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1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
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4. RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE LAS VEGAS CONVENTION CENTER (LVCC) LOOP PROJECT
5. DISCUSS NEAR-TERM UNFUNDED TRANSIT NEEDS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
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8. DISCUSS TRAC NEXT STEPS
9. DISCUSS UPCOMING EVENTS
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11. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
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### SUBJECT:  CITIZENS PARTICIPATION  

### PETITIONER:  M.J. MAYNARD, 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,  

M.J. MAYNARD  
Chief Executive Officer  
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CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Don Snyder, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:36 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
Ken Evans, Urban Chamber of Commerce
David Frommer, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Peter Guzman, Latin Chamber of Commerce
Warren Hardy, Associated Builders and Contractors
Ram Kumar, Kumar Consulting Services
Karlos LaSane, Caesars Entertainment
Andy Maggi, Nevada Conservation League
Erin McMullen, Boyd Gaming
Mike Mixer, Colliers International and NAIOP
Paul Moradkhan, Metro Chamber of Commerce
Tommy Morley, Laborers Local 872
Jonas Peterson, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Todd Sklamberg, Sunrise Hospital
Virginia Valentine, Nevada Resort Association
Bryan Wachter, Retail Association of Nevada
Tom Warden, The Howard Hughes Corporation
Cassidy Wilson, Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Paul Enos, Nevada Trucking Association
Lee Farris, LandWell Development Company
Betsy Fretwell, Switch
Barry Gold, AARP
Alan Jeskey, AJB General Contractor
Robert List, Kolesar & Latham
Jim Long, Sun City Anthem Resident
Keith Lynam, Greater Las Vegas Association of Realtors
Lori Nelson-Kraft, Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority

TRAC     Item #2
December 5, 2019
MEMBERS ABSENT CONTINUED:
Jean Peyton, Blindconnect
Mike Shohet, Nevada Hand
Rick Smith, Henderson Development Association
Sean Stewart, Nevada Contractors Association
Judy Stokey, NV Energy
Jim Sullivan, Culinary Union 226
Danny Thompson, Labor Consultant

MEETING FACILITATOR:
Helen Foley, Faiss Foley Warren

RTC STAFF:
MJ Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
David Swallow, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer
Angela Castro, Chief Strategy, Policy, and Marketing Officer
Catherine Lu, Manager of Government Affairs and Media Relations and Marketing
Nathan Goldberg, Manager of Transit Planning
Jacob Simmons, Principal Transit Operations Planner
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst

CONSULTANT TEAM:
Guy Hobbs, Hobbs Ong & Associates

INTERESTED PARTIES:
Erin Breen, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Chris Brooks, Nevada Senate Senator, Senate District 3
Michael Brown, Nevada Department of Business and Industry
Yvanna Cancela, Nevada Senate Senator, Senate District 10
Kami Dempsey, Accretive
Bob Leuck, Clark County Public Works
Jason Love, Nevada Department of Transportation
Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Nevada State Assemblywoman, Assembly District 1
David Newton, Nevada Transportation Authority
Joey Paskey, City of Las Vegas
Sean Robinson, City of Las Vegas
Jacob Snow, Paceline Consulting
Scott Whittemore, Nevada Taxicab Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item:</strong></th>
<th>1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td>Chair Don Snyder introduced Mr. Michael Brown, Director of the Nevada Department of Business and Industry. Mr. Brown introduced Mr. Scott Whittemore, Administrator of the Nevada Taxicab Authority and Mr. David Newton, Commissioner for the Nevada Transportation Authority. Mr. Brown conveyed the importance for these organizations to better understand the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motion:</strong></td>
<td>No motion was necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote/Summary:</strong></td>
<td>No vote was taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item:</strong></th>
<th>2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of August 28, 2019 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Comments:** | Mr. Ram Kumar asked to correct his remarks of the August 28, 2019 Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration meeting minutes. He stated the following:  

*Mr. Chairman, I just have one point. I was quoted as saying that SR-18 is after the grade in the minutes. It is actually before the grade, before the Cajon Pass. So, just that correction.*  

Ms. Virginia Valentine asked to clarify comments attributed to her in the August 28, 2019 meeting minutes. She stated the following:  

