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Items 2 and 7 are for possible action. Items 1, 3 through 6 and 8 through 11 are discussion items and no action can be taken. Please be advised that the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) has the discretion to take items on the agenda out of order, combine two or more agenda items for consideration, remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda any time.

1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of August 28, 2019 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
3. RECEIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THE TRAC GOALS, FRAMEWORK AND AGENDA
4. RECEIVE A RECAP OF POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS
5. DISCUSS TRANSIT’S IMMEDIATE UNFUNDED NEEDS
6. RECEIVE A LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND ENGAGE IN A PANEL DISCUSSION WITH STATE LEGISLATORS
7. DISCUSS POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS AND DIRECT STAFF ACCORDINGLY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
8. RECEIVE A RECAP OF THE BORING COMPANY FIELD TRIP
9. DISCUSS UPCOMING EVENTS
10. CONDUCT AN OPEN DISCUSSION ON TOPICS AND DISCUSSIONS FROM THE TRAC AGENDA
11. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

During the initial Citizens Participation, any citizen in the audience may address the Committee on an item featured on the agenda. During the final Citizens Participation, any citizens in the audience may address the Committee on matters within the Committee’s jurisdiction, but not necessarily featured on the agenda. No vote can be taken on a matter not listed on the posted agenda; however, the Committee can direct that the matter be placed on a future agenda.

Each citizen must be recognized by the Chair. The citizen is then asked to approach the microphone at the podium, to state his or her name, and to spell the last name for the record. The Chair may limit remarks to three minutes’ duration, if such remarks are disruptive to the meeting or not within the Committee’s jurisdiction.

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada keeps the official record of all proceedings of the meeting. In order to maintain a complete and accurate record, copies of documents used during presentations should be submitted to the Recording Secretary.

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada appreciates the time citizens devote to be involved in this important process.

In compliance with Nevada Revised Statute 241.035(4), the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada shall create an audio and/or video recording of the meeting and retain such recording(s) for the required period of time.

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada Meeting Room and Conference Room are accessible to the disabled. Assistive listening devices are available for the hearing impaired. A sign language interpreter for the deaf will be made available with a forty-eight hour advance request to the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada offices. Phone: (702) 676-1500 TDD (702) 676-1834

Any action taken on these items is advisory to the Regional Transportation Commission.
AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with State of Nevada Open Meeting Law, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (Committee) shall invite interested persons to make comments. For the initial Citizens Participation, the public should address items on the current agenda. For the final Citizens Participation, interested persons may make comments on matters within the Committee’s jurisdiction, but not necessarily on the current agenda. No action can be taken on any matter discussed under this item, although the Committee can direct that it be placed on a future agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #1
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent
MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
AUGUST 28, 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.
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CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Don Snyder, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. in the Colorado River Room of the Southern Nevada Water Authority offices located in the Molasky Corporate Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Don Snyder, Chair, Community Advocate
Mauricia Baca, Outside Las Vegas Foundation
MaryKaye Cashman, Cashman Equipment
Cindy Creighton, Nevada Taxpayers Association
Krista Darnold, Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
Lee Farris, LandWell Development Company
Betsy Fretwell, Switch
David Frommer, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Barry Gold, AARP
Peter Guzman, Latin Chamber of Commerce
Warren Hardy, Associated Builders and Contractors
Alan Jeskey, AJB General Contractor
Ram Kumar, Kumar Consulting Services
Robert List, Kolesar & Latham
Erin McMullen, Boyd Gaming
Mike Mixer, Colliers International and NAIOP
Paul Moradkhan, Metro Chamber of Commerce
Mike Shohet, Nevada Hand
Todd Sklamberg, Sunrise Hospital
Rick Smith, Henderson Development Association
Sean Stewart, Nevada Contractors Association
Judy Stokey, NV Energy
Jim Sullivan, Culinary Union 226
Danny Thompson, Labor Consultant
Bryan Wachter, Retail Association of Nevada
Virginia Valentine, Nevada Resort Association
Tom Warden, The Howard Hughes Corporation
Cassidy Wilson, Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Paul Enos, Nevada Trucking Association
Ken Evans, Urban Chamber of Commerce

TRAC  Item #2
October 3, 2019
MEMBERS ABSENT CONTINUED:
Karlos LaSane, Caesars Entertainment
Jim Long, Sun City Anthem Resident
Keith Lynam, Greater Las Vegas Association of Realtors
Andy Maggi, Nevada Conservation League
Tommy Morley, Laborers Local 872
Jonas Peterson, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Jean Peyton, Blindconnect

MEETING FACILITATOR:
Helen Foley, Faiss Foley Warren

RTC STAFF:
Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer
Fred Ohene, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
MJ Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
David Swallow, Chief Engineering and Technology Officer
Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer
Angela Castro, Chief Strategy, Policy, and Marketing Officer
Jodie Bare, Director of Data and Innovation
David Clyde, Associate General Counsel
Catherine Lu, Manager of Government Affairs and Media Relations and Marketing
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst

CONSULTANT TEAM:
Guy Hobbs, Hobbs Ong & Associates

INTERESTED PARTIES:
Joseph Norby, City of Las Vegas
Dawn Christensen, Nevada Resort Association
Bob O’Malley, Virgin Trains USA
Alyssa Rodriguez, City of Henderson
Michael Barton, HDR
Joey Paskey, City of Las Vegas
Nancy Amundsen, Clark County Comprehensive Planning
Kami Dempsey, Accretive
### Item: 1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

### Item: 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of June 27, 2019 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
Mr. Bryan Wachter made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

**Vote/Summary:**
24 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.

- Ayes: Don Snyder, Mauricia Baca, MaryKaye Cashman, Cindy Creighton, Krista Darnold, Lee Farris, Barry Gold, Peter Guzman, Warren Hardy, Alan Jeskey, Ram Kumar, Erin McMullen, Mike Mixer, Paul Moradkhani, Mike Shohet, Todd Sklamberg, Rick Smith, Sean Stewart, Judy Stokey, Danny Thompson, Bryan Wachter, Virginia Valentine, Tom Warden, Cassidy Wilson
- Nays: None
- Absent: Paul Enos, Betsy Fretwell, Ken Evans, David Frommer, Karlos LaSane, Robert List, Jim Long, Keith Lynam, Andy Maggi, Tommy Morley, Jonas Peterson, Jean Peyton, Jim Sullivan

### Item: 3. RECEIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THE TRAC GOALS, FRAMEWORK AND AGENDA

**Comments:**
Chair Don Snyder introduced the item with a brief summary of meeting goals and intentions. He shared that there was a consensus among the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) to further explore future and current mobility priorities and resources. Chair Snyder thanked those in attendance before turning the time over to Ms. Helen Foley, Meeting Facilitator, for further item discussion.

