CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Larry Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Clark County Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Larry Brown, Chair, Clark County
Debra March, Vice-Chair, City of Henderson
Isaac Barron, City of North Las Vegas
George Gault, City of Mesquite
Jim Gibson, Clark County
Carolyn Goodman, City of Las Vegas (Via telephone)
Kristina Swallow, Nevada Department of Transportation (ex-officio)
Lois Tarkanian, City of Las Vegas
Rod Woodbury, City of Boulder City

MEMBERS ABSENT:
None

RTC STAFF:
Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer
Fred Ohene, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
M.J. Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Greg Gilbert, Outside Legal Counsel
David Swallow, Chief Engineering and Technology Officer
Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer
Angela Castro, Chief Strategy, Policy, and Marketing Officer
John Peñuelas, Jr., Director of Engineering Services – Streets and Highways
Aileen Magnera, Advertising and Creative Supervisor
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst

INTERESTED PARTIES:
Patricia Anderson
Robyn Beacham-Chancellor
Aleta Dupree
Dale Keller, Nevada Department of Transportation
Ken MacDonald
Michael Saltman
Scott Thompson
Ed Uehling

RTC Item #5
May 23, 2019
Consent
Item:
1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Comments:
Chair Larry Brown mentioned that several of the commenters wanted to speak on Item #39. He said that the speakers could choose to speak during the initial citizens participation or during the item itself, noting that the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada Board of Commissioners would open the item to public comment.

Chair Brown first called on Mr. Michael Saltman, who made the following comment:

Hello everybody, my name is Michael Saltman. I’m the owner of the Vista Group. Hello Tina. I’ve been involved in this community for many, many years, particularly in terms of development and transportation, as many of you know. In fact, I was the Chairman of Bruce Woodbury’s Citizens for Improved Transportation for Question 10 back in whenever that year was. So, I’ve had an interest in public transportation. I’ve had an interest in the community’s development. I have been as you know, some of you know, a really long-term supporter of all things light rail. I was the one that started the whole mid-town UNLV concept. I worked with Tina’s predecessor, Jacob Snow, on that concept. We were able to build the multi-modal transportation center at UNLV, and it was underway for that project, of course the recession hit and so ’08-2015 kinda slowed down the timeframe for us. But, after all these years, 15, 20 years of being a huge light rail supporter, even more than BRT, although I could certainly live with really advanced dedicated lane BRT program as well. I’ve been, I’m a convert now. I’m a convert from light rail to autonomous vehicles. So, my statement today to you, as a Board and to your staff is that I’d like you to seriously consider the future for next gen, as Tina Quigley calls it, next gen transit, which is autonomous vehicles. I just took a group; we formed a venture called the Nevada Innovation Center. My partner, Nissim Ezekiel and me, we took a group of Nevadans delegation to Israel to Tel Aviv for the mobility conference in November. And the penny dropped for me at that conference. What I saw there was everybody from the world came along talking about autonomous vehicles and how that’s going to change the world, and I’m a convert. I was a convert there and then I came back to Las Vegas and I talked to a fellow that is part of the department of transportation in Washington, D.C. who is also a friend of Tina’s. I spent a lot time with Michael Sherwood in the city who is probably one of our top technology brains and gurus in this community, and like I said I’m a convert. I hope that what you consider today and going forward is another option, and the option is less expensive, dedicated lanes, autonomous vehicles. And, all that is going to happen over the next 5 to 10 years, so it’s a very short for these changes to occur and the research and development of autonomous vehicles. So, that’s my statement. I’d like you to consider it. I’m available for that discussion at any time of course, and I want to work with the RTC like I have been for some time with Tina and with David Swallow and the team. So, I’m available and like to get involved, and we have a lot possible technology coming to town that can help advance the discussion, so thanks for listening to me. I’m looking forward to hearing the presentation today, and I look forward to working with the RTC on what might be a whole new 21st century option. Thanks.

Vice-Chair Debra March asked Mr. Saltman if he was referring to autonomous cars or autonomous buses, and he gave the following response:

Autonomous vehicles are gonna happen. Driverless vehicles are going to happen. Vehicles, cars. I’m talking about autonomous buses, trams, what I consider a cool factor. Again, you have to have dedicated lanes for this, but it can be really so flexible. It can be Maryland Parkway. It can go to Sahara. It can go to Flamingo. It can go to Las Vegas Boulevard. The flexibility of this concept is really, it’s almost, almost, you can think of so many options for autonomous trams, buses, and the like.
Vice-Chair March inquired about the availability of the technology to which he gave the following response:

*I think it’s incipient. It’s happening right now. I think we can bring people to the table to talk to the staff and to talk to the Board and talk about what’s going, what’s actually happening today in the autonomous vehicle world. It’s happening around the world. For sure, Las Vegas could be a leader in whole new world of technology, which I think would a very exciting prospect for all of us here. Thanks.*

Next, Mr. Ed Uehling made the following comments:

*Yes, my name is Ed Uehling. Yes, Las Vegas could be a leader. Las Vegas should be the greatest city in the world.*

Chair Brown asked Mr. Uehling which item number he wished to comment on to which he gave the following comment:

*Oh, I don’t know. About the light rail. I hope you don’t ignore everything Michael said. Las Vegas could be the greatest city in the world by developing its resort corridor, and the way to do it is to get the traffic off the surface and underground. It’s much more safe there. You can have tunnels everywhere. Go to any great city in the world and they have a subway system. And now we have this huge opportunity with the Boring Company, which is going to do the convention center, 2 miles for $50 million. That’s $25 million a mile. Multiply, multiply the nine miles of the system that we’re talking about, of the light rail, that’s at $50 million a mile, that’s $450 million. That’s $250 million less than the, than the budgeted amount, and it’s a much better system. Please travel around the world and look at the great cities. Las Vegas has the chance of becoming another, the second real city in the United States after New York, and we should take advantage of that. It’ll be the greatest place in the world to live, work, and play, all without needing an automobile. Thank you.*

Chair Brown called on Mr. Ken MacDonald, who made the following comment:

*Hi, Ken MacDonald. Affiliation Newfields Environmental Consulting. We’re a multinational firm and in my day job I worked on much of the major infrastructure in Clark County, the regional flood control master plan permitting, the Hoover Dam Bypass Bridge I worked on and more recently, the I-11. I’m also affiliated with Southern Nevada Strong, which many of you know is designed to help our community become more livable, more sustainable, more economically vibrant. And through that work, our committee and others went to downtown Denver and went to Salt Lake City to find out how they did transit-oriented development; how did they make it happen, and what were the benefits to those communities? And they’re extraordinary. And we heard over and over the same message was, rail was the way to go, and so I’m encouraging the Board to support the Maryland Parkway Item 39 light rail alternative. And the reason rail got the edge over and over was the development community reported it’s a bus lane. You can change the bus schedule with a drop of pen, whereas rail is steel in the ground. It’s a commitment. You invested millions. They’re going to invest millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions. And the economic development that comes from rail, we also heard from a Vice President from Panasonic, building a world headquarters just outside of Denver. Why there? It’s in Kansas really; because rail. Their millennials, their next gens, their newer people, won’t go if there is no rail. They don’t want to drive. They want to be connected and have somebody else do it for them. And that’s why cities with, that have embraced light rail, Portland, Madison, Wisconsin. Really, people are choosing Madison over us? Come on. So, we’re a leader in so many things, so many things. Been a proud and happy resident of southern Nevada since 1989, and in this we’re just not quite there. So,
Item: 2. APPROVE THE AGENDA (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Comments: Ms. Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), suggested that Item #16, Interlocal Contract with the City of Henderson for Project 008X-FTI2; Sunset Road, I-515 to Pabco Road, be pulled from the agenda and brought back before the RTC Board of Commissioners for approval at its May 2019.

Motion: Commissioner Jim Gibson made a motion to approve the agenda with the removal of Item #16.

Vote/Summary: 8 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.
Ayes: Larry Brown, Isaac Barron, George Gault, Carolyn Goodman, Jim Gibson, Debra March, Lois Tarkanian, Rod Woodbury
Nays: None
Absent: None

Item: **3. RECEIVE THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT

Comments: Following a detail PowerPoint presentation [attached], Ms. Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), provided the Chief Executive Officer’s Report. Before starting the report, she wished Ms. Angela Castro, Chief Strategy, Policy, and Marketing Officer for the RTC, a happy birthday.

Ms. Quigley then moved on to operator recognitions. First, She recognized Mr. Scott Thompson, an operator with Keolis North America (Keolis), who helped save a lost four-year-old child. Mr. Thompson gave a few remarks thanking the RTC and Keolis. Ms. Quigley then recognized operator Ms. Robyn Beacham-Chancellor, an operator with Transdev North America (Transdev). Ms. Beacham-Chancellor secured her passengers and removed them from the vicinity of a shooting while on her route. Ms. Beacham-Chancellor thanked the RTC and Transdev for the recognition and her safety and training team for providing the training to navigate dangerous situations such as the one she experienced.

Next, Ms. Quigley gave an overview of the activities held during National Work Zone Awareness week. The RTC hosted a Work Zone of the Future installation at the Southern Nevada Traffic Management Center. The event was attended by the public and the press, who saw demonstrations by
Nexar, Haas Alert, iCone, and Waze. She also spoke about the pilot program the RTC is developing with Nexar to collect work zone cone placement data via dashcams and use that data to understand the effects cone placement has on traffic as well as make real time adjustments. She commended Mr. John Peñuelas, Director of Engineering Services – Streets and Highways for the RTC, for his work on the project during the past year and a half. The pilot project will be the first in the country to use the technology in this manner.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**

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

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Ms. Kristina Swallow, Director for the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), provided the NDOT Director’s report. New to her role as Director, Ms. Swallow introduced herself. She related that she is a Las Vegas resident and civil engineer who worked with the City of Las Vegas and as policy advisor and transportation consultant. She reinforced her commitment to working with the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) and making Southern Nevada a priority. She added that one-on-one meetings with the RTC Board of Commissioners (Board) members would be scheduled in a few months after the end of the state legislative session.

Following her introduction, Ms. Swallow highlighted some of NDOT’s current projects. She began with an update on the Boulder Highway safety improvements. The $1.5 million project consists of the several safety improvements that include mid-block crosswalks, overhead rapid flashing beacons, median enhancements, advanced crossing warning signs, and new crosswalks. NDOT expects the project to be completed by summer 2019.

Next, Ms. Swallow updated the RTC Board on Project Neon, which is nearing completion. On April 2, 2019, several ramps at Interstate-15 (I-15) northbound and Charleston Boulevard were opened. She informed the Board that the ribbon cutting celebration scheduled for May 2019 was postponed. This postponement was due to pending items such as laying down crumb rubber, some landscaping, and the installation of some art enhancements. A press event announcing substantial completion will be held in May 2019, and roads will be open, but the big ribbon-cutting event will occur in July 2019.

Then, Ms. Swallow reported on the One Nevada Transportation Plan, the long-range transportation plan for Nevada. NDOT spent the past two years engaged in substantial community and stakeholder outreach to develop the plan, which is now in the implementation phase. The plan will move NDOT to become an outcome-based, decision-making organization. Project prioritization and strategies will be moved based on outcomes.

Ms. Swallow announced the retirement of NDOT Deputy Director Bill Hoffman.

Ms. Swallow then introduced Mr. Dale Keller, NDOT, to provide an overview of the changes to the High-Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) system. He stated adjustments to the HOV system would begin mid-May 2019. A public education campaign was recently launched to inform the public about the changes, which were based on recent updates to NDOT’s HOV study and plan. He then outlined the changes. NDOT is restriping the two express lanes on I-15 to create a general purpose lane and an HOV lane.
The HOV lane will connect the U.S.-95 and I-15 HOV lanes, creating a 22-mile continuous HOV system. To incentivize longer trips and improve safety, access entry points to the HOV system will be limited. There will be two HOV interchanges, one at Elkhorn Road and the Neon Gateway Interchange. He stated that the biggest changes were the hours. HOV lanes will be enforced 24 hours a day to accommodate local travel demand and the increased law enforcement of the proper use of HOV lanes. He noted that the change in hours of use would put the area on the same schedule as surrounding states. The new HOV system would offer the following benefits: better connectivity, improved air quality, system efficiency, cost savings (reduced fuel costs), less congestion, and saves time.

Next, Mr. Keller discussed the Active Traffic Management (ATM) system, which includes electronic signs spaced every half mile that provide dynamic messages based on prevailing and predicted traffic conditions. The ATM allows for real-time communication with the public, such as informing them about traffic accidents, road construction, speed-limit changes, and changing the HOV lanes to general purpose lanes in emergencies.

Mayor Pro Tem Lois Tarkanian asked that Mr. Keller follow up on some of the noise complaints she received resulting from Project Neon Construction.

Vice-Chair Debra March asked if the ATM system was tied to the Freeway and Arterial System of Transportation (FAST) system. Mr. Keller confirmed that it is and that NDOT is also looking to connect to the Waycare system to better coordinate response time and avoid secondary accidents.