*On page 9 of 15, there are some quotes in here from me, and it says, starting with, “Ms. Valentine summarized that it sounded like expenses outpace revenue, and the only way to counter this is with additional revenue sources.” I don’t think I said the only way to counter that would be with additional revenue sources.*  

Chair Don Snyder asked what Ms. Valentine suggested be the change. She replied with the following:  

*I would just strike after the comment “revenue period.” There were probably other things that could be done. It doesn’t sound like something I’d say.*  

**Motion:**  
Mr. David Frommer made a motion to approve the meeting minutes with the requested changes.  

**Vote/Summary:**  
21 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.  
Ayes: Mauricia Baca, MaryKaye Cashman, Cindy Creighton, Ken Evans, David Frommer, Peter Guzman, Warren Hardy, Ram Kumar, Karlos LaŠane, Andy Maggi, Erin McMullen, Mike Mixer, Paul Moradkhani, Tommy Morley, Jonas Peterson, Todd Sklamberg, Don Snyder, Virginia Valentine, Bryan Wachter, Tom Warden, Cassidy Wilson  
Nays: None  
Absent: Paul Enos, Lee Farris, Betsy Fretwell, Barry Gold, Alan Jeskey, Robert List, Jim Long, Keith Lynam, Lori Nelson-Kraft, Jean Peyton, Mike Shoher, Rick Smith, Sean Stewart, Judy Stokey, Jim Sullivan, Danny Thompson |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item:</strong></th>
<th>3. RECEIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THE TRAC GOALS, FRAMEWORK AND AGENDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Helen Foley, Meeting Facilitator, provided an overview of the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) goals and framework around which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
future meetings would adhere. She began with a few housekeeping items before describing the Committee goals, which included the following:

- 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 by sharing the upcoming meeting schedule and a brief rundown of agenda items to follow.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
8. RECEIVE A RECAP OF THE BORING COMPANY FIELD TRIP

**Comments:**
Due to the delay of a presenter, it was suggested to shuffle the agenda sequence in order to allow the presenter time to arrive at the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee). Chair Don Snyder introduced the item, asking some of the TRAC members that attended to provide a recap of the trip. He first called on Mr. Tom Warden.

Mr. Warden gave the following recap:

> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This picture was taken when we were pretty much wrapping up. It was really the only one that we were allowed to take. When we first got onto the property, I asked Tina if we could take pictures and she said, sure. I wanted thank Faiss Foley Warren for covering my bail. But, really, it was an extraordinary experience. The building that you see behind us, the white one on the left, is SpaceX. There is a Falcon 9 parked in front of it. So, this whole area is just covered with Elon Musk stuff. We were there to see the Boring Company project. It is a tunnel that is 30 to 50 feet below the street level. It runs through the right of way for a little more than a mile. They explained a lot about what goes on. We saw the drill bit, they talked about how it happens, how as they drill every five feet there has to be these armored sections that go in. It is basically made of concrete and steel, and there’s. It’s amazing to see what they’ve really developed here. But the point is, this is about the culture of Elon Musk. It started with an idea that nobody would think could ever work. It’s crazy to think of drilling these 14-foot tunnels and run a Tesla through them. He eventually, of course, wants to do this between metropolitan areas. But, I heard a couple of different figures. The starting figure when this was just an idea, was perhaps as much as a billion in a mile, if not that then 750 million a mile. So, Elon and his team get started under the streets of L.A. in this area of Hawthorne Airport, which is pretty close to LAX, and they start doing it. Typical of the Elon Musk culture, they’re figuring out, why does it cost so much. How much can we do it for less. And they start whittling away at the constraints on timeframes and constraints on budget and they wind up, whittling it down from 750 a mile, to about, maybe 10 million a mile is what I heard. That’s just this stage now. They’re going to build, which you all read about, underneath the Convention Center, and have a couple of stations and it will be a little over a mile. These are demonstration projects. He knows where he wants to go with this. The meeting, the little tour, accommodated with getting a ride through one of the tunnels. What they run through them now are Type 3 Teslas as well as a Type X, but we had a couple of Type 3, one of them was a dual motor. Don said that’s the fast one. So we got into that one. We drove to the other end of the tunnel on surface roads, it took 10 minutes, 15 minutes, something like that. You get on this little plate, and it’s
an elevator that goes down five stories. You are looking at the tunnel, with a bit of a cheesy LED lighting to it.