Ms. Foley provided an overview of TRAC goals and the framework around which future meetings would adhere, which included:
- Learn about Southern Nevada’s mobility challenges, new developments and opportunities.
- Learn about smart communities, emerging technologies, and how these efforts can impact and improve mobility, accessibility, and safety in Southern Nevada.
- Obtain input and feedback and make recommendations on how to best address and prioritize mobility solutions.
- Explore current and future mobility funding and resources.

She concluded with an overview of the upcoming meeting schedule with tentative dates of October 3, November 7, and December 5, 2019 and a rundown of agenda items to follow.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.
Item:
4. RECEIVE AN UPDATE OF MAJOR PROJECTS IN SOUTHERN NEVADA

Comments:
Chair Don Snyder recounted the history surrounding the desire for a train system between Southern Nevada and Southern California. He then introduced Mr. Bob O’Malley, Virgin Trains USA (Virgin), as the lead for government affairs for expansion of Virgin operations. Mr. O’Malley thanked Chair Snyder and said Virgin plans to build a high-speed rail line between Las Vegas and California, concurring that this is not the first time many in attendance had heard such a pledge. Mr. O’Malley prefaced his presentation by sharing a short marketing video showcasing Virgin’s accomplishments in high-speed rail.

Mr. O’Malley explained that the video referred to the train system as Brightline, noting that it had entered into a strategic partnership with Virgin and would be using the Virgin name.

Next, Mr. O’Malley spoke to Virgin’s intentions of connecting cities that are too far to drive and too close to fly, saying the goal is to reinvent train travel in America. He talked briefly about a current Virgin rail system already operating in Florida and shared slides highlighting system logistics, such as commuter statistics, ridership details, and surrounding transit connectivity amenities. Mr. O’Malley explained that Virgin is not simply a Point A to Point B transportation company, but is more of a hospitality company.

Speaking to financing for the Florida rail project, Mr. O’Malley said funding comes from a mix of equity and debt in the form of tax exempt Private Activity Bonds. This same financial strategy would also be used to fund projects like the one proposed for California to Las Vegas. He also expanded on the notion that Virgin is not just a transportation company by saying it also invests in Transit Oriented Development (TOD). He highlighted TOD improvements in downtown Miami resulting from the Florida rail system integration as well as the amenities available in the immediate vicinity of the train station.

Ms. Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), interjected by asking if Virgin would be including TOD and transit infrastructure focus in a California-Las Vegas rail system. Mr. O’Malley responded that this is a focus, and the company is doing its due diligence in speaking with developers and businesses in the area to ensure the area will be developed to its fullest potential. He said the goal is not to just build a station, but to develop around the station as well. This development would be dependent on market demand and local community input. This could likely include a blend of housing, business, and retail components.

Mr. O’Malley said that Virgin’s western expansion involves a 180-mile corridor between Southern California and Las Vegas. Virgin plans to use electric trains that will travel between 150 and 170 miles per hour. While there are faster trains on the market, it is more cost effective to use trains of this speed and more ideal for travelers. He said the costs associated with trains traveling at over 200 miles per hour are not feasible for this project. The train will initially travel between Victorville, California and Las Vegas. Eventually, the train will extend to Palmdale and tie into the Metrolink system. He said the trip is estimated to take between 75 and 90 minutes.

Mr. O’Malley reported some of the potential economic and environmental benefits because of the proposed rail line. These include an estimated $1.98 billion direct economic impact; 1,000 jobs created (at any given time; 15,000 jobs total throughout construction); 460 jobs created post-rail line construction; 645 million pounds of carbon removed from the air; 811 million vehicle miles removed
Chair Snyder shared Mr. Thompson’s delight in seeing a project that can logistically move forward.

Ms. MaryKaye Cashman asked if either the Florida or Nevada projects require an environmental impact study prior to construction. Mr. O’Malley replied that a record of decision was made in 2011 for XpressWest, the previous company proposing to build the project. The Federal Railroad Administration is doing a re-evaluation, but a new National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process would not be required. This is what attracted Virgin to the area and project initially.

Chair Snyder followed up with a question about right-of-way and easement issues. He also broached the need to work with Union Pacific Railroad (UP). Mr. O’Malley said the right-of-way would be primarily along the median of the I-15 corridor, and an easement would be purchased. He added that a partnership with UP was not necessary as Virgin would be building its own tracks.

Mr. Ram Kumar mentioned his experience of a previous high-speed rail project in California. He opposed the 220-mile-per-hour train because of its costs, noting the voter approved sales tax increase to pay for it. He was pleased that Virgin is being more realistic in terms of train speed and the associated costs. Chair Snyder wondered if that project was still underway and how the political sensitivity of it might affect this project. Mr. O’Malley said this would not impact the California-Las Vegas project.

Next, Mr. Kumar recalled that a previously proposed high-speed rail project between Las Vegas and Victorville planned to extend across the Mojave Desert to the Metrolink upgrade in Palmdale, California. He stated that there were different options for this. One plan was for a multi-infrastructure corridor, that included fiber, along the highway to Palmdale, but would be after the grade. Another option was the CA-58, which goes south of Barstow, California and meets the CA-14. He noted that the latter option is more level. He asked if Virgin had considered either of those options. Mr. O’Malley could not confirm if these were options, but noted that Virgin’s engineering team is looking at all options.