Chair Larry Brown inquired about the effective date for the change to the 24/7 HOV Lanes. Mayor Carolyn Goodman asked when notice would be given to the public. Mr. Keller responded that a public education campaign was already underway. A media event was scheduled for the end of April and would be followed by a law enforcement campaign. The effective date is mid-May. Chair Brown asked that the RTC members help spread the information and host NDOT at their various public meetings.

Mayor Goodman asked if the hours were changing to 24/7 in perpetuity. Ms. Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer for the RTC, confirmed.

Motion: No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary: No vote was taken.

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 5 THROUGH 38)

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 March 14, 2019 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**6. APPROVE UNIFORM STANDARD SPECIFICATION SECTION 216 FOR HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING OPERATIONS WITHIN PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**7. ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**8. APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN SUPPLEMENT NO. 2 TO THE
**9.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Supplemental No. 1 to the Interlocal Contract to increase Project funding and revise the scope of work that includes an authorization to proceed for construction from Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Funds for construction for Clark County Project 211B2-MVFT; Traffic Signal Improvements Program - Fiscal Year 2019 Clark County (For Possible Action)

**10.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign the Interlocal Contract that includes an authorization to proceed from Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Funds for engineering for City of Las Vegas Project 072H-MVFT; Industrial Road, Boston Avenue to Circus Circus Drive (For Possible Action)

**11.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Supplemental Interlocal Contract No. 2 to increase funding that includes an authorization to proceed for engineering and right-of-way from Fuel Revenue Indexing Funds for City of Las Vegas Project 187A-FTI; Shadow Lane, Alta Drive to Charleston Boulevard (For Possible Action)

**12.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Supplemental Interlocal Contract No. 1 to increase funding that includes an authorization to proceed for engineering from Fuel Revenue Indexing Extension Funds for City of Las Vegas Project 218A-FTI2; Citywide Bottleneck Intersection Improvements: Decatur Boulevard at U.S. 95 (For Possible Action)

**13.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Supplemental Interlocal Contract No. 3 to increase funding that includes an authorization to proceed for engineering and construction from Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Funds for City of Las Vegas Project 194A-MVFT; Symphony Park Infrastructure: Phase 2 (For Possible Action)

**14.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Supplemental Interlocal Contract No. 1 to increase funding that includes an authorization to proceed for engineering from Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Funds for City of Las Vegas Project 203B-MVFT; Safe Routes to School: Harris Avenue, Bruce Street to Wardelle Street (For Possible Action)

**15.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Supplemental Interlocal Contract No. 3 to extend the project completion date for City of North Las Vegas Project 188A-MVFT; Tropical Parkway/Linn Lane, El Campo Grande Avenue to CC-215 (For Possible Action)

**16.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign the Interlocal Contract that includes an authorization to proceed from Fuel Revenue Indexing Extension Funds for engineering for City of Henderson Project 008X-FTI2; Sunset Road, I-515 to Pabco Road (For Possible Action)

**17.** Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Supplemental
| **18.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT THAT INCLUDES AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF HENDERSON PROJECT 223B-MVFT; TRAFFIC SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM: STARR AVENUE AND BERMUDA ROAD (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **19.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT THAT INCLUDES AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS FOR ENGINEERING FOR CITY OF BOULDER CITY PROJECT 135AB5-MVFT; ARTERIAL RECONSTRUCTION: 2019 BOULDER CITY PAVEMENT EVALUATION (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **20.** | APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN SUPPLEMENTAL INTERLOCAL CONTRACT NO. 1 TO INCREASE FUNDING AND CHANGE THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT THAT INCLUDES AN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED FOR CONSTRUCTION FROM MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FUNDS AND APPROVE CHANGE ORDER NO. 1 FOR CITY OF BOULDER CITY PROJECT 175Q1-MVFT; NEIGHBORHOOD REHABILITATION: 2019 CITY OF BOULDER CITY MAINTENANCE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **21.** | RECEIVE A REPORT ON THE RECOMMENDATION FOR BEST BID FOR CONSTRUCTION FROM QUESTION 10 FUNDS FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 190F-Q10; PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE: CIMARRON ROAD AT SUMMERLIN PARKWAY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **22.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CLARK COUNTY PROJECT 007M-MVFT; DECATUR BOULEVARD, CACTUS AVENUE TO WARM SPRINGS ROAD (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **23.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CLARK COUNTY PROJECT 016H-MVFT; CAREY AVENUE, NELLIS BOULEVARD TO TOIYABE STREET (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **24.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF BOULDER CITY PROJECT 060AV-FTI; 1-11 BOULDER CITY BYPASS UTILITY CROSSING (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **25.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 089K-MVFT; LAS VEGAS BOULEVARD, STEWART AVENUE TO SAHARA AVENUE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **26.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 128J-FTI; U.S. 95, ANN ROAD TO DURANGO DRIVE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **27.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 177B-FTI; INTERSTATE 11, I-515 TO U.S. 95 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **28.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 178B-FTI; CITY OF LAS VEGAS PEDESTRIAN SAFETY UPGRADES-PACKAGE 2 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **29.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 180A-FTI; CARSON AVENUE, CASINO CENTER BOULEVARD TO 9TH STREET (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| **30.** | APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CLARK COUNTY PROJECTS 068K-MVFT DIRECT DISTRIBUTION, 068K-Q10, AND 068K-SB5; MOAPA VALLEY ROADS VI (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
**31. APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 128K-MVFT; U.S. 95 OVERPASS WIDENING STUDY, VEGAS DRIVE TO ALEXANDER ROAD TO LONE MOUNTAIN ROAD (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**32. APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR CITY OF LAS VEGAS PROJECT 186A; SKY POINTE DRIVE, ELKHORN ROAD TO CIMARRON ROAD (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 19-09 TO THE 2017-2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**35. APPROVE AMENDMENT TWO TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**36. APPROVE CONTRACT 19-031, ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS CONTRACT - PAINT AND SCRATCH REPAIRS, WITH DENTPRO OF LAS VEGAS, INC., THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE BIDDER, FOR AN ANNUAL NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $140,450.00 FOR THE CONTRACT PERIOD FROM DATE OF AWARD TO MAY 31, 2020, WITH FOUR ONE-YEAR OPTIONS TO RENEW, SUBJECT TO PRICE ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON THE APPLICABLE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE CONTRACT (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**37. ADOPT AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2019 ANNUAL LIST OF CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**38. APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT, INCLUDING TITLE CHANGE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUDGET (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
Vice-Chair Debra March made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda with the removal of Item #16.