Chair Snyder interjected, providing a visual of the width of the tunnel. To which Mr. Warden expounded on, saying the following:

*Fourteen feet. Since it’s only 14 feet, they’ve paved a little lane there. There’s white stripes on either side of the lane, and that’s what the car is reading, if they let the car drive. But our driver was NASCAR qualified, and he said are you ready, we said yes, and he floored it. And I mean it was a pharmaceutical rush.*

Chair Snyder exclaimed that the vehicles hit 123 miles per hour. Mr. Warden elaborated with the following:

*In this little tunnel, which felt like 300 miles per hour. It was at that point I was glad I brought a spare pair of pants. It was amazing to get this feeling of whipping through this tunnel, and that’s not what’s going to happen under the Convention Center – 35-40 miles an hour. 50 max. But the point is, that you’re seeing the beginnings of a whole new idea for getting people around. I think It’s pretty cool that Las Vegas is going to be a part of that.*

Next, Mr. Mike Mixer recounted his experience at the Boring Company site, saying:

*My first time experiencing Ludacris mode in a tesla, which was an ultra-fast, rocket ship ride... I was amazed at their goal is to, not only create transportation systems, but the name is the Boring Company, they want to create a standard tunnel that can utilize or be utilized for all different types of mass transit. From a rail, you can put a rail in there, they can put a, they can seal it. Completely sealed, airtight. For the Hyperloop. They can run lanes like we saw, where you can run a car. So they’re creating the standard at a price that’s unheard of: This could really become a viable alternative for many cities with whatever source of transportation that they embrace. I thought it was really impressive.*

Chair Snyder recalled that the project at the Las Vegas Convention Center will be the first fully operational tunnel, noting the one the group visited in California is a demonstration tunnel.

Mr. David Frommer made the following remarks regarding the project:

*Related to the convention center. If you drive by DJ and Swenson, you’ll see the augers, drill rigs, up there working right now. When you think about the promise of something like this, not only in terms of making the Convention Center easier to navigate over this long large area, but the ability to move people back and forth between halls. But Las Vegas has certainly staked itself as the place where the spectacular and amazing the happens. I can only imagine that this kind of thing in our city just becomes one more thing that says, we have to do our convention, have our event in Las Vegas. That’s really amazing. Thinking more broadly about the cities that we live within, we are always struggling with issues of right of way, of capacity, of trying to find ways to move people and move vehicles within constraints that exist that are hard to modify. And the notion of finding an affordable way to go below ground, not disrupt at grade activities, trying to find right of way, and use that area, understanding that there are utilities and other things, just opens up a whole new series of doors to move people around cities. I think we saw that. The promise here, I think, is vast. It really could be an incredible transformation if it finds it way here more broadly.*

Chair Snyder added the following:

*I think the conversations that we’ve had here kind of remote from seeing it, were interesting, but when you see it in person and then experience it, it’s absolutely staggering in terms of what it’s going to...*
happen. And I know having a NASCAR-trained driver taking us 123 miles an hour was great. I feel more comfortable with autonomous vehicles that are kind of breeding things a little bit more. That’s really the intent, is to use these autonomous features of these Tesla vehicles to navigate in these towns. It’s going to be interesting to watch what develops, but we saw a really good head start on what’s been done.

Mr. Warden stated the following:
Completion January of next year.

Chair Snyder remarked, saying:
Is it January? I couldn’t remember the exact date. Anybody remember? It’s the real deal. I think we are all going to have the chance to experience it when it gets done.

Mr. Warden replied:

Mr. Warren Hardy inquired:
Are you talking about at the convention center?

Chair Snyder replied affirmatively.

Mr. Hardy added the following thoughts:
I guess I can’t… You don’t have to explain in any detail, I can’t get my arms around the fact that that kind of technology can work in an area as small as the, I mean I know it’s a big area but, the convention center. Are you satisfied? I trust everyone that went. They are smart people, smarter than me.

Chair Snyder responded by saying:
Speed will be the issue. This is not a high-speed system that is being set up. It is basically just a system to move people. They do have a lot of ground to cover. The promise is really the technology that allows this to be in much more wide open areas where there isn’t the need to stop and go as much.