Mr. Rick Smith asked about the project timeline. Mr. O’Malley said Virgin is very aggressive as far as the timeline is concerned, citing how the Florida project went from conception to operation in seven years. He believed this timeline can be improved for future projects. He added that Virgin is targeting construction to begin in 2020 for the Nevada project, with a 36-month build expected. Ms. Quigley chimed in by asking for confirmation that Mr. O’Malley had already chosen an engineering/construction team. He responded affirmatively, but he could not divulge any other information at the time.

Mr. Danny Thompson said that he worked with Mr. O’Malley in the past. Mr. Thompson expressed his disappointment that past attempts to formulate and realize a high-speed rail system like this had not panned out before due to legislature challenges. He was happy with the current progression and said that the realization could be seen in the example of the Florida system already in place. Mr. O’Malley said Virgin hoped to tap into the same incentives available to any company looking to relocate to Southern Nevada. He considered a rail line to be more attractive for incentives because of the permanency of laying tracks in the ground, whereas something like a call center could easily relocate. In response, Chair Snyder shared Mr. Thompson’s delight in seeing a project that can logistically move forward.
Next, Mr. Robert List asked how origination compares in Las Vegas to Los Angeles, asking specifically whether people dropped off in Victorville would have to find alternative transportation to reach and depart a station. Mr. O’Malley said the goal would be to strike a balance, albeit not an even one. He said that the heaviest ridership would be from people in California wanting to visit Las Vegas. He noted that there is ridership from Nevada to California that would increase over time. That said, he expressed that partnership would be sought with rideshare companies like Uber and Lyft, rental car companies in the area, and also destinations. Mr. List and Mr. O’Malley briefly discussed options for specific destinations such as Victorville. Mr. O’Malley said at this point, everything is on the table. Chair Snyder said that there are options that provide some degree of flexibility.

Mr. Kumar joined the conversation again by saying right now only 39 miles of the proposed route is in Nevada, with 150 miles in California. Having worked with both the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Mr. Kumar wondered if there is potential for developing a steering committee at a state level to help streamline the process. Chair Snyder continued the discussion by asking where the governors stand on the issue. Mr. O’Malley said that Governor Steve Sisolak, while new, is intrigued and possesses a healthy skepticism. He is not “all in” just yet. Mr. O’Malley explained that the goal in the near future would be to have elected officials visit the stations and system in Florida to help sway them. Ms. Quigley also confirmed by way of Ms. Angela Castro, Chief Strategy, Policy, and Marketing Officer for the RTC, that there are plans for Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) members to also visit the Florida system. Mr. O’Malley said, on the California side, people are very enthusiastic.

Continuing questions, Chair Snyder asked where Virgin’s organizational infrastructure – offices, staff, etc. – would be located. Mr. O’Malley said the executive team would have offices in Las Vegas. The vehicle maintenance facility would likely be on the California end, but a final decision has not been made. Operating crews would be located between the two markets.

Mr. Barry Gold inquired about the cost for riding the Florida train. He followed up by asking what the costs would be for the proposed Las Vegas-Southern California train ride. Mr. O’Malley prefaced his answer by saying it would be less expensive than the true cost of driving and less expensive than flying. For Florida, there are two coach prices from Miami to West Palm Beach – Smart Coach is $15-20 and Select Coach is $40. Monthly passes for commuters are also available. He provided the caveat that while more expensive than Amtrak, the service level is much higher. He provided an estimate of approximately $60 one way for the Las Vegas-Southern California system.

Chair Snyder thanked Mr. O’Malley for his answers and again expressed the need for a focus on Victorville transportation.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
5. RECEIVE A TRANSIT SYSTEM UPDATE

**Comments:**
Chair Don Snyder introduced the item by recounting how staff provided an overview of the transportation system two years prior, but so much has changed since then that another update was appropriate. He introduced Ms. MJ Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer for the Regional
Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), to provide that update. Ms. Maynard began with an anecdote describing her experience relying on walking and transit to get around when she was younger, which is why she has a passion for transit. She then reminded the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) that the RTC has 39 transit routes with 404 fixed route vehicles servicing 3,300 transit stops. It is the 14th busiest bus-mode transit system in the United States, which saw 64.4 million transit riders at a $114.4 million contracted service cost in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019.

Ms. Maynard said the transit system does not generate a profit and is highly subsidized by taxpayer funding. At the RTC, the average operating cost per passenger is $2.65 while the average revenue per passenger is 99 cents. This means there is a $1.66 subsidy for each passenger trip. She explained that the fare box recovery percentage is the amount collected at the fare box divided by the cost to operate the system, which is currently 37.4 percent. However, she continued, the previous year’s fare box recovery was 44 percent. She noted that the RTC used to realize a 163 percent fare box recovery in the Resort Corridor, and that $6 million supported the local market fixed route system. She stated that this is an indicator that the RTC watches closely.

Next, Ms. Maynard explained how the RTC is mandated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to provide paratransit service 3/4 of a mile boundary around the fixed route transit system. In FY 2019, the RTC provided 1.35 million rides at a cost of almost $40 million. She said that each trip costs an estimated $33.00, one way, and revenue per passenger is $2.07. This means each trip is subsidized by almost $31.00. She emphasized how it is an important service provided to the community, adding that there are regular requests to expand the service. She noted that paratransit service customers are able to use fixed route services for free. She noted that paratransit customers take an average of 2,700 trips on fixed route.

Ms. Maynard said that the RTC provides special services for senior citizens and veterans although the law does not require it. She noted how their quality of life is enhanced as a result of providing these services. In FY 2019, the RTC provided approximately 63,000 senior trips and 28,000 Veterans Medical Transportation Network (VMTN) trips. Ms. Maynard elaborated that the VMTN was introduced a few years earlier and provides active or retired military personnel and their dependents free transportation for medical trips. Additionally, they are eligible for a 50 percent reduced fare on fixed route. There is also a veterans-centric transit route from Downtown Las Vegas to the Veterans Affairs (VA) Hospital in North Las Vegas. There are approximately 320,000 trips per year on that service.

Next, Ms. Maynard shared that approximately 62 percent of riders surveyed through On Board expressed safety concerns when using transit. As a result, the RTC invested nearly $18 million in federal funds to improve safety. She highlighted a few of these improvements, which included: moving bus shelters further away from the roadway; installing 1,000 new shelters to provide shade and improve comfort and safety at stops; and implementing a bollards pilot project at 20 stops to assess whether it enhances safety at stops.