**Vote/Summary:**
8 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.
Ayes: Larry Brown, Isaac Barron, George Gault, Jim Gibson, Carolyn Goodman, Debra March, Lois Tarkanian, Rod Woodbury
Nays: None
Absent: None

**Item:**
39. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE MARYLAND PARKWAY ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND ADOPT A LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. David Swallow, Chief Engineering and Technology Officer with the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), presented on the Maryland Parkway Environmental Assessment and adopting a locally preferred alternative (LPA). He began with a review of the goals for the project and the important role the Maryland Parkway bus route has within the RTC’s network. The route has the highest productivity of any general use bus line in the system, second only to the Las Vegas Strip route. It connects to 25 of the 39 bus routes in the transit network and follows a route with a high population of residents and jobs.
However, it is one of the slowest routes in the system. Mr. Swallow recounted that the goal of the project was to not only increase mobility, maximize choice, provide more reliable transport, and make the route faster, but to also make a public infrastructure investment that will instill a sense of place and foster new development along the corridor. He added that the proposed route is similar to the existing route, but will get closer to Fremont Street and have an extension to the Las Vegas Medical District (Medical District).

Continuing, Mr. Swallow outlined the three alternatives available to the RTC Board of Commissioners (Board). The first option, Enhanced Route 109, would consist of decreasing the number of stops along the route, thereby making the route faster, pushing back the stops behind the sidewalk, and upgrading the bus shelters. Some of the considerations for the Enhanced Route 109 include:

- Attracts more riders, but less than bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail transit (LRT);
- Minimal opportunity for transit-oriented development;
- Least construction impact; and
- Increased service can be phased in faster than BRT or LRT.

The second option, BRT, would convert the two curbside lanes on Maryland Parkway to dedicated bus lanes, while still allowing general traffic to use them to make right turns. Separated bike lanes adjacent to the curbs on each side would remove cyclists from vehicle traffic. The number of stops would also be reduced, similar to the Enhanced Route 109 option, in order to speed up the route. He listed the following considerations for the Bus Rapid Transit option:

- Increased frequency, faster travel time, higher ridership;
- Operates like light rail, but not as many riders;
- May attract some transit-oriented development;
- Major reconstruction of the corridor; and
- Higher capital and annual operations and maintenance costs.

The third option, LRT, would convert the two curbside lanes to dedicated transit lanes, while still allowing right turn use for general traffic and include separated bike lanes, similarly to BRT. Considerations for the Light Rail Transit option include:

- Improved community image and attracts new riders;
- Increased frequency, fastest travel time, highest potential ridership;
- Greatest opportunity for economic and transit-oriented development;
- Major reconstruction of the corridor; and
- Highest capital and annual operations and maintenance costs.

Next, Mr. Swallow reviewed the benefits and cost comparison of all three options. The analysis included metrics on ridership, travel time, capital costs, annual operating costs, and maintenance costs. The existing route 109 bus service has over 9,000 boardings per day. Projected ridership for each option is: 10,000 for Enhanced Route 109; 13,300 for BRT; and 16,100 for LRT. Projected travel time for each option is: 44 minutes for Enhanced Route 109; 38 minutes for BRT; and 32 minutes for LRT. He noted that the sharp decrease in LRT travel time was attributed to time gained by easier access for people in mobility devices. He elaborated that with the current system and the Enhanced Route 109 and BRT, drivers have to spend more time to assist passengers in mobility devices to get on or off the bus. LRT allows for self-boarding.

In terms of capital costs, Mr. Swallow continued, estimated capital costs would be $15 million for the current option, $29 million for the Enhanced Bus Route, $345 million for BRT, and $1 billion for LRT. He added that the estimated costs for BRT and LRT had increased from the initial projections presented
to the public, which were calculated in 2016, based on the increased demands in the current construction market. Estimated Operating and Maintenance (O&M) costs total $6.8 million for the existing bus route 109, $7.8 million for the Enhanced Route, $8.3 million for BRT, and $13.3 million for LRT. Based on projected ridership and estimated O&M, the cost per boarding is $2.52 for the existing option, $2.60 for Enhanced Route, $2.08 for BRT, and $2.75 for LRT. He added that BRT yielded the lowest cost per boarding due to the increased ridership, but relatively low O&M cost.

Then, Mr. Swallow reviewed possible funding options for the BRT and LRT options. He stated that the Enhanced Route option was not included in the analysis because current RTC funding could cover the costs. Possible funding sources include:

- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts – a competitive grant program that can support up to 50 percent of the costs to build a project, but typically covers 33 percent of project costs
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funds – federal funds appropriated annually to the Southern Nevada region; local jurisdictions agreed to allocate funds to the proposed Maryland Parkway project should it move forward
- Fuel Revenue Indexing (FRI) – roadway improvement funds were earmarked for Maryland Parkway on the initial ballot measure that could be incorporated as part of the larger proposed project

The FTA New Starts grant, CMAQ, and FRI funds could cover the cost of the BRT option. However, for the LRT option, additional sources would be needed. Possible sources include a Special Improvement District (SID) that would assess a tax to the property owners along the project’s corridor. The RTC estimates that the SID would yield at most $50 million, leaving a gap of $330 million for the LRT option that would need to be covered by new funding sources. He also reviewed the Net Operating Cost (total operating cost offset by fare revenue) for each option. Estimated Net Operating Cost was:

- $4.1 million for the existing option, $4.8 million for the Enhanced Route option, $4.3 million for BRT, and $8.5 million for LRT.

Next, Mr. Swallow discussed the results from the public comment period held February 4, 2019 through March 7, 2019. Various methods of communication were used, including the RTC website and social media, to reach out to the public. The RTC received over 1,000 comments. Approximately 22 percent of the comments were not specific to the proposed Maryland Parkway project and instead were aimed at other general needs. Of the 759 comments received related to the project, nearly 72 percent of them favored the LRT option (550) and 13 percent favored the BRT (96).

Mr. Swallow related some of the questions posed by the RTC Board prior to the present meeting. He explained that the Board was voting to select one of the options as the LPA to help complete the environmental assessment. Regardless of which option was selected, transit fares on the Maryland Parkway route would remain the same as the rest of the system. Connectivity to McCarran International Airport (Airport) would not change for either the Enhanced Route or the BRT as compared to the current route 109 service to the Airport. The LRT option would likely require an elevated track structure to connect to either or both of the Airport’s terminals. The BRT and LRT options would take two and three years respectively to complete construction and would be constructed in phases in order to minimize disruption.

Lastly, Mr. Swallow reviewed the next steps. Once the RTC Board voted on the LPA, it would be submitted to the FTA to close out the environmental assessment. The RTC is anticipating a finding of no significant impact. Then the RTC would apply and look for funding sources and begin project development at the beginning of 2020.
Vice-Chair Debra March asked if it would be possible to change the decision in the future in the event that more funding sources are found. Mr. Swallow responded that the project could continue up to preliminary engineering since it would be the same for all options. If the decision changes, RTC staff would notify the FTA to make the modification and would probably need to do additional public engagement. Ms. Quigley added that making the revision would take approximately six months.