Mr. Hardy stated:
That I get. I just am incredulous about the application, but if they are going to have it done, somebody thinks it is going to work. I will take this offline.

Chair Snyder began to wrap up the conversation, asking if there were any other thoughts or comments. Mr. Ram Kumar said the following:
A demo project without any obstructions and things like that, when you do the costs estimates, you could lower it as much as you want. We were just working on a project in Downtown Los Angeles. One of the biggest expenses is utility relocation. And you cannot get down to 50 or 60 feet, and even there you have big sewer lines and water mains and things like that. I would be very surprised if it comes down to, comes down that significantly. The cost there, is about 2 miles, it’s about 2 billion dollars. In that kind of very constrained environment with a lot of utilities and obstructions during construction, it is that high, but you could maybe look at 60 percent of that in un-, non-congested, non-downtown areas.
Mr. Bryan Wachter asked the following:
How much surface disruption is there when the tunnel is being built, or when the vehicle is undergoing its process? Is there a lot of surface disruption?

Chair Snyder responded, saying no.

Mr. Kumar added the following:
If I could clarify. It depends on the area because you need these are called tunnel boring machines or TBMs. Whether Elon Musk does it or Scanska does it. It’s the same technology. We are doing 50 feet diameter tunnels because for transit, that is what you need. Fourteen feet diameters are good for a Tesla, but if you put even a Navya kind of a shuttle in there, you’ll need a bigger diameter boring. You have various areas where you have ventilation shafts coming out, you have a place to stage the entire entrance and exit to the tunnels where the tunnel boring machines enter the tunnels and then exit the tunnels. There is a significant amount of surface disruption. I wouldn’t say that in the convention center, it’s primarily under the parking lot, I would imagine.

Chair Snyder answered, saying:
At the convention center you won’t really see that. I will tell you that just the drive that we took, from where we started the tour to where we got into the tesla to take the demonstration ride, there’s a series of buildings that were there before and are still there. Yes, there’s ventilation shafts and things like that. They bought a small facility and created the entrance into it, but for the most part, I was surprised how little disruption there had been to the surrounding area. These tunnels are smaller than the more traditional one. I have been on the board of Tutor Perini Corporation for the last several years, they did the tunnel under Seattle, downtown Seattle. This is much less disruptive than you see in the major projects.

Mr. Kumar closed by saying:
Disruption is more during construction than after.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
5. DISCUSS TRANSIT’S IMMEDIATE UNFUNDED NEEDS

**Comments:**
Chair Don Snyder stated that the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) would move on to discuss Item #5 while waiting for the presenter of Item #4. He explained that this item would provide an overview of transit’s immediate unfunded needs, noting that the Committee had asked Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) staff to provide an overview.

Ms. M.J. Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer for the RTC, concurred with Ms. Helen Foley’s, Meeting Facilitator, earlier remarks regarding transit’s funding gap in the current fiscal year, noting that it will worsen if it is not resolved. She introduced Mr. Jacob Simmons, Principal Transit Operations Planner for the RTC, to provide an overview of the transit system.

Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Simmons explained that would walk the Committee through a series of maps showing 2020 population and employment density in the Las
Vegas Valley (Valley) and how it relates to the transit network. He added that density plays a foundational role in determining transit demand. The first map illustrated the current population density throughout the Valley, with moderate and higher population density being prevalent in much of the Valley. However, employment density is more clustered, but with significant employment concentrations in several areas.

Mr. Simmons displayed a map with a combined population density and employment density, explaining its importance to transit. He then overlaid the current transit network. He pointed out how there is little to no transit service area in the areas with very low/low population and/or job density. Moreover, he noted that the system is missing several pockets of medium and higher density in areas of the Valley such as the northwest, southwest, and the far south. He remarked that transit riders are unable to access these important and growing areas. In addition to these unserved areas, there are areas that have routes that operate at reduced frequencies despite a higher level of ridership. These long wait times mean inconvenience for transit riders, which can depress ridership.