Transit agencies, Ms. Maynard continued, are trying to understand the intersection between technology and transportation. She explained that in the modern mobility climate in which technology is front and center, there are more options for mobility than ever before. The RTC is embracing this through a couple of partnerships with Lyft. First, Ms. Maynard described the paratransit same-day on-demand pilot for paratransit customers. This allows paratransit customers to travel when they want to travel, versus scheduling rides up to three days in advance through paratransit. Paratransit customers
participating in the pilot like the flexibility. She added that there have been cost savings for the RTC as well through the program. The other partnership involves Lyft providing last-mile/first-mile service from 13 designated stops that are the last stops on routes near the Fanatics warehouse. This allows the employees to travel safely between the bus stop and the warehouse. Instead of costing $350,000.00 to provide service to the area, Ms. Maynard said this has cost Fanatics less than $5,000.00 for the service. Other companies have approached the RTC to provide similar service to their employees.

Next, Ms. Maynard reintroduced micro transit on the strip. She recounted how revenue in the Resort Corridor has declined by about $20 million. A customer satisfaction survey showed that people wanted an on-demand service. The Trip to Strip micro transit can accommodate up to 11 passengers. She announced that over 20,000 trips have been taken so far. Staff will assess the program at the end of six months.

In conclusion, Ms. Maynard summarized the existing transit challenges for the RTC. First is the declining revenue and ridership in the Resort Corridor. Ms. Maynard said this is the first year the RTC has had to subsidize transit in the Resort Corridor versus turning a profit. Second is the limited paratransit service area. She noted that the community is asking for more service. Third is the limited fixed route service in developing areas of the Las Vegas Valley. And finally, the limited revenue sources is a challenge.

Chair Snyder remarked that these items were a conversation in themselves. Ms. Maynard said Mr. Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer for the RTC, would go into further detail on these challenges.

Mr. Rick Smith asked if the micro transit vehicle is a free service. Ms. Maynard said it is not. He followed up by asking if there was a feasibility of using this service to take passengers to McCarran International Airport. Ms. Maynard answered by saying that is the number one destination for the micro transit vehicle at this time. She briefly explained how a passenger might use the service.

Finally, Ms. Maynard shared a short video showcasing passenger testimonials pertaining to RTC’s transit system.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
6. RECEIVE A TRANSIT FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), provided a transit financial overview for the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee). He reported that Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 numbers are being audited, so he would be presenting FY 2018 figures.

To begin, Mr. Traasdahl reviewed the revenue for transit operations. He noted that the RTC relies heavily on sales tax to fund transit. While the RTC collected about $75 million in fares, it does not cover all of the expenses associated with providing transit services. Sales tax provides 65 percent of the revenue. He observed that sales tax is currently very robust, but questions what would happen when it is not as robust. He reflected on how sales tax decreased significantly in 2007 to 2010.
Next, Mr. Traasdahl described transit operating expenses, noting that while the total revenue was $237 million and expenses were $231 million, there needs to be a $14 million gap to cover the capital program. The $6 million is not adequate to meet those needs. In FY 2018, he explained, the RTC saw 64.4 million rides on fixed route at a cost of approximately $110 million compared to 1.35 million paratransit rides at a cost of $44.8 million. The RTC spent about $8.4 million for security, $9.8 million on fuel, and about 7 percent of total expenses went to wages and benefits. He noted that this was solely for RTC staff. The “Other” category encompassed a large range of expenses, from utilities to maintenance. Approximately $29.2 million went to other costs. He said staff spent a lot of time trying to reduce costs in that area.

Continuing, Mr. Traasdahl said that, based on current projections, revenue would be overtaken by expenses. He noted that this would not be allowed to happen and said the projections were made without factoring in any kind of increase in service. He also cited a healthy current sales tax revenue, but cautioned that this revenue cannot always be relied on as it is dependent on the economy.

Ms. Virginia Valentine asked about assumptions for expenses as they pertain to the graphs shown, noting that no change in service was already explained. Mr. Traasdahl said that sales tax was conservatively projected at a 3.5 percent increase year-over-year. Ms. Valentine clarified that she understood the revenue side, but was asking about the expense side of the equation. To this, Mr. Traasdahl spoke briefly to scheduled yearly transit contract rate increases, with an expected expense growth year-over-year of four percent.

Ms. Valentine summarized that it sounded like expenses outpace revenue, and the only way to counter this is with additional revenue sources. Mr. Traasdahl explained that this was part of the challenge facing the RTC. Chair Don Snyder chimed in and agreed that this issue is what periodically prompts a repeat of this particular conversation, saying this analysis is meant to provide a transit financial overview. Mr. Traasdahl conceded that if revenue does not change, the only option is to cut expenses. He also revisited sales tax, saying that if a 3.5 percent sales tax contribution does not materialize, the RTC is faced with an even bigger problem than highlighted in the bar graph projection.

Mr. Traasdahl also noted that the Las Vegas Resort Corridor alone has seen a $20 million decrease in revenue year-over-year, which equates to a 29 percent decrease in revenue. He also briefly spoke to the notion of a recession and considerations that this entailed, citing recent treasury yield inversions.

Continuing with questions, Mr. Robert List asked about the source of funds and how federal dollars are used. Mr. Traasdahl said approximately 99 percent of federal grant funding is used for capital expenses. Ms. Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer for the RTC, interjected, clarifying that federal grant money does not fund operational expenses. When asked, Mr. Traasdahl said $60-70 million in capital is spent each year. Mr. List considered how this funding is not guaranteed in the future. To this, Mr. Traasdahl agreed, saying most of federal funding comes from formula grants that the transit industry is very reliant upon. Changing that program could have a big impact. Mr. List expressed that it feels like that grant funding is taken for granted.

Ms. Valentine asked for clarification about the federal grant formula, wondering if lower ridership means less grant money. Mr. Traasdahl confirmed this is the case.