Councilman Isaac Barron asked if the RTC had the funds to cover the net operating costs for the BRT option. Mr. Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer for the RTC, responded that finding the funds for the BRT option would be relatively simple. Councilman Barron followed up with the same question regarding the LRT. Mr. Traasdahl said covering costs for the LRT would be more difficult and would require finding new funding sources or revenue.

Mayor Carolyn Goodman recounted a previous conversation with Ms. Rosemary Vassiliadiis, Director of Aviation for Clark County, about the difficulty in connecting LRT to the Airport. She asked whether, given the difficulty in getting a docking station approved, the LRT option was feasible. Mr. Swallow responded that the LRT would require a connection via an overpass or underground. He would defer to the Department of Aviation as to the impact on the Airport’s operations. An alternate site, north of the terminals, was proposed, but any connection to the Airport would require approval by the Department of Aviation.

Mayor Goodman followed up and asked if BRT would be a more feasible option. Mr. Swallow responded that the BRT option would not have issues since it would follow the existing bus routing. Mayor Goodman also asked if the RTC could expand BRT at the airport. Mr. Swallow said the RTC could expand its presence at the Airport if approved by the Airport.

Councilman George Gault asked if the RTC had reviewed issues other cities had with light rail construction. Mr. Swallow responded that the light rail projects are unique to their respective cities. He kept abreast of some of the issues other cities had. For example, he mentioned Durham, North Carolina was having issues with Duke University. However, Phoenix, Arizona; Denver, Colorado; and Salt Lake City, Utah projects were moving forward. Overall, light rail construction is more difficult than other types of construction. Ultimately, he thought it came down to each community’s priorities.

Councilman Barron expressed concern about the length of time it would take before all the jurisdictions, including his, were connected to the LRT. He asked if there were any plans to increase interconnectivity overall. Mr. Swallow responded that interconnectivity is frequently discussed and analyzed at the RTC. The City of North Las Vegas was the first city with a BRT route. The agency reviews the entire valley and identifies key corridors with higher density and demand and prioritizes them for expansion accordingly to enhance the whole transit network. Council Barron stated that one of his concerns is whether the LRT could achieve the critical mass of ridership to offset the cost.

Commissioner Jim Gibson asked if the FRI funds were available for facets of the LRT option. Mr. Swallow responded that FRI could be used only for roadway improvements specifically. The $125 million in FRI funds mentioned earlier were earmarked for specific items such as paving, curbs, and medians. He also asked whether the $1 billion cost for the LRT included the connection to the Airport. Mr. Swallow confirmed that the LRT capital cost included an estimate for the Airport extension.

Vice-Chair March recognized the community’s desire for LRT and understood that the permanence of the project would create more ridership and development. However, she added that the cost of the LRT project was significant and that the Board needed to take that into consideration. Her inclination was to
support the BRT option with the understanding that RTC staff would continue to the look for additional public and private funding sources to support a larger transit system. Mayor Goodman added that she was in agreement with Vice-Chair March. Additionally, Mayor Goodman requested that the BRT option include a connection to the Airport. Mr. Swallow confirmed that it would be included.

Chair Brown commented that the Board is in a unique situation as it contemplates what the next generation of ridership will look like. There was also the evolving technology with multiple possible options impacting transportation in the near future. He said it created a difficult decision for public agencies to either do nothing or something. He felt it important to move forward in a way that would provide the agency the flexibility to accommodate the possible changes and that the BRT option provides that flexibility. Adding that it is a decision that creates momentum and begins the process for federal funding while retaining the ability to tweak the decision. He also expressed concern about connectivity at the Airport. The options available at the moment seem expensive or impractical. He also felt the LRT estimated cost of $1 billion was low since those types of projects often encounter issues. His biggest concern would be getting the public support for the additional funding needed to complete the LRT project when community priorities are evolving. Strategically, he felt it best to continue to build out the infrastructure in preparation for future technology. He recommended selecting the BRT as the LPA.

Chair Larry Brown invited any members of the public to make comments on the topic. He called on Ms. Aleta Dupree, who made the following comment:

Chair Brown, members, Aleta Dupree for the record. I decided to defer my speaking on this item until the matter is discussed and heard so I could prepare my response. I come to you, as always, as a user of this system. I took the bus today and used the app, and I came here to you, and continue to come here to you as a supporter of rail. I have ridden the 109 many times. It is a difficult ride. I have been to the various meetings for the outreach and discussion of this plan for rail, which I believe was well reasoned and thought out. I’ve been to many cities and ridden rail, and rail is proven. Rail goes back 200 hundred years, we’ve just tweaked it, but I believe in the basics. Rail predates the motorbus, and so it was my hope that we would’ve had rail to be the genesis of a new system to build our city to promote infill development and affordable housing and affordable transportation for our working, retired, and disabled, and school folks. So, we are one of the biggest communities in this country that lacks rail, and I was very excited about the possibility of rail. You know, we have a history of building things and building them well. We’re building a new stadium which is coming along, coming along nicely; home of Raiders football. Hence, my shirt. We’re doing the Las Vegas Convention Center District expansion, which I ride along on the monorail and see the good progress it’s making. Those public structures are very important to me because they help bring about a sense of home. I go to many places, but this community is my home. And, so I wanted a stadium and we’re getting it. I wanted a new expanded convention center campus and we’re getting it. And so, it was, I only hoped that I could’ve spoken to you before you took this vote, but anyway I get to speak with you now, and I will be speaking on my non-agenda items later. But, thank you for your time.

**Motion:**
Chair Larry Brown made a motion to select Bus Rapid Transit as the Locally Preferred Alternative for Maryland Parkway.

**Vote/Summary:**
8 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.
Ayes: Larry Brown, Isaac Barron, George Gault, Jim Gibson, Carolyn Goodman, Debra March, Lois Tarkanian, Rod Woodbury
Nays: None
Absent: None
Item: 40. RECEIVE INFORMATION ON THE MAY 2019 RTC BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING AND DIRECT STAFF ACCORDINGLY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Comments:
Ms. M.J. Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), provided information on the May 2019 RTC Board of Commissioners (Board) meeting. She recommended that the Board reschedule its May 9, 2019 meeting to May 23, 2019 in order to conduct general business and hold a public hearing on the budget in compliance with Nevada Revised Statutes.

Motion:
Vice-Chair Debra March made a motion to reschedule the May 9, 2019 Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada Board of Commissioners meeting to May 23, 2019.

