for transit in the area. There are three critical links present in the Resort Corridor: McCarran International Airport (Airport) to the Las Vegas Strip (Strip), movement along the Strip, and between the Strip and Downtown Las Vegas (Downtown).

Mr. Swallow then detailed several of the Study’s goals, one of which involves soliciting customer feedback. He said the in-person surveys that were being used to collect this feedback, noting that over 1,700 individuals were surveyed. Additionally, a Wi-Fi-based survey in the Airport collected feedback from roughly 1,300 more respondents. Mr. Swallow shared some of the results. Of all the respondents, 94 percent were either satisfied or highly satisfied with their ability to get around Las Vegas. Another key point was that 50 percent of respondents used ridesharing in some form, which is important information to fold back into the program.

Looking into the future, Mr. Swallow acknowledged that visitorship to the area would likely increase, along with increased transit use in the region. He reviewed further information included in the report, specifically detailing the modes of transit most commonly used among each of the three critical Resort Corridor links. Of all the trips taken, light rail (LRT) was the most common choice (46 percent).
followed by ridesharing (18 percent) and taxis (13 percent). Mr. Swallow explained the process by which these responses were collected and the efforts to keep the information as objective as possible.

Next, Mr. Swallow went over the fare sensitivity metric, which was another way of reporting how much people would be willing to pay for a trip. Riders were generally willing to pay higher fare rates for light rail than buses, although the existing data showed similar fare curves for both options.

Mr. Swallow then reviewed the transit technologies element, describing each of the criteria used to review possible transit technologies. This included visitor experience, value, constructability/disruption, speed, reliability, accessibility, convenience, potential ridership, and roadway capacity in terms of people throughput. After touching on each component, he listed and described each of the technology options. This included the Deuce, limited stop bus service (SDX), bus rapid transit (BRT), modern streetcar, European tram, people mover, monorail/elevated transit, light rail, and gondola. He said the three options that were determined to be the most viable for the Study included the Deuce, SDX, and European tram. He then highlighted some of the pros and cons of each of these options. He noted that the Deuce/SDX options are lower cost, featuring more flexibility and more stops, while the European Tram is higher cost, but with more rider capacity and fewer stops. He provided some ridership data on the current state of the Resort Corridor and how riders get around.

To incorporate new types of transit, Mr. Swallow explained that six different scenarios are being considered. Each feature a different combination of transit strategies. This includes the following:

1. Existing Deuce and SDX – The transit options already in use on the Resort Corridor, but with no direct connection to the Airport.
2. Enhanced Bus (Deuce and Airport SDX) – Involving rerouting SDX to provide direct access to the Airport.
3. European Tram – Removing buses altogether and replacing with a tram, which offers similar rider capacity to what already exists.
4. European Tram (Strip and Airport) – Using the European Tram and connecting with the Airport, with the potential for building better ridership capacity over time.
5. European Tram and Airport SDX – Mixing the European Tram with bus service, offering increases in potential ridership similar to Alternative 2.
6. Deuce and Airport European Tram – Keeping the Deuce in place and using a European Tram to connect the Airport to Downtown, offering noteworthy increases in ridership.

Mr. Swallow then provided data on the ridership increases (and cost increases) of each of the six options:

1. Alternative 1: 41,900 estimated daily ridership, $31,740,000.00 net operating surplus (deficit)
2. Alternative 2: 54,100 estimated daily ridership, $406,114,000.00 net operating surplus (deficit)
3. Alternative 3: 47,500 estimated daily ridership, $74,014,000.00 net operating surplus (deficit)
4. Alternative 4: 69,200 estimated daily ridership, $580,436,000.00 net operating surplus (deficit)
5. Alternative 5: 59,700 estimated daily ridership, $202,549,000.00 net operating surplus (deficit)
6. Alternative 6: 63,600 estimated daily ridership, $549,777,000.00 net operating surplus (deficit)

Mr. Swallow pointed out that, while these costs seem significant, they would be costs incurred over the next 20 years and do not include other considerations, such as grant funding. Overall, he noted that Alternatives 1, 2, and 6 seem the most promising. However, more detailed financial analysis needs to be completed before decisions can be made.
Lastly, Mr. Swallow reviewed the transit stop improvements discussed in the study. He said this includes improved wayfinding/customer experience, speed-boarding processes, improve guest awareness of transit options, longer transit stops for multiple vehicles and/or longer vehicles, enlarge and integrate pedestrian waiting areas, and reduce right-lane conflicts.