Mr. Danny Thompson asked what Mr. Traasdahl believed contributed to loss of ridership in the Resort Corridor. Mr. Traasdahl simply stated that competition was the cause, such as rideshare companies like Lyft and Uber.
Mr. Traasdahl then revisited the idea of a recession, speaking to what had been done in the past, specifically during 2007 through 2010. During this recession, the following tactics were implemented to combat funding challenges:

- Implemented hiring freeze
- Froze management pay
- Cut travel
- Cut memberships (American Public Transportation Association)
- Reduced contractor costs
- Cut fixed route transit service
- Retracted paratransit service area
- Eliminated paratransit unlimited monthly pass
- Started conversion from diesel fuel to compressed natural gas (CNG)
- Received CNG excise tax credits
- Increased fares

Mr. David Frommer joined the conversation with an observation that only a few of the above-listed tactics were revenue-focused items. Most of the tactics available to RTC seem to be cost and service cuts. Mr. Traasdahl agreed.

Next, Mr. Ram Kumar brought up the revenue funding course of value capture from capital projects. He cited previous revenue funding methods he had been a part of in California such as benefit assessment districts and value capture for capital projects. He asked for more details regarding funding sources. Ms. Quigley said that Mr. Guy Hobbs, Hobbs Ong & Associates, would speak to this later in the meeting.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
7. RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA’S TRANSIT SYSTEM

**Comments:**
Chair Don Snyder segued into the next agenda item by introducing Mr. Guy Hobbs, Hobbs Ong & Associates, who would present information regarding potential funding sources. Mr. Hobbs prefaced his presentation by reminding the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) that the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) will not be able to maintain current service levels based on current revenue projections. Ensuring that the expenditure side is economized is part of the solution. The other part of the solution is finding alternative/additional funding sources. He explained that this was the focus of his presentation – to suggest possible funding sources.

Following a detailed PowerPoint presentations [attached], Mr. Hobbs described factors when considering funding options. This included whether the program funding is for operating or capital needs, the size of the program to be funded, whether there is a nexus between funding sources and program needs, and whether the funding is for a new program or the expansion of an existing program. He listed criteria to be considered when evaluating funding options. This included the following:

- Sufficiency
Stability, predictability, and volatility
Creditworthiness
Horizontal and vertical equity
Administrative ease
Competing needs and political barriers
Exportability
Regressivity

Mr. Hobbs went on to say these were not recommendations, but rather examples of the depth and breadth of things that can be considered. He said that traditional funding methods for transit include fare revenue, sales tax, and grants. Furthermore, he hoped to get the Committee’s reaction to these funding options to determine which ones to research and bring back for additional discussion.

Continuing, Mr. Hobbs detailed some of the possible funding options, beginning with vehicle registration fees. Here, he explained that while this could be used for both streets and highways and transit needs, registration fees could be based on factors not used previously and applied to transit versus streets and highways. Comparatively, some European countries assess a higher excise tax on the purchasing price of a vehicle to pay for some of the public costs associated with owning a vehicle. However, he did not see a broad application for it locally, but thought those that travel in Europe may be aware of programs like this.

Mr. Hobbs suggested another option to be parking fees. He said this could be based upon a percentage of revenue from parking or the number of spaces or perhaps based on the distance from certain centers. He elaborated that spaces within a certain distance would cost more than spaces outside the area.

Then, Mr. Hobbs highlighted Transportation Network Company (TNC) fees and assessments. He observed that the large drop in fare revenue in the Resort Corridor correlates to the introduction of competition in the market, namely in TNCs. He said fees could be assessed based on either revenue generated or a per-trip application.

Chair Snyder asked what other states have done in this regard. Mr. Hobbs replied that they have done either or a combination of both. He added that based on his research, other transit markets have yet to plateau in the decline.

Mr. Robert List asked about fare pricing, wondering if fares were the same everywhere or if fares could be raised in the Resort Corridor. Ms. Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer for the RTC, answered, saying that this was already the case. The fare rate is $6.00 one way and $8.00 all day on the Strip, whereas the regular fare is only $2.00.

Ms. MJ Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer for the RTC, asked for confirmation that TNC fees are assessed on the state level. Mr. Hobbs confirmed TNC fees are assessed at 3 percent. Chair Snyder asked where these funds are utilized, to which Mr. Hobbs and Ms. Quigley said they are retained and used by the State of Nevada. Ms. Quigley noted that these funds go to the Department of Transportation. Chair Snyder remarked that this particular issue was one that would benefit from further discussion and that impact assessment would be pertinent.

Continuing the discussion, Mr. Warren Hardy said that the issue of TNC fees being retained by the state is indicative of a problem. He said that this problem of where to allocate TNC fees has been discussed in the past, but no one has presented a concrete solution. He noted that continuing conversations always
Mr. Hardy strongly stated that the way forward would be for a group like TRAC to conduct a study and present a formal recommendation to the legislature. He felt a solid solution needs to be presented rather than asking the legislature to conduct a study.

Mr. Hardy went on to ask how much of the decline in revenue can be attributed to rideshare companies. He wondered if these companies will always be an issue, or will their business models eventually fail, noting the losses they experience each quarter. He mentioned that further information provided by a subject matter expert would be beneficial in understanding the competition better. Ms. Quigley strongly agreed with Mr. Hardy’s comments, saying that not only are rideshare companies eating into revenue, but they are also causing congestion on the streets that cannot be wrangled. Chair Snyder shared that a recent trip to New York confirmed that TNCs are increasing congestion in areas where they are widely utilized. Mr. Hardy commented that the TNC business model is designed to eliminate the competition, and it is effective, but the business model cannot be sustained indefinitely. He said the right course of action would be to plan for a time when a company like Uber may no longer be in business and to not be taken by surprise when it happens.

Moving on but continuing the conversation, Mr. Bryan Wachter asked if TRAC could reach out to legislative chairs to include them in a meeting about TNCs and compare what is being done locally and at the state level. Both Chair Snyder and Ms. Quigley were in agreement that this was a good idea.