Next, Mr. Simmons shared maps with population and employment density projected in 2025. He explained that when the population and employment densities are combined, areas like the northwest, southwest, and far south will develop with densities similar to the rest of the Valley. These areas will look similar to the other areas of the Valley in terms of activity and the demand generated, but they will not have any transit service. He said that the existing issue of certain pockets in the Valley having no transit access will worsen to large portions of the Valley being unreachable by transit. He felt that this negatively impacts the entire region because it means those that are transit-reliant are excluded from certain areas of the Valley.

Mr. Simmons then presented potential new routes, route extensions, and frequency increases to existing routes. He explained how these improvements are designed to resolve existing gaps and provide a reasonable level of basic transit service across the developed area. This would be phased in over five years, adding that the RTC’s On Board study is a visionary, long-term plan for what would be needed to take transit to the next level in Southern Nevada. He emphasized that the current discussion is about the basic needs.

First, Mr. Simmons remarked that six new transit routes are needed in the near-term to provide basic transit service to the major unserved corridors. These routes would help complete the transit grid. The additions include routes along Ann Road, Harmon Avenue, Russell Road, Blue Diamond Road, Cactus Avenue, and St. Rose Parkway.

Next, Mr. Simmons said that other areas would need an extension of an existing route to resolve existing gaps in the transit network. Many of these extensions would lengthen routes farther north or south, while others are infill on major streets in older areas.

Finally, Mr. Simmons explained that some existing routes justify higher frequency than what the RTC is currently able to provide. General Market ridership, which is ridership outside of the Resort Corridor, is at a post-recession record high, indicating a still growing need for more transit service on popular routes.

Mr. Simmons summarized how these additional routes, extensions, and frequency increases would provide service to nearly all areas with combined medium or better density. In the end, these adjustments to the transit network would make fixed route service available to an additional 260,000 residents and increase frequency for hundreds of thousands more.
Chair Snyder made the following remarks:

I think we all recognize that we’ve had incredible growth here. Compounded growth on top of compounded growth creates needs in all different arenas. But certainly from a transit point of view, it’s not inexpensive to expand the routes and there is limited resources and that is a big part of why this committee has, in this particular phase, to focus more attention on resources, because it is a funding, a resources issue, if we are going to provide services to those areas that are part of our growth. I made a comment at the last meeting, that I had a chance to go to an event out in the Skye Canyon area. I was blown away at how much has happened out there in the last two years. I think we can all appreciate and understand the impact of this growth but then the impact it has on the RTC is difficult.

Mr. Ram Kumar stated the following:

Maybe I should wait until the presentation is over, but I am just taking up to the top now what we heard. Density has always been an issue in transit. Provision of transit services. If we look at traditional transit, which has been primarily fixed route service, density has been a major issue, but in the recent about five years or so, mobility is become more, mobility solutions, which is a seamless transition between types of transit, reduce it make it very cost-effective. For example, we’ve talked about micro transit, we have talked about autonomous vehicles going into areas where the density is low, feeding to the high-capacity fixed route services. So, there are cost-effective ways of seamlessly integrating different types of public transportation or mobility services. I am sure it will come up. I was just thinking that the density issues and the first mile last mile issues have been a problem as long as transit has existed. But today, we have the technology and means to choose the solutions. The types of solutions that are cost-effective and can address these kinds of issues.

Mr. Simmons responded, saying that Mr. Kumar made a good point. He said that the current discussion revolves around the places and corridors that have the density to support fixed route transit. However, he continued, there are certainly areas in the Valley that do not have the density for fixed route, but there may be other tools or other techniques that can be employed to provide transportation. These corridors are where traditional fixed route transit would not be cost effective. He added that it is about using the appropriate tools in the appropriate places.

Ms. Maynard clarified that this one- to five-year-plan is part of the overall On Board study the RTC is wrapping up. She added that mobility options are important and the future of transit is not just about 40- or 60-foot buses. The RTC has a menu of options it is looking to for the future, but all of this will take funding to support.

Mr. Kumar added the following comments:

Just to respond to MJ, one thing, yes they would require funding resources, but I was talking more about cost-effectiveness, a toolbox of solutions that we have. I think today we have the technology. Because a lot of when it comes to funding, we talk about TNCs. A lot of people have been criticizing the impact of TNC on transit. I don’t look at it as negative part as a piece of the solution for mobility. So I think cost-effectiveness of a toolbox of solutions is probably what we’d be looking for when we want to move ahead five years.