In terms of next steps, Mr. Swallow explained that these recommendations were being socialized to key stakeholders throughout the Resort Corridor and surrounding areas. These findings will be incorporated into the larger On Board Plan, followed by a process of creating more near- and long-term recommendations to improve transit in the area.

Councilman Isaac Barron asked which option has the best viability for expansion to outlying regional areas. Mr. Swallow said that was being taken into consideration, including what ramifications each option would have on the long-term growth of the region. While buses offer the easiest expansion, how each of the transit options could be built out to other parts of the Las Vegas Valley are being explored. Mr. Barron then inquired as to if there are any calculations on how the carbon footprint of each option compares. Mr. Swallow said this was not part of this particular Study, but assured Councilman Barron that this issue will be examined in the scope of the larger On Board Plan.

Mayor Carolyn Goodman agreed with what had been said about coordinating transit throughout the community. She praised the efforts so far and hoped the conversation would continue to move forward. Commissioner Jim Gibson concurred with Mayor Goodman and said it is important for elected officials in each region to receive this information. There are many critical pieces, and it is important that the information get spread around, as the region is growing too fast to ignore these HCT options for much longer.

Mayor Pro Tem Lois Tarkanian recalled hearing that there is less desire for rail-based transportation. She asked that someone confirm this perspective. Mr. Swallow responded that from the visitors’ perspective, the data actually suggested that rail is the preferred transit option.

As the discussion drew to a close, Ms. Quigley suggested later discussion on how to disseminate this information to other agencies. Mr. Gibson agreed, stating that it would be great information to bring back to Clark County. He stated that Clark County is preparing to do a major infrastructure revision, so these topics are crucial for understanding what would happen in the coming years. He directed staff to present this information to all of the local jurisdictions.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.

**Item:**
4. RECEIVE THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DIRECTOR’S REPORT

**Comments:**
Mr. Rudy Malfabon, Director for the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), provided the NDOT Director’s Report. He began by announcing NDOT’s groundbreaking event for the newly-completed Centennial Bowl interchange, which would be held on January 22, 2019. This interchange will provide a vital connection between the north/south and east/west routes in the area.

In regard to the federal shutdown, Mr. Malfabon noted that it will not affect NDOT’s highway funding, but it will affect transit funding. NDOT is responsible for rural transit, and Mr. Malfabon noted that...
NDOT will be helping to support these rural providers throughout the shutdown. Unfortunately, the shutdown could delay federal approvals for some active projects, so NDOT was still waiting to see how these issues might shake out.

Mr. Malfabon stated that there would not be a Transportation Board meeting in January 2019 because of the new constitutional officers on it. The new members needed to be briefed and brought up to speed on their roles. He anticipated the next meeting to be held in February 2019.

Next, Mr. Malfabon reported that NDOT had taken over maintenance of a portion of the southern beltway as of 2019, and was working on taking ownership over the entirety of Summerlin Parkway’s maintenance. He said these details are still being worked out.

In closing, Mr. Malfabon announced that he would soon be retiring as NDOT Director. He praised the efforts of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC). He emphasized the importance of the RTC’s collaboration with NDOT. Although there was a lot going on, he affirmed that NDOT would be committed to delivering projects on the FRI 2 list, as agreed-upon in the previous fall. Ms. Tina Quigley, General Manager for the RTC, and Commissioner Jim Gibson both thanked Mr. Malfabon for his service and efforts with NDOT over the years. Councilman Isaac Barron also thanked Mr. Malfabon for his contributions to NDOT and the work NDOT was able to achieve with Mr. Malfabon at the helm.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.