Mr. Danny Thompson shared the sentiment that, having spoken with legislators, they do not want to talk about these issues. He also mentioned their disdain for talking about the gas tax or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a solution. He agreed that TRAC may have to be the ones to “sound the alarm” and press the issues, saying this problem will be compounded very quickly when no funding for transit is available. Ms. Quigley agreed with Mr. Thompson’s comments, saying it would be pertinent to begin crafting direction for the Committee to lead the discussion. She noted that this was the purpose of TRAC – to take the lead on issues the state should act upon.

Ms. Judy Stokey asked for clarification, saying she believed rideshare companies were charged a fee to be allowed to travel to McCarran International Airport (Airport). She asked if a similar fee was assessed for access to Las Vegas Boulevard. Mr. Hobbs said there was a fee assessed for Airport access, but not for Las Vegas Boulevard.

Mr. Hardy shared everyone’s sentiment. He said he believed in capitalism, and if rideshare companies were competing, he would be more understanding. Instead, rideshare companies are cannibalizing the market with their business models. He believes the alarm has already been sounded, and legislators are going to want a concrete solution presented. Mr. Hobbs shared that the rideshare model is going to be utilized, whether it be for transit or something else, and it is important to be in front of that issue moving forward. Mr. Hardy interjected that rideshare companies are not a reliable source of revenue, citing recent quarter-over-quarter losses.

Mr. Todd Sklamberg asked if it was possible to have someone from Uber share its strategic vision or plans with the Committee. He was interested in knowing Uber’s vision of transportation in the next 10 years. Ms. Quigley referred to her experience with Uber on panels she has participated in. She noted that Uber keeps it relatively superficial in regards to long-range plans. Mr. Hardy agreed with Mr. Sklamberg, adding that he felt Uber’s plan revolved around driverless vehicles, but it is not developing technologically. He would like to know what Uber’s “Plan B” is. Ms. Quigley clarified that the RTC would need to make it clear what the expectations of the conversation would be should Uber be willing to present. Mr. Sklamberg said that even declining to present ideas would send a strong message.
Mr. Ram Kumar believed there was no better nexus than the issue of revenue reduction to the public transport system and that the state is already collecting fees. He wanted to know how the fees are distributed to the users. He said transportation has the closest nexus to fees being collected.

The consensus on the TNC issue was that a less emotionally charged and more strategic approach needs to be formulated to progress the issue.

Mr. Hobbs continued his presentation, introducing congestion mitigation fees as a funding option. He explained that it could be done in a variety of ways based on entering certain zones, at certain times of day, and time spent within the zone.

Ms. Mauricia Baca spoke to congestion mitigation, saying that New York City has layered in additional fees for rideshare companies that replicate subway routes. She said this notion also layers into the goals of Nevada in regard to climate change and air quality. Increased congestion increases air quality impact. Incentivizing mass transit can affect air quality. Chair Snyder brought up mobile billboards and their impact as well. Mr. Hobbs commented that, upon exploration of these revenue options, there are many interesting intersections worth considering. It presents an opportunity to think about best practices. Chair Snyder believed VMT is a very “ripe” option to consider for transit funding.

Mr. Hobbs listed several other possible revenue options, such as VMT, event surcharges, electric utility-related charges, value capture through special assessments and tax increment districts, etc., property tax, transient lodging tax, and sales tax. In speaking about sales tax logistics, Mr. Hobbs elaborated on economic changes to goods and services over the last several decades. He noted that, traditionally, goods have been taxed and services have not, with a number of exemptions. The trend shows goods declining and services increasing, which has impacted sales tax revenue considerably. If sales tax is going to be considered as a revenue source in the future, volatility is going to be an issue.

Mr. Hobbs also noted, in regard to sales tax allocation, there is a percentage at the state level dedicated to streets and highways. He wondered if a portion of this could be shifted to contribute to transit. He and Ms. Quigley briefly discussed the dollar amount (approximately $50 million) and how this might be done at a local level and not a state level.

Mr. Hardy spoke to allocation, saying his concern is that this issue would be politically charged. Views on sales tax, in general, play a big role in how legislators position their re-election campaigns. If allocation is a consideration, that money is going to be sought after by a number of sources. He voiced that he was not sure how willing legislators will be to see that sales tax allocated to transportation.

Mr. Hardy then pivoted to say he would like to take a deeper dive into value capture as a revenue option. He mentioned the previous presentation from Virgin Trains USA and its value capture model. Chair Snyder agreed that this was worth discussing further.

Next, Mr. Watcher brought the conversation back to Mr. Hobbs’ chart comparing services and goods. He asked if a 1 percent tax on services would also equate to a 1 percent tax on goods. Mr. Hobbs said the comparison is two-to-one in favor of services over goods. Realistically, he said, some services would never be considered for a tax – such as medical services. Past discussions have boiled down to “amusement” and discretionary services such as entertainment. He returned to Mr. Hardy’s point of expanding the tax base to provide more stability. To this, Mr. Hardy said the pitch to legislators has always been to decrease the sales tax across the board. The reality is different than the pitch. Mr. Hobbs
said, traditionally, percentages were pledged to bonds that could not be altered. As a result, areas not pledged to bonds have to be compressed. Mr. Hobbs cited education as an example.

Finally, Chair Snyder summarized the discussion by saying he saw a number of areas worth focusing on as possible revenue sources. He said a nexus of transportation and transit is a good place to start and noted that fairness and logic are going to be important qualities that carry the conversation. He expressed that the next TRAC meeting would be a good time to expand on specifics.

Mr. David Frommer shared closing comments that focused on how troubling revenue versus expense is to the future of transit operation. He said that the absolute worst time to look at revenue options is when the economy is not doing well and everyone is struggling. If the revenue discussion is postponed until a tipping point, options will be more limited.

Motion:
No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary:
No vote was taken.

---

**Item:**
8. DISCUSS UPCOMING EVENTS

**Comments:**
Ms. Helen Foley, Meeting Facilitator, shared a few upcoming event details. This included the following:
- A trip to Southern California is planned for September 27, 2019 to tour The Boring Company. Interested Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration members should contact Ms. Angela Castro, Chief Strategy, Policy, and Marketing Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada to attend. Space is limited to 15 people.
- A potential trip to Florida to view the Virgin Trains USA system is being scheduled for October or November 2019.
- The GoNV Summit, in participation with the Consumer Electronics Show, will be held on January 6, 2020.