Vote/Summary:
8 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.
Ayes: Larry Brown, Isaac Barron, George Gault, Jim Gibson, Carolyn Goodman, Debra March, Lois Tarkanian, Rod Woodbury
Nays: None
Absent: None

Item: 41. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 AND DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE TO SUBMIT THE TENTATIVE BUDGET TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION BY APRIL 15, 2019 AS REQUIRED UNDER NEVADA REVISED STATUTE (NRS) 354.596 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Comments:
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), presented the RTC Board of Commissioners (Board) the tentative budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020. He began with an overview of the RTC’s funding sources. The top funding sources include sales tax (38 percent), Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (MVFT) (12 percent), Fuel Revenue Indexing (FRI) (15 percent), and grants (16 percent). The total revenue is estimated to be $593.8 million, which is a two percent increase from 2019. Sales tax revenue is projected at a total of $225 million. Mr. Traasdahl then detailed how sales tax distribution is broken down among transit, streets and highways, the Freeway and Arterial System of Transportation (FAST), and Department of Air Quality (DOAQ). He noted that 73 percent goes to streets and highways, 17 percent goes to the Department of Air Quality (DOAQ), and 9 percent goes to FAST. He commented that the MVFT revenue and FRI-1 are projected to remain flat at $74.9 million and $90.7 million respectively. FRI-2 is budgeted at $17.6 million.

Moving on, Mr. Traasdahl highlighted the proposed FY 2020 expenditures. Total expenditures are estimated at $679.4 million, a slight decrease from 2019. Capital Outlay ($276.1 million) is the largest expenditure. Debt service payments for FY 2020 will be $25 million for Sales and Excise Tax Bonds, $36 million for MVFT Bonds, and $26.5 million for FRI Bonds.

Next, Mr. Traasdahl highlighted the FY 2020 transit capital budget, with a total budget estimated at $76.4 million, of which $58.3 million is grant funded. Capital improvements include 60 new paratransit compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles, 30 fixed route vehicles, $64 million of transit CNG fueling...
equipment, $7.6 million for bus shelters and safety enhancements, $10.6 million of Integrated Bus Maintenance Facility (IBMF) and Sunset Maintenance Facility (SMF) state of good repair equipment upgrades, and $10.2 million in technology upgrades. A new project is the GoMed facility for testing autonomous vehicles with an estimated expenditure of $770,000.00.

Operating expenses, Mr. Traasdahl continued, are budgeted at a total of $247.8 million, which is a $1.7 million increase over 2019. Of these operating expenses, the fixed route contract cost is budgeted at $118.5 million, the paratransit contract at $49.49 million, transit security at $8.75 million, and transit fuel costs at $7.7 million. Transit fuel costs have decreased due to the use of CNG.

Vice-Chair Debra March asked how far out the RTC budgets. Mr. Traasdahl responded that the RTC does projections for the next 20 years. Vice-Chair March added that the Finance Committee met last month to review the budget and thought it was a fiscally responsible budget.

Motion:
Vice-Chair Debra March made a motion to approve the tentative budget for submission to the Nevada Department of Taxation.

Vote/Summary:
8 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.
Ayes: Larry Brown, Isaac Barron, George Gault, Jim Gibson, Carolyn Goodman, Debra March, Lois Tarkanian, Rod Woodbury
Nays: None
Absent: None

Item:
42. 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, Chief Executive Officer 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:
43. 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:
Chair Larry Brown called on Ms. Patricia Anderson, who made the following comment:
Good morning everyone. We have, we had a, actually I was on Flamingo bus, on 4/2, and you know the Strip is up and down. They feel that this is a play town. Which it’s not. People got on the bus at Las Vegas Boulevard and they had an open, they had bought, they had whiskey in a bottle. The bus driver told them that you couldn’t, you know, they said you can’t get on here. And, he turned around again and used profanity to the bus driver. I just happened to be on the bus. It was just, I don’t take the bus that often. I happened to be on the bus. So, I went, I have the bus driver’s number. It’s 111275, and he said to me, oh I was running late. And I said well, even though you were running late, that is not
acceptable on the bus. So, these people have dogs. I mean dogs on the bus. A lot of them say, you know, they are service dogs, but they really are not service dogs. And, I feel that they, you know like I said, I don’t cause any trouble, like I said because I try to observe. And, as I say, the drivers are fantastic drivers and they do a fantastic job. They need more, what they really need, and I feel personally, they need, actually at the end of, of the line, they need to be a 30-minute break. I mean, I know it’s not lunch, but it’s like, okay, 30 minutes, regardless what they’re, relax, what have you, in between. Or, either what they need to do sometime if they really are driving, which they’re driving which is true, they need, I mean we’re not worried about a schedule cause these passengers, to be honest with you, disrespect and they’re not there, so what are we, why are we, why are we, why are the drivers have to be on time.
There’s not supposed to, I mean, I mean I’m not saying that an hour or two hours or something like that, but I’m just saying why should the drivers turn around again and respect, these drivers to respect. There were like another incident happened at Palace Station, the driver, you know said it nicely, turn your radio down. This is my radio. He says, I paid for this. This is my phone. I mean this is, this is all disrespect, and then they come in with, alright driver, you know what driver, you know, I don’t have any money, or I left my wallet at home, or like, a lot of stupid stuff going on. So why, like I said again, the drivers, they need a raise, they need to be a raise and they also need to get a pension. This is, I mean, I’ve been, you know they really need a pension. And they need, you know, at least, I mean, I know it sounds crazy, $30 an hour. I know that’s, again, that’s what they need, and these drivers are fantastic. I know my time is up. I’m going crazy. I know. As I say again, you know, and they shouldn’t do that. I mean people, a lot people are homeless which is understandable. And I understand that, but these carts that come on there, it shouldn’t be. So, anyway, thank you so, I didn’t mean to go over my time. God bless you. Thank you.