### Item:
45. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE PROGRESS OF YEAR ONE GOALS FOR THE TRAFFIC SIGNAL MOBILITY VISIONING PROJECT

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Ms. Theresa Gaisser, Principal Project Engineer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), updated the RTC Board of Commissioners (Board) on the progress of Year One goals for the Traffic Signal Mobility Visioning Project (Project). She explained that the Project involves providing a framework of strategies for emerging technology opportunities, with the goal of incorporating more data-driven decisions into the strategy. All of the data collected in the project is being sent to Icebox Consulting, who will aid in the data analysis. From there, Ms. Gaisser introduced Ms. Yin Nawaday of Icebox Consulting (Icebox) to provide further details.

Ms. Nawaday explained that this presentation would be a high-level overview of what was being done in the data analysis processes. To begin, Ms. Nawaday reviewed how data is a key component to several elements of the RTC’s Mobility Roadmap. This Project outlines steps to developing the foundational elements to support those data objectives. The goals of this Program involve understanding more about data origins, commonalities, and governance, with the end goal of coming up with recommendations for the next steps in the Project.

Then, Ms. Nawaday provided more details on the “big data” portion of the Project. In this context, big data refers to the volume, velocity, and variety of the data included. She further explained these requirements and what characteristics make up big data. She noted that the bottom line is that the RTC is working with big data in this Project, which will be crucial moving forward. Big data will provide
insights and details into risk management, workflows, security, and talent management. Ms. Nawaday noted that beyond what had already been collected, there would be far more data coming in over the next 12 to 18 months.

Understanding this data, Ms. Nawaday continued, involves three steps as part of the process. This includes the following: descriptive – what has happened; predictive – what will happen; and prescriptive – what we need to make happen. These pieces are crucial to Icebox’s understanding of the data. Looking forward, data will become an increasingly important part of the transit decision-making process, including decisions for Smart Cities, the Internet of Things, and other emerging technology options.

Mr. Rudy Malfabon, Director for the Nevada Department of Transportation, asked whether it is difficult to hire data administrators and how Icebox is handling that issue. Ms. Nawaday replied that she could not speak for the public sector overall, but said the options available are being assessed. She admitted that there is a shortage of talent in this area, so there would be a lot of competition for those experts.

Ms. Tina Quigley, General Manager for the RTC, briefly mentioned that the Freeway and Arterial System of Transportation (FAST) had collected large quantities of data in the past, but had focused less on the data analysis side of things. The use cases for the information had not yet been explored, so this is an important first step in turning these data points into actionable insights.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.

**Item:**
46. RECEIVE INFORMATION FROM LEGAL COUNSEL REGARDING POTENTIAL AND EXISTING LITIGATION INVOLVING A MATTER OVER WHICH THE RTC HAS SUPERVISION, CONTROL, JURISDICTION, OR ADVISORY POWER AND TO DELIBERATE TOWARD A DECISION ON THE MATTER (Note: This item may be closed to the public pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 241.015(3)(b)(2) in order to discuss legal matters.) (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
Ms. Tina Quigley, General Manager for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, remarked that there were not any issues to discuss under this item.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Item:**
47. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION: No action can be taken on any matter discussed under this item, although the Commission can direct that it be placed on a future agenda.

**Comments:**
Commissioner Jim Gibson conducted the meeting’s second period for citizens participation. He called on Ms. Aleta Dupree, who made the following comment:

Commissioner Gibson, thank you. Aleta Dupree for the record. Speaking again on miscellaneous RTC stuff. So a lot of good things, I hope we can see rail here, I personally would prefer New York City style
subway, but that might be too rich for most peoples’ blood, but I think a lot of the casinos they have these big basements and I can imagine subway passengers coming out into the casinos from the trains, throw some high-speed rail in there, it’d be really nice. So, I’m not riding the bus a whole lot. I’ve been walking six miles a day. But I still ride it enough where I can buy passes on the app, but as my walking increases, I may be going to single fares, which means that I’ll be doing single rides using the $1.50 two-hour pass, so I can buy that on the app, because I’m not going to go out and withdraw dollar bills. And I may be overpaying for that, but I need the convenience. I think it’s important to look at fare policy in dealing with the Strip. Maybe we shouldn’t be looking so much at the Strip versus general market. I ride the Strip but yet I am buying general market passes, because I buy them for 15 or 30 days at a time, so I’m not really showing up in the mix at all. So, I think there should be a uniform policy and our minimum fare I think should go away from a single ticket, but to have our minimum fare be a timed pass, such as two hours that we have. You see that in San Francisco and L.A., and now Denver has a three-hour minimum, and you can buy all the fares in Denver on the app. So, we can hopefully eliminate a lot of the cash payment and continue the push to move away from paper tickets. So since I last saw you, I got this neat little thing called a contact list debit card. There are actually millions of them out there, but most people don’t know what the little sideways Wi-Fi symbol is. It’s very fast. That might be our future fare payment along with the app. That’s how we can move away from paper tickets, so I use this, maybe i will have to show you all in action someday. And I think it’s important we continue to work on the rideshare for disabled passengers. You are serving me, the Veteran’s Transport Network took me on a very good ride, but I rode in the big bus all by myself. The driver was very nice. It was very safe, but it probably cost about $40.00. I punched in a Lyft calculation from here to that same location, they could do it for about $20.00. These are things to think about as I get on my way and get ready to ride another bus. Thank you.

Next, Mr. Havander Davis made the following comment:

Good morning, Commissioners. Happy new year. I’m Havander Davis, and I’ve been coming here for about a year, and I’d still would like for you guys to work on extending the service area for persons with disabilities. There’s still a lot of us who aren’t able to get around, because we may live outside of the service area, and it’d be nice for us to be able to go where we’d like to go. Thank you.

Ms. Stephanie Vrsnick made the following comment:

Good morning Commissioners. My name is Stephanie Vrsnick, and I’m speaking in front of you for the 14th time. I’m very disappointed to see that I’ve only got three members to speak to. Public comment, that I’ve seen, doesn’t seem to be important enough to have our members stay until the end of the meeting. However, I’ve got new members, and nobody is really familiar with my story, so short story is, I’m half a mile outside the service area. My son works at the Nellis Air Force Base Commissary, and he’s been there for over 15 years. He’s a federal employee. I have to take him to work, and RTC will bring him to the library, but will not bring him to my home, because I am half a mile outside of the service area. I’m asking RTC to expand that service area to the way it was in 2011, which was one and a half miles. What the ADA requires is, three-quarters of a mile, but in 2011, we were going on one and a half miles outside the service area. So, last month, I stated that my opinion, I felt the peer review study that was conducted by Dr. Monteiro, did not address the unique, growing needs of this community. For the last two months, and I know I’m speaking to new members, so you guys weren’t here, but for the last two months I’ve asked this commission for their feedback and their viewpoint on the peer review study. I still haven’t received an answer. Have you even read the study? Have you even listened to my testimony? Do you even care? Recently, I spoke to a grandma who is raising her grandson with Autism. He’s 21 years old. She lives in the 89131 ZIP code in the northwest. She has
lived there for 11 years, and she’s not in the service area. She transports her grandson everywhere, and she’s in her 70s. Soon she won’t be able to do that anymore. Then what will happen? Do you even care? Last week I heard on the news that Las Vegas is one of the fastest growing cities in the country. It also reported that Las Vegas is one of the top cities for seniors to retire. Our growth will only continue to grow. How many people will buy homes and not have transportation? I find it ironic that almost every casino has a paratransit stop. So if you live in the service area, you can go to any casino in the city, however you can’t pick up your mail at certain post offices or go to a cemetery to visit your loved ones. There’s something morally wrong with that. Do you even care? This commission needs to understand that they are not meeting the needs of this community. Members of our community who are taxpaying citizens and registered voters, just like my son, have no transportation. If I’m not here to drive him to work, he would lose his job. A federal job that he’s held for over 15 years. His benefits and retirements would go away. That’s not fair. He doesn’t deserve that. Do you even care? In closing, the Americans with Disabilities Act was designed to protect the rights of people with disabilities. Give access to transportation. Again, I’m asking this commission to restore the service area back to the way it was in 2011, eight years ago.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:32 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Marin DuBois, Recording Secretary