Ms. Foley said the next meeting would also include an On Board study discussion and potential options for Fuel Revenue Index funding spending.

Motion:
No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary:
No vote was taken.

---

**Item:**
9. CONDUCT AN OPEN DISCUSSION ON TOPICS AND DISCUSSIONS FROM THE TRAC AGENDA

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

Motion:
No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary:
No vote was taken.
**Item:**
10. **CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION**

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_________________

Marin DuBois, Recording Secretary

_________________

Marek Biernacinski, Transcription Secretary
August 28, 2019

Item #1

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
Item #2

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Item #3

TRAC GOALS & AGENDA REVIEW
COMMITTEE GOALS

• Learn about Southern Nevada's mobility challenges, new developments and opportunities.

• Learn about smart communities, emerging technologies and how these efforts can impact and improve mobility, accessibility and safety in Southern Nevada.

• Obtain input and feedback and make recommendations on how to best address and prioritize mobility solutions.

• Explore current and future mobility funding and resources.

MEETING FRAMEWORK

• Meeting 2 – Thursday, October 3 at 2:30 p.m.
• Meeting 3 – Thursday, November 7 at 2:30 p.m.
• Meeting 4 – Thursday, December 5 at 2:30 p.m.
AGENDA REVIEW

- Major Project Update
- Transit System Update
- Transit Financial Overview
- Potential Transit Funding Sources
- Upcoming Events

Item #4

MAJOR PROJECT UPDATE
Reinventing Train Travel in America

- Privately-owned, built and operated high-speed passenger rail system, connecting strategic city pairs
- Currently operate in Florida with stations in Miami, Ft. Lauderdale and West Palm Beach; extension to Orlando under construction
- Focus on first-class customer experience
- Opportunities to expand nationwide, connecting other strategic city pairs
- “Too close to fly, too far to drive”
Our Current South Florida System

- Started construction in late 2014, completed late 2017
- Invested $1.5bn in equity; $2.7B in PABs; no operating subsidies; lease of state highway ROW
- Commenced operations in January 2018, opened Miami station in May 2018
- Executed a trademark and licensing agreement with Virgin Group and rebranding to Virgin Trains USA
- Operating hourly service along 67-mile corridor with stops in Miami, Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach

Stations Linked to Multiple Transit Options

- Within five block radius of Miami’s Largest Destinations
- Connecting three transit systems today collectively moving over 30 million people each year, and planned future connectivity to Tri-Rail
- 130,000 sq. ft. of retail, shopping and dining
- Fully integrated with first/last mile travel solutions – formed strategic partnership with Lyft for seamless pick-up/drop-off
Virgi in Miami Central

Las Vegas Expansion

Travel from Southern California to Las Vegas in 90 minutes at less than the cost of driving or flying

1. One-third of all visitors to Las Vegas originate from Southern California
2. Addressable market of 56 million annual trips (1)
3. 1.5 hour train ride vs. nearly 3 hour drive with frequent departures
4. Multiple partnership opportunities with hotels and resorts
5. Will improve travel to the world’s top convention destination.

(1) Represents addressable market for the Las Vegas expansion as supported by the Steer Davies Gleave Ridership & Revenue report.
Economic and Environmental Benefits for Nevada

$1.98 Billion
Direct economic impact to Nevada’s economy

1,000+
Jobs created through rail-line construction

460
Jobs created post rail-line construction

645 Million
Pounds of carbon removed from the air

$11 Million
Vehicle miles removed annually

4.5 Million
Cars removed from I-15 annually

Questions?

Bob O’Malley
bob.omalley@gobrightline.com
(407) 803-3969
Item #5

TRANSIT SYSTEM UPDATE

ABOUT OUR TRANSIT SYSTEM
64.4 Million Passenger Trips in FY 2019

39 Transit Routes

$114.4 Million Contracted Service Cost for FY 2019
**Paratransit Service**

1.35 Million Total Rides in Fiscal Year 2019

$39.9 Million Contracted Service Cost for FY2019

Ride Fixed Route Free

**Specialized Services for Seniors & Veterans**

63K Senior Trips Fiscal Year 2019

320K Downtown & Veterans Medical Center Express (DVX) Trips Fiscal Year 2019

28K VMTN Trips Fiscal Year 2019

$7.3 Million Contracted Service Cost for Senior/ Specialized Services Fiscal Year 2019
ENHANCING TRANSIT SAFETY

Transit Investments Thus Far:

- Re-location of bus shelters
- Improved lighting at bus shelters
- Improved security measures including implementation of LiveTrax

INNOVATION THROUGH MOBILITY ON DEMAND
PARATRANSIT RIDE ON-DEMAND PILOT

WORKFORCE MOBILITY PROGRAM
MICROTRANSIT ON THE STRIP

EXISTING TRANSIT CHALLENGES

- Declining Revenue and Ridership on Strip
- Limited Paratransit Service Area
- Limited Fixed Route Service in Developing Areas
- Limited Revenue Sources
public transport connects people
TRANSIT FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

Item #6

FY 2018 TRANSIT REVENUE FOR OPERATIONS

Total: $237.3
- Sales Tax $155.1 (65%)
- Fare Revenue $75.1 (32%)
- Transit Advertising $3.8 (2%)
- Operating Grants $1.4 (<1%)
- Other $2.0 (1%)

MILLIONS
OPERATING REVENUE AND EXPENSE

DISCLAIMER: TRANSIT BUDGET ONLY

TRANSIT BUDGET & IMPACT ITEMS

- $14 Million Annual Cost for Fleet Replacement
- Decreasing Transit Ridership on Las Vegas Strip
**STRIp Revenue**

![Graph showing STRIP revenue over fiscal years 2015 to 2019.](image)

**DEFICIT FISCAL MANAGEMENT**

WE HAVE BEEN HERE BEFORE

- Implemented hiring freeze
- Froze management pay
- Cut travel
- Cut memberships (American Public Transportation Association)
- Reduced contractor costs
- Cut fixed route transit service
- Retracted paratransit service area
- Eliminated paratransit unlimited monthly pass
- Started conversion from diesel fuel to compressed natural gas (CNG)
- Received CNG excise tax credits
- Increased fares
Item #7

POTENTIAL TRANSIT FUNDING SOURCES

FACTORS WHEN CONSIDERING FUNDING OPTIONS

• Is the program to be funded for operating or capital needs?