Mr. Simmons responded that in order to remedy some of the lack of coverage, adding the six previously mentioned routes would provide basic service to those unserved corridors. He noted that those areas have the density to support that type of transit.

Chair Don Snyder asked how many routes there currently are in the RTC transit network. Mr. Simmons replied that the RTC currently has 39 routes. He recapped the need for the additions to the network,
saying that in reference to Chair Snyder’s fundamental question, this is an expensive endeavor – even when done cost effectively. These improvements would require about a 36 percent increase in resources versus today’s service. He elaborated that this is a substantial increase, but it is still slightly below the amount of fixed route service per capita the RTC operated in 1999. Thus, it is well within historical norms.

Ms. Cindy Creighton asked:
Do you have to have fixed route to have paratransit? Or can you get paratransit service on Blue Diamond and St. Rose?

Mr. Simmons replied that the RTC follows the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. He elaborated how the paratransit service area would expand with the expansion of the fixed route system.

Mr. Ken Evans looked for clarification on the discussion, saying:
I was trying to follow your comments. Essentially what you are saying is, even though we are below post-recession numbers, our system demand is still growing and will continue to grow.

Mr. Simmons reminded him that the General Market ridership is at a post-recession high, while the Strip ridership is significantly down. He said the General Market ridership was at its peak in 2007 and 2008 as a result of high fuel prices. However, during the recession, ridership declined because of the high unemployment rate. General Market ridership is reaching that pre-recession high, but the challenge, he explained, is in the population growth, which is 15 to 20 percent higher than that period. He noted that per capita, transit is lower than that time.

Mr. Jonas Peterson inquired with the following:
Do we know how our level of transit funding per capita stacks up to similar metro areas around the west?

Ms. Maynard referenced information gained through a University of Nevada, Las Vegas researcher hired to contact the top 50 transit agencies in the United States to ask that question. She recalled that the RTC falls below the mean and has less funding in Nevada for transportation than most peers.

Mr. Ram Kumar followed by remarking:
When we look at the last chart, we still have fixed route, paratransit as the most. I still feel that moving forward we need to start looking at demand responsive systems, which can play a really significant role, because access to transit is one of the impeding factors. So, if we can provide better access by improving public transportation or availability for – that’s why TNCs are getting these demand because of demand responsiveness. So, if we could add another, actually, probably have an overlay the fixed route system would probably have to change in a way. We did that when we started implementing rail transit. We removed the bus transit and restructured it so it became an access to rail transit. Similarly, we could remove some fixed route, because fixed route is a higher cost than access. You could have between maybe 18- and 40-foot buses – 18-passenger and 40-foot buses and provide access to it. I think the costs, I agree with you, if you looked at it from a traditional standpoint in terms of a fixed route and paratransit. This is probably going to be the cost model you are going to come up with. I don’t know if it can overlay on that, a restructuring of the transit route so that your fixed route and paratransit system is supplemented, complimented by demand responsive system.
Ms. Maynard concurred, adding that the RTC is exploring smaller, alternative transportation options that could help connect people to transit hubs.

Mr. Bryan Wachter had questions about costs. He asked:
*Can we go to that cost slide? Can you explain? I am trying to understand why it costs more every year. Is it because as these routes come on line? How quickly would all six of these routes come into service? Over what period of time?*

Mr. Simmons remarked that those numbers include a sum of each improvement type – new routes, extensions, increased frequencies. The concept was that an increase of this magnitude would need to be phased in over a five-year period, adding 20 percent of the improvements each year. He noted that the capital costs would come in the earlier years and the later years would mostly be maintaining operating costs.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

### Item:
4. RECEIVE A RECAP OF POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Guy Hobbs, Hobbs Ong & Associates, provided a recap of the potential transportation funding options. He began by saying that given changes in the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada’s (RTC) revenue structure, which was largely attributable to the change in fare box recovery, there is a shortfall in revenue for operating expenses. Mr. Hobbs reflected on the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC or Committee) of the discussion regarding funding options for the future of transit that took place at the October 3, 2019 TRAC meeting.

First, Mr. Hobbs advised that Committee members keep a few things in mind when thinking about funding options – whether the funded program is for operating or capital needs, the size of the program, 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. Other key attributes to keep in mind included, whether the revenue sources are sufficient and sustainable over time, some are more predictable and reliable, creditworthiness, the administrative ease associated with the revenue, competing needs and/or political barriers, exportability, and the regressivity of the source.