Chair Brown called on Ms. Aleta Dupree, who made the following comment:
Chair Brown and members, Aleta Dupree for the record. Now, I’m gonna take my three minutes and talk about some other things. So, I am feeling the good effects of these new long buses, and I did go to a meeting where we pretty much retired the double-deckers from our North division. So, I’m hoping that I’ll be able to board long buses when I go up on the 113. Hopefully that will come soon. I am hoping that this agency will really push to be innovative. You know, I discovered recently, well maybe not recently, I’ve been listening to podcasts. I heard a really good podcast with our CEO and Deputy, Deputy CEO on my phone last week. Listened to it while I was riding a bus. Very, very good stuff, so I’m getting a lot of information, but we have to be courageous and take leadership in a global perspective. Seventy percent of Americans have smart phones, so how can we have 70 percent of our passengers using the app to ride the bus, and apps are better than cards. Cards are better than paper tickets. Can we have an electric bus, so we’re not going to have an electric railway right now, but can we have an electric bus? It’s already happening in California and other places. It’s a mandate in California coming on. So, it is important that we be proactive. I think our communications is lacking. I have trouble getting into this meeting this morning because it was not communicated about that the bus stop in front of our county building was closed due to construction. I had to walk all the way here from the Bonneville Transit Station, and so I have a phone. Push notifications would be nice. I was afraid that I wouldn’t make it to the meeting in time, but I did. And, the last couple of days I’ve had trouble calling this number and I get a message saying your call cannot be completed as dialed. This is not what I expect from this agency that I care about so much, and maybe it’s not due to your control, but it should not happen. It’s important that we not hang on to the past as we build this agency out. Equity must be considering the future and allowing all people to be able to participate equitably in all the things that the future has to offer. So, when we want to do something, we have to do it with all our hearts and get behind it and live it, just as I do. Thank you.
Ms. Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), thanked Ms. Dupree for listening to the podcast and said she would follow-up with her regarding the station closure.

Chair Larry Brown called on Mr. Ed Uehling, who made the following comment:
Yes, my name is Ed Uehling, I just wanted to, ask the question basically, why more information wasn’t given. First of all, congratulate you for making this decision because I think in the future the private sector can take care of this problem. As Commissioner Brown well knows, he, you negotiated with the Boring Company for the system at the convention center. And that system is being done for a maximum of $50 million. Two miles of tunnels and, as I said earlier, that would mean if we did tunnels, for if, and a private company can do this, and the Boring Company has offered to build free a system down to the stadium and over to, under the strip, down to the stadium and over to the airport. So, already you have this huge system being built for free and for $50 million under the convention center. They will get that money, but the rest of it will be for free and, and we should be thinking in terms of interconnectivity and the ability to build above this structure, they’re not having big subway cars. They’re not having heavy rail. They’re using Tesla-type vehicles under the, underground that will go on a track and can go right one after another, and transport a huge number of people very quickly, and they at each station they only stop at the station, each vehicle, only stops at the station that is designated. And so, it will go off the track and into that station in the meantime all the rest of the vehicles, all the rest of the transport vehicles, move along at a very rapid speed. So, it’s an incredible system that they’ve come up with and the Convention Authority was brilliant enough to think about these people and listen to them, and, they’re doing amazing things. They’re only on their first level, what you call it, first generation of drilling machine and they’re doing it for $25 million a mile. Their second-generation drilling machine will be out at the end of the summer. They’re working on a third generation which is all electric drill which will be out later, which was, has all sorts of environmental implications. Which will be out later and presumably that can be done for even cheaper. And they’re working with Israel to, and if you’ve been to Tel Aviv, you know how bad the traffic is there. They’re working on the traffic there. A tunnel there for $10 million a mile. So, congratulations for this decision because it allows a lot flexibility and interconnectivity in the future. Thank you.

Motion:  
No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary:  
No vote was taken.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:49 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marin DuBois, Recording Secretary

Marek Biernacinski, Transcription Secretary
Happy Birthday, Angela!
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transdev
Our focus is on eight locations along Boulder Highway

$1.5 million in improvements including:

• Mid-block crosswalks
• Overhead rapid flashing beacons
• Median enhancements
• Advanced crossing warning signs
• New crosswalks

Project Neon

Milestone reached with several ramps opening at I-15 NB and Charleston Boulevard

Improved safety, access and mobility

Create new gateway into Symphony Park, Downtown Las Vegas and Medical District
One Nevada Transportation Plan

The OneNevada Plan equips NDOT and its partners with the strategic direction and essential action to meet Nevada’s current and future transportation needs.

Deputy Director Retiring
ATM Benefits

- Reduces number and severity of crashes
- Travel lane management
- Speed harmonization
- Supports work zone management
- Increases safety
- Improves trip reliability, accuracy of posted travel times
- Improves operations
- Ability to open HOV lanes to all

High Occupancy Vehicles
HOV
Active Traffic Management
ATM
New HOV System

Northbound Access
HOV entrances & exits.

Southbound Access
HOV entrances & exits.

HOV Interchange
Direct connection to HOV lane.

PARK and RIDE
Park your vehicle and proceed to your destination.

HOV Rules

**Yes!**
- Vehicle with 2+ persons
  - Rear lables count.
- Motorcycles
  - Even if only one person.
- RTC Buses
  - With or without passengers.
- Emergency Vehicles
  - Lights on or off.
- Trucks with 2+ axles
  - Even if 2+ persons.
- Pets as passengers
  - 2+ persons must be human, not pets.
- Electric cars
  - 2+ persons.

**No!**
- Vehicle with only one person
  - Minimum of two required.
- 24 hours/day
- 7 days/week
- $250 fine

ILLEGAL TO CROSS SOLID DOUBLE WHITE LINES.
ATM Benefits

- Reduces number and severity of crashes
- Supports work zone management
- Increases safety
- Ability to open HOV lanes to all
- Improves trip reliability, accuracy of posted travel times
- Speed harmonization
- Improves operations

NEVADA DOT
SAFE AND CONNECTED
WHY MARYLAND PARKWAY?

Connects to **25** transit lines

Links **key destinations**

93,096 Residents

High-productivity route

85,685 Jobs
WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

- Improve mobility
- Maximize transportation choices
- Faster, more reliable and attractive
- Instill a sense of place
- Foster economic development

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

PROPOSED ROUTE

- Downtown to airport
- 8.7 miles
- Technology options
  - Enhanced Bus
  - Bus Rapid Transit
  - Urban Light Rail
- 25 station locations
  0.35-mile spacing

Las Vegas Medical District
Downtown
Sunrise Hospital
Boulevard Mall
UNLV
McCarran Intl. Airport
WHAT IS BEING CONSIDERED?