• What is the size of the program to be funded?

• Is there a nexus between funding sources and program needs?

• Is the funding for a new program or for expansion of an existing program?
CRITERIA TO CONSIDER WHEN EVALUATING FUNDING OPTIONS

- Sufficiency
- Stability, predictability and volatility
- Creditworthiness
- Horizontal and vertical equity
- Administrative ease
- Competing needs and political barriers
- Exportability
- Regressivity

TRADITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR TRANSIT (RTC)

- Fare Revenue
- Sales Tax
- Grants
REVENUE OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION

- Vehicle registration fees
  - Electric and hybrid vehicles
  - All vehicle types
  - Fees based upon other factors (i.e. weight)
- Vehicle sales surcharges (used in Europe)
- Parking fees
  - Based upon a percentage of revenue from parking
  - Based upon a per-parking-space charge

REVENUE OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION

- TNC fees and assessments
  - Based upon revenue generated
  - Based upon a per-trip application
- Congestion mitigation pricing
  - Based upon entering certain congested zones
  - Based upon time of day
  - Based upon time within the congested zone
- Vehicle miles traveled
- Event surcharges
REVENUE OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION

- Electric utility-related charges
- Value capture
  - Special assessments
  - Tax increment
- Property tax
- Transient lodging tax
- Sales tax
  - Additional tax units
  - Expansion of the tax base
  - Allocation
Item #8 – Upcoming Events

September 27, 2019
Boring Company

Item #8 – Upcoming Events

WE'RE BACK
SAVE THE DATE
GO-NV Summit
Monday, January 6, 2020
GO NV
Item #9

OPEN DISCUSSION

Item #10

FINAL CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SUBJECT:** TRAC MEETING OVERVIEW

**PETITIONER:** TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

**RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:** THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) RECEIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THE TRAC GOALS, FRAMEWORK AND AGENDA

**GOAL:** ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None

**BACKGROUND:**

The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) will review and discuss the TRAC Phase 4 goals, framework and Meeting 2 agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #3
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent
### RECAP OF POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS

**PETITIONER:** Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

**RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:**
That the Transportation Resource Advisor Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) receive a recap of potential transportation funding options.

**GOAL:** Enhance public awareness and support of the Regional Transportation System.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
None.

**BACKGROUND:**
The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) will receive a recap of the August 28, 2019 TRAC meeting, including an overview of the various potential transportation funding options discussed at the meeting. Mr. Guy Hobbs, Managing Director of Hobbs Ong & Associates, will highlight the funding options Committee members expressed interest in further research and exploration as potential funding opportunities.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY  
Chief Executive Officer

---

TRAC Item #4  
October 3, 2019  
Non-Consent
SUBJECT: TRANSIT’S IMMEDIATE UNFUNDED NEEDS

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) DISCUSS TRANSIT’S IMMEDIATE UNFUNDED NEEDS

GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) staff will discuss the immediate needs and gaps in service costs of the current transit system. Staff will also identify and discuss a list of additional unfunded needs for transit should future funding be available.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #5
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJET: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND PANEL DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</td>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER: THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) RECEIVE A LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND ENGAGE IN A PANEL DISCUSSION WITH STATE LEGISLATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

BACKGROUND:

The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) will receive a legislative update and engage in a panel discussion with Nevada State legislators, specifically Chairwoman Yvanna Cancela and Vice-Chairman Chris Brooks of the Senate Growth and Infrastructure Committee and Chairwoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno from the Assembly Growth and Infrastructure Committee. TRAC will receive insight on the legislative process, transportation priorities and funding options and solutions of the 2019 Legislative Session.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #6
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

Metropolitan Planning Organization [ ]
Transit [ ]
Administration and Finance [ X ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT:</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PETITIONER:</td>
<td>TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</td>
<td>THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) DISCUSS POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS AND DIRECT STAFF ACCORDINGLY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL:</td>
<td>ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
In culmination of the October 3, 2019 Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) meeting discussions, Mr. Guy Hobbs, Managing Director of Hobbs, Ong & Associates, will review the list of potential transportation funding options. The Committee will select which funding options it would like to further research and explore.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #7
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent
SUBJECT: RECAP OF THE BORING COMPANY FIELD TRIP

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) RECEIVE A RECAP OF THE BORING COMPANY FIELD TRIP

GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) will receive a recap of The Boring Company field trip to Hawthorne, California, held on Friday, September 27, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #8
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Upcoming Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Petitioner: | Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer  
Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada |
| Recommendation by Petitioner: | That the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) discuss upcoming events |
| Goal: | Enhance public awareness and support of the Regional Transportation System |

**Fiscal Impact:**

None

**Background:**

The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) will receive ongoing announcements of upcoming events occurring in Southern Nevada related to transportation and TRAC discussions.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina Quigley  
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #9  
October 3, 2019  
Non-Consent
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SUBJECT: OPEN DISCUSSION

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) CONDUCT AN OPEN DISCUSSION ON TOPICS AND DISCUSSIONS FROM THE TRAC AGENDA

GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) can share information about activities, meetings, news and other topics of interest pertaining to the Committee, as well as review discussions from the TRAC October 3, 2019 agenda, in an informal manner. While no action may be taken on the subjects discussed, this item provides an opportunity for the exchange of information and may serve as a forum to suggest topics for future meetings of the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #10
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT: CitiZENs Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER: THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with State of Nevada Open Meeting Law, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (Committee) shall invite interested persons to make comments. For the initial Citizens Participation, the public should address items on the current agenda. For the final Citizens Participation, interested persons may make comments on matters within the Committee’s jurisdiction, but not necessarily on the current agenda. No action can be taken on any matter discussed under this item, although the Committee can direct that it be placed on a future agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

TINA QUIGLEY
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #11
October 3, 2019
Non-Consent