[Signature]

Marek Biernacinski, Transcription Secretary
Longevity Pay

Current Language (as of September 11, 2008):

“Employees appointed/ hired/ reclassified / promoted to an RTC Management position prior to July 1, 2007, shall upon completion of five (5) years of creditable service, receive an annual lump sum payment equal to 0.57 of one percent (.57%) of base pay per each year of service. Creditable service includes RTC and Clark County service time. Employees hired into Management Position subsequent to June 30, 2007 shall not be eligible for longevity pay, except for those new hires who were previously receiving longevity with either RTC or Clark County. Current RTC employees who have been reclassified as a result of a classification and compensation audit will be eligible for Longevity pay.

For current RTC employees who have been promoted into a Management position may receive longevity at the General Managers Discretion.”

Proposed Language:

Employees appointed/hired/reclassified/promoted to an RTC Management position prior to July 1, 2007, shall upon completion of five (5) years of creditable service, receive an annual lump sum payment equal to 0.57 of one percent (.57%) of base pay per each year of service. Creditable service includes RTC and Clark County service time. Employees hired into a Management position after June 30, 2007 shall not be eligible for longevity pay, except for those new hires who were previously receiving longevity with either RTC or Clark County prior to October 1, 2008. Clark County service after October 1, 2008 is not considered creditable service. Current RTC employees who have been reclassified as a result of a classification and compensation audit will be eligible for Longevity pay.

For current RTC employees who have been promoted into a Management position may receive longevity at the General Manager’s discretion

History
December 14, 2006 – Original Document
February 14, 2008 – Employees after June 30, 2007 not eligible (no exception language)
September 11, 2008 – Revised to its current form
April 9, 2009 – No Changes
September 13, 2013 – No Changes
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FUEL REVENUE INDEXING

PROGRESS REPORT AS OF DEC. 31, 2018
AB 413 PASSED IN 2013 SESSION WHICH ALLOWED THE RTC TO:

FUND APPROXIMATELY $700 MILLION TO BUILD 225 ROADWAY TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

FUEL REVENUE INDEXING PROGRESS REPORT AS OF DEC. 31, 2018

- Contracts Awarded: 225
- Local Small Businesses: 78
- Amount Awarded: $628M
- Jobs Created: 8,101
Voters approved Question 5 in 2016 which allowed the RTC to:

Fund approximately up to $3 billion

To create up to 25,000 jobs

Fuel Revenue Indexing Extension Progress Report as of Dec. 31, 2018

Contracts awarded: 59
Local small businesses: 16
Amount awarded: $141M
Jobs created: 1,228
RESORT CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

OBJECTIVE: Consider feasibility of a high-capacity transit system to improve access to, from and within the Resort Corridor

CRITICAL LINKS:
- Airport to the Strip
- Movement along the Strip
- Strip to downtown Las Vegas

STUDY OVERVIEW
How satisfied are you with getting around Las Vegas?

- Very Satisfactory: 43%
- Satisfactory: 51%
- Unsatisfactory: 3%
- Very Unsatisfactory: <1%
- Don't know: 2%

While in Las Vegas, which types of transportation did you choose?*

* Multiple Choices Allowed

- Public Bus: 11% for Convention Delegates, 23% for Leisure Visitors
- Monorail: 11% for Convention Delegates, 16% for Leisure Visitors
- Rideshare: 50% for Convention Delegates, 37% for Leisure Visitors
- Taxi: 33% for Convention Delegates, 29% for Leisure Visitors
- Personal/Rental Car: 36% for Convention Delegates, 41% for Leisure Visitors
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Estimated Daily Resort Corridor Visitor Trips