- Enhanced Route 109
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Light Rail (LRT)

ENHANCED ROUTE 109
ENHANCED ROUTE 109

- Attracts more riders but less than BRT and LRT
- Minimal opportunity for transit-oriented development
- Least construction impact
- Increased service can be phased in faster than BRT or LRT
- Lowest capital and annual operations & maintenance costs

BUS RAPID TRANSIT
BUS RAPID TRANSIT

- Increased frequency, faster travel time, higher ridership
- Operates like light rail, but not as many riders
- May attract some transit-oriented development
- Major reconstruction of the corridor
- Higher capital and annual operations & maintenance costs

LIGHT RAIL
**LIGHT RAIL**

- Improved community image and attracts new riders
- Fastest travel time, highest ridership
- Greatest opportunity for transit-oriented development
- Major reconstruction of the corridor
- Highest capital and annual operations & maintenance costs

### ORIGINAL BENEFIT / COST COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Route 109</th>
<th>Enhanced Route 109</th>
<th>BRT Build Alternative</th>
<th>LRT Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership (Opening Year)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Travel Time (Min)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $)</td>
<td>$15M</td>
<td>$29M</td>
<td>$335M</td>
<td>$750M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Cost</td>
<td>$5.9M</td>
<td>$6.8M</td>
<td>$7.2M</td>
<td>$11.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Cost Per Boarding</td>
<td>$2.19</td>
<td>$2.27</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Updated Benefit/Cost Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Route 109</th>
<th>Enhanced Route 109</th>
<th>BRT Build Alternative</th>
<th>LRT Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership (Opening Year)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Travel Time (Min)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $)</td>
<td>$15M</td>
<td>$29M</td>
<td>$345M</td>
<td>$1.0B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Cost</td>
<td>$6.8M</td>
<td>$7.8M</td>
<td>$8.3M</td>
<td>$13.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Cost Per Boarding</td>
<td>$2.52</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BRT Build Alternative</th>
<th>LRT Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA New Starts</td>
<td>$115M</td>
<td>$334M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$105M</td>
<td>$163M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI 2</td>
<td>$125M</td>
<td>$125M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>$50M</td>
<td>$50M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP/Sales Tax</td>
<td>$330M</td>
<td>$330M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$345M</td>
<td>$1.002B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNUAL OPERATING COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Route 109</th>
<th>Enhanced Route 109</th>
<th>BRT Build Alternative</th>
<th>LRT Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Cost</td>
<td>$6.8M</td>
<td>$7.8M</td>
<td>$8.3M</td>
<td>$13.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue</td>
<td>- $2.7M</td>
<td>- $3.0M</td>
<td>- $4.0M</td>
<td>- $4.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Cost</td>
<td>$4.1M</td>
<td>$4.8M</td>
<td>$4.3M</td>
<td>$8.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

**Public Comment Period** *(Feb 4 – March 7)*

**Method of communication:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Website</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail/Letter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Cards Mailed In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Cards at Events</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Reporter</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

**All public comments received:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Bus</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT or BRT</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Rail/Bus/Monorail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

From the 1,002 comments received, 759 provided direct input on the proposed options. They favored:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Bus</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT or BRT</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>759</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

• What is the RTC Board deciding today?
• What are the costs to build each option?
• How could BRT or LRT be funded?
• What is a Special Improvement District (SID)?

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

• What are the ongoing operating costs for each?
• What is the projected ridership for each option?
• What is the projected cost per boarding?
• Would there be higher fares for light rail?
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

• What are the estimated travel time savings?
• How would each option connect to the airport?
• How long will construction take?

NEXT STEPS

• RTC Board adopts Locally Preferred Alternative
• Receive FTA environmental decision
• Pursue local and federal funding opportunities
• Begin project development
FY 2020 Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount (Millions $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>224.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI - 1</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVFT</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI - 2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microtransit</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet-Aviation FT</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$593.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sales and Use Tax Revenue

**YEAR**  | **PROJECTED** | **BUDGETED**
--- | --- | ---
'11 | 142 | 150
'12 | 150 | 159
'13 | 159 | 170
'14 | 170 | 182
'15 | 182 | 189
'16 | 189 | 198
'17 | 198 | 207
'18 | 207 | 217
'19 | 217 | 225

### FY 2020 Transit Operating Revenue

**MILLIONS $**

- **Sales Tax** | $168.6
- **Fares** | 65.5
- **Microtransit** | 3.9
- **Medicaid** | 8.3
- **Advertising** | 4.0
- **Other** | 1.0
- **Total** | $251.3

- **Passenger Fares**: 27.2%
- **Sales Tax**: 66.2%
- **Medicaid Reimbursement**: 3.3%
- **Transit Advertising**: 1.6%
- **Other**: 0.4%
FY 2020 Sales and Use Tax Distributions to FAST, S&H & DOAQ

MILLIONS $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FAST</th>
<th>S&amp;H</th>
<th>DOAQ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S&H: $41.7
DOAQ: 9.4
FAST: 5.8
Total: $56.9

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax

MILLIONS $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>'11</th>
<th>'12</th>
<th>'13</th>
<th>'14</th>
<th>'15</th>
<th>'16</th>
<th>'17</th>
<th>'18</th>
<th>'19</th>
<th>'20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FY 2020 Total Funding Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Millions $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>238.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>276.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>120.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>679.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2020 Capital Outlay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Millions $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRI-2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVFT</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI-1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sales and Excise Tax Bonds

2010: $ 3,290,000
2010B: 22,235,000
2010C: 140,560,000
2016: 36,405,000
Total $202,490,000

FY2020 Debt Service $24,929,893

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Bonds

2010A1: 32,595,000
2011: 64,830,000
2016: 94,165,000
2016B: 43,495,000
Total $235,085,000

FY2020 Debt Service $36,108,248
Fuel Tax Indexing

2014A: $86,680,000
2015: 79,830,000
2017: 145,405,000
Total $311,915,000

FY2020 Debt Service $26,527,225

Highlights of FY 2020 Transit Capital Budget

TOTAL BUDGET $76.4 Million

GRANT FUNDING $58.3 Million
Highlights of FY 2020 Transit Capital Budget

60 Paratransit CNG Vehicles  
$7.2 Million

Fixed Route Vehicles
20 – 40' $12.5 Million
15 – 60' $14.2 Million

85% Grant Funded

90% Grant Funded

Transit CNG Fueling Equipment  
$6.4 Million

Bus Shelters & Safety Enhancements  
$7.6 Million

80% Grant Funded
Highlights of FY 2020 Transit Capital Budget

IBM F & SMF State of Good Repair & Equipment Upgrades
$10.6 Million

Technology Upgrades
$10.2 Million

65-80% Grant Funded

GoMed Build Grant

72% Grant Funded

FY20 Budget
$770,000
72% Grant Funded
FY2020 Budgeted Transit Operating Expenditures

MILLIONS $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>$214.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>$14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$247.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fixed Route Contract Cost

MILLIONS $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contract Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>105.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>110.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>115.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'20</td>
<td>118.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34% increase from 2011 to 2020
### Paratransit Contract Cost

**MILLIONS $**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>33.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>37.99</td>
<td>37.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>42.39</td>
<td>42.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>42.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>40.79</td>
<td>40.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>42.95</td>
<td>42.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>44.72</td>
<td>44.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>46.96</td>
<td>46.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'20</td>
<td>49.49</td>
<td>49.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Percentage Increase:** 47%

### Transit Security Cost

**MILLIONS $**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'20</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Fuel Cost

MILLIONS $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>