Next, Mr. Hobbs reviewed funding sources for transit. He began by listing the traditional funding sources, which include fare revenue, sales tax, and grants. However, he noted that grants are geared towards the capital side of costs versus operating. Then he reviewed the list of potential funding sources for consideration in the future. These were highlighted at the October TRAC meeting. He briefly shared the various options. He noted that he was not making recommendations of funding sources, but was asking the Committee to help select the most viable options to develop further.

Chair Don Snyder then elaborated on this last point, saying:
*I am going to pick up on that. The previous two slides, you went through a whole laundry list of potential options, things that we discussed. We really did have a good dialogue. We summarized some of that before you got here today. The whole purpose was to get down to a manageable list of potential items. We are not going to vote on and pick a, or b, or c today. What we are saying, we have gotten*
through our previous discussion down to five items that we think do make sense for additional study to see how they could provide answers to the funding, revenue issues that we have. Sources of funding issues that we have. I think this really does capture the essence of what we talked about. Are there any questions or comments? I would like to take them now. The purpose of today’s conversation is to say are these the five that we want to have Guy and his colleagues spend time on to get additional information to come back with specific recommendations.

Mr. Ram Kumar commented, saying:
Actually, these five that we always talk about. One of my questions was, does the vehicle registration fees, we had talked about having the vehicle miles traveled. For example, when they send you renewal notices, they were to ask you for your odometer readings, and based on that, like the insurance companies do some of them, if we did that, we just need to be a little careful that we are not double dipping into that. A lot of the TNC comments that we have heard is because they are on the street a lot and they add to congestion and so on. So, if we are going to have separate TNC fees, which their drivers are paying vehicle miles traveled as well as congestion mitigation pricing, then it might be sort of triple, double dipping or perceived as that. That was my comment.

Chair Snyder responded by saying:
We do have to be careful. It goes back to one of the doctrines we talked about before. That is of fairness. I think that we want to come up with something at the end of the day that passes the fairness and reasonable test. To double and triple dip does not do that.

Mr. Warren Hardy stated the following:
I think that is the list. And, I don’t feel strongly about this, but I would hate to see us take event surcharges and electric utility related charges off the table at this point, especially when it comes to the electric vehicle question and the question of relative of the Strip. Again, I don’t feel strongly about it, but it is something I’d like potentially to have more discussion on.

Mr. Hobbs spoke to Mr. Kumar’s comments, explaining that in examining these concepts, it is wise to not only look at the amount of a fee, but to also think about how it is applied. He used sales tax as an example. When looking to fund something, the discussion is often related to changing the sales tax rate. Whereas, in developing this concept, altering the sales tax base could be considered. He summarized that these are not single concepts, each would need developing and there would be overlap with some of them.

Mr. David Frommer added:
The two that I think should be considered by some of the comments, are the VMT, or vehicles miles traveled, and, to a lesser degree, the event surcharges. I think those things that drive or are components of use of infrastructure and drive use of the infrastructure are reasonable elements to consider in terms of the use of public transit and more efficient use of that infrastructure through other modes than private vehicles. Those to me, seem to resonate a bit, again VMT a little more than event surcharges because they are really about the use of infrastructure that everyone uses for transportation. How do you support public transportation as part of that?

Mr. Andy Maggi commented with:
I agree about the comments about the VMT. I want to also make sure, this goes back to another slide when we are looking at criteria to consider. I also want to make sure that when we are looking at anything on this list, we are also considering potential impacts of adopting new technologies, particularly thinking around the impacts transit and transportation have on pollution in our
community. When you look at vehicle surcharges, registration fees, we’ve seen in other states, that they apply those fees and it has a fairly chilling impact on sales of things like electric vehicles, which we should actually be encouraging. The electrification of our transportation system. Just in terms of the things we are considering as we evaluate these different options is what impacts are they going to have on the rest of the system. And other considerations like quality of life, livability, pollution, things like that.