Projected Daily Trips with both Origin and Destination within the Resort Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Visitor Volume</th>
<th>Daily Visitor Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>44 M</td>
<td>492,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>56 M</td>
<td>618,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+26%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Stated Preference Survey

Modes of Travel to/from Airport

- Ride Share: 34%
- Personal Car: 18%
- Limo: 5%
- Taxi: 26%
- Public Bus: 4%
- Paid Airport Shuttle: 11%
- Other: 3%
- Rental Car: <1%
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Stated Preference Survey

Modes of Travel along the Strip

- Personal Car: 33%
- Rental Car: 16%
- Walk: 12%
- Other: 2%
- Ride Share: 17%
- Taxi: 6%
- Shuttle / Bus: 3%
- Monorail: 4%
- Public Bus: 7%

Modes of Travel between Strip and Downtown

- Personal Car: 27%
- Rental Car: 24%
- Walk: 12%
- Other: 3%
- Ride Share: 19%
- Taxi: 9%
- Public Bus: 17%
- Monorail: 1%
### Transportation Modes Chosen by Respondents

#### Stated Preference Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Trip</th>
<th>Mode Chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Trips</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Airport and Resort Corridor</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Strip and Downtown</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along the Strip</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fare Sensitivity

#### Stated Preference Survey

- **Percentage of Visitors traveling between the Airport and the Strip and Downtown**
  - **Light Rail**
  - **Bus**

- **Daily Ridership**
  - **$1**
  - **$2**
  - **$3**
  - **$4**
  - **$5**
  - **$6**
  - **$7**
  - **$8**
  - **$9**
  - **$10**
  - **$11**
  - **$12**
  - **$13**
  - **$14**
  - **$15**
  - **$20,000**
  - **$30,000**
  - **$35,000**

- **Fare Sensitivity Chart**
Fare Sensitivity

Stated Preference Survey

Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Transit Technologies

Criteria Considered in Reviewing Transit Technologies

- Visitor Experience
- Value
- Constructability / Disruption
- Speed
- Reliability
- Accessibility
- Convenience
- Potential Ridership
- Roadway Capacity in terms of people throughput
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study
Transit Technologies

- Deuce
- Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Transit Technologies

- Deuce
- Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Transit Technologies

- Deuce
- Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Modern Streetcar
• Deuce
• Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
• Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
• Modern Streetcar
• European Tram

• Deuce
• Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
• Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
• Modern Streetcar
• European Tram
• People Mover
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Transit Technologies

- Deuce
- Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Modern Streetcar
- European Tram
- People Mover
- Monorail / Elevated Transit

Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Transit Technologies

- Deuce
- Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Modern Streetcar
- European Tram
- People Mover
- Monorail / Elevated Transit
- Light Rail
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study
Transit Technologies

- Deuce
- Limited Stop Bus Service (SDX)
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Modern Streetcar
- European Tram
- People Mover
- Monorail / Elevated Transit
- Light Rail
- Gondola
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Technologies included in Alternatives Analysis

Deuce and SDX

Pros
- Operates in mixed flow or exclusive lanes
- Deuce popular with visitors
- SDX faster, with limited stop service
- Frequent stops
- Maneuverable in heavy traffic
- No construction required

Cons
- Lower capacity (88 to 108 passengers)
- Slow boarding (Deuce only)
- Slowed by street congestion

European Tram

Pros
- Operates in mixed flow or exclusive lanes
- Positive visitor response
- Operates without wires
- Faster boarding
- Higher capacity (200 to 220 passengers)

Cons
- High capital costs
- Requires construction of a track
- Slowed by street congestion
- Not maneuverable around traffic

Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Existing Deuce and SDX (persons per hour)

Present Peak Period Capacity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Automobiles</th>
<th>Deuce and SDX Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 1/2 minute bus frequency</td>
<td>7,100 persons per hour per direction</td>
<td>6,050 persons per hour per direction</td>
<td>1,050 persons per hour per direction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Alternative 1: Existing Deuce and SDX

Deuce and SDX

Estimated Total Average Daily Boardings

Deuce + SDX

20,300 + 9,900 = 30,200 (2020)

27,200 + 13,200 = 40,400 (2040)

alternative 2: Enhanced Bus (Deuce and Airport SDX)

Deuce and Airport SDX

Estimated Total Average Daily Boardings

Deuce + Airport SDX

30,200 + 10,700 = 41,100 (2030)

40,400 + 10,700 = 51,100 (2040)
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Alternative 3: European Tram

Estimated Total Average Daily Boardings

European Tram

- 33,000 (2020)
- 44,300 (2040)

8.2 miles

Alternative 4: European Tram (Strip and Airport)

Estimated Total Average Daily Boardings

Strip Tram + Airport Tram

- 33,000 + 18,100 = 51,100 (2020)
- 44,300 + 21,700 = 66,000 (2040)
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Alternative 5: European Tram and Airport SDX

Estimated Total Average Daily Boardings

European Tram + Airport SDX

- 33,000 + 10,200 = 43,200 (2020)
- 44,300 + 10,700 = 55,000 (2040)

Alternative 6: Deuce and Airport European Tram

Estimated Total Average Daily Boardings

Deuce + Airport European Tram

- 30,200 + 18,100 = 48,300 (2020)
- 40,400 + 21,700 = 62,100 (2040)
### Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Estimated Year 2040 Total Daily Ridership</th>
<th>Net Operating Surplus (Deficit)</th>
<th>Capital Deficit Requiring Additional Revenue Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>$31,740,000</td>
<td>($69,715,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>54,100</td>
<td>$406,114,000</td>
<td>$215,203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>($74,014,000)</td>
<td>($1,034,568,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>69,200</td>
<td>$580,436,000</td>
<td>($618,591,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td>59,700</td>
<td>$202,549,000</td>
<td>($853,907,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 6</td>
<td>63,600</td>
<td>$549,777,000</td>
<td>($427,779,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resort Corridor Feasibility Study

Transit Stop Improvements

RTC
• Improve wayfinding / customer experience
• Speed boarding process
  – Off board ticketing
  – Level boarding
  – Reduce pull-outs

Private Properties / Public Rights of Way
• Improve guest awareness of transit options
• Longer transit stops for multiple vehicles and/or longer vehicles
• Enlarge and integrate pedestrian waiting areas
• Reduce right-lane conflicts
  – Right turn pockets
  – Pedestrian grade separations

Next Steps

• Present draft recommendations to stakeholders – seek consensus
• Incorporate results into overall On Board plan
• Pursue recommendations
  ▪ Near-term
  ▪ Long-term
Data Pilot Overview

Data is a key component to several elements of the RTC’s Mobility Roadmap. This pilot project outlines steps to developing the foundational elements to support those data objectives.

**Project Timeline**
- 3.5 months
- 3 Phases: Discovery, Insights, Governance

**Outcomes**
- Know Your Data: What, Where, Who and How
- Insights: Data commonalities
- High-Level Governance
- Recommendations: Next Steps along Roadmap
What is Big Data?
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- Volume
- Velocity
- Variety

Icebox 2019

Why is this Important?

04

Big Data is Already Here
- All 3 V’s (Volume, Velocity, Variety)
- Over 1 terabyte of data
- Deployed technologies will ramp up that volume even further within 2019 (DSRCs)
- Forecasted to grow data exponentially over the next 18-24 months

Insights and Risk Management
- Streamline and improve the flow of critical insights
- Data-Driven Insights

Risk Management
- Talent, Knowledge and Transition Risk
- Data Protection and Security Risk

Icebox 2019
Understand, Predict and Prescribe
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Descriptive
What has happened

Predictive
What will happen

Prescriptive
What we need to make happen

What Does the Future Hold?

Data-Driven Insights

Data and data insights will drive outcomes within the areas we continue to invest in: Smart Cities, the Internet of Things, and overall Technology Strategy & Planning for the foreseeable future.
Thank You