Ms. Virginia Valentine remarked the following:
I don’t know if you are going to ask us to vote on this today, but I am seeing this list and what you are asking is to act on to vote the first time. I would like to be able to discuss this and get input from my members. I would also just say, sometimes these are kind of odd conversations to have when you’re talking about just one piece of everything we need here in Nevada because at the end when you get to the legislature, it’s a more holistic discussion that would include something like K-12, or Higher Ed, transportation, property tax reform, and a variety of other things. I would either ask that we not take action today, or I will abstain.

Chair Snyder asked Mr. Hobbs:
In the ideal world, what were we hoping to accomplish today in terms of an action by the group?

Mr. Hobbs explained that the Committee was presented with a long list of options to consider. He elaborated how many of the options would require more research and information for the Committee to recommend moving them forward or removing them as a viable option for the RTC.

Chair Snyder responded, saying:
That’s a good summary. I think it gets to your point, Virginia. We are not going to reach an ultimate conclusion here. We are going to get additional information so there are thoughtful recommendations that we can go forward with and make sure it kind of passes the test and review that we need to go through with our various constituents. The approach we are taking today is just to narrow the list to get additional information. At the next meeting, we are going to have a more robust conversation that allows us to have the additional input that may reach beyond this group.

Mr. Kumar added the following:
Guy, when you were discussing the previous slide with the longer list, is it fair to say that some of these shorter little list items would include two or three from the longer list. For example, registration fees could actually include vehicle miles traveled, because until we get the technology to put in every vehicle, that could be a mechanism to identify the vehicle miles traveled over here. Similarly, the parking fees could go into the congestion mitigation pricing.

Mr. Hobbs concurred, explaining that when further developing the options, every aspect would need to be identified and where those parts could be adjusted to achieve the desired outcome.

Mr. Hardy added the following comments:
Would it be helpful to, instead of looking at in terms of specific taxes, to look at it in terms of subcategories or categories. To Ram’s point, what do we do about participation, what do we do about congestion, that kind of thing? And look at it in terms of those. It’s pretty hard to say that one of these is a better method. I look at vehicle miles traveled. The only reason that wasn’t on any recommendation I presented is because I understand the political barriers with that. Where we have done, where that’s the first thing we looked at for year, but it just doesn’t get there. It doesn’t mean it’s not the best method. Maybe we look at it from that perspective. How do we deal with the participation without
Chair Snyder asked to hold on Mr. Hardy’s comments. He then called on Mr. Paul Moradkhan, who made the following comment:

*I have to echo Virginia’s comments. Also, for the Chamber, I will have to go back to Committee members for our government affairs committee. I will be abstaining on this today.*

Chair Snyder made the following remarks:

*What I’d like to suggest, it picks up on the comments that have been made. Let’s take this conversation, it’s going to inform the type of analysis that Guy does and our next conversation is going to be a drill down into these areas. It is going to help to get us to the point where we do feel comfortable in getting additional input from our constituents, and also be able to move forward with clear direction to staff with regard to where the focus should be as we move toward the legislature.*

Mr. Hobbs noted that he had received enough direction to begin reducing the list.

**Motion:**

No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**

No vote was taken.

---

### Item:

6. **RECEIVE A LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND ENGAGE IN A PANEL DISCUSSION WITH STATE LEGISLATORS**

**Comments:**

Ms. Helen Foley, Meeting Facilitator, introduced the panelists, which included Nevada State Senators Yvanna Cancela and Chris Brooks, and Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno. She highlighted their respective leadership roles in the state legislature before moving on to the panel discussion. To begin, she asked them what each of them sees as the current transportation priorities for Nevada.

Senator Cancela stated the following:

*Thank you all so much for having us here today to have this important discussion. It’s not an accident that some of the best ideas for transportation and infrastructure for our state come out of the TRAC committee. We have a lot of opportunity to do great things as it relates to transportation and infrastructure and the state. It’s clear to me that the time for us to have a big imagination about how we better move Nevadans across the state, and certainly within the City of Las Vegas is both here and urgently pressing because our city is getting bigger. We have more and more opportunities for exciting businesses and growth and we need our transportation infrastructure to match that. At the state level, I think, one of the most important things we have done is we have really worked to restructure NDOT so that it has much more collaboration with groups like the RTC and our different local groups that are really on the ground and in the community. For a long time it seemed like there was a disjointment that didn’t really serve the folks who are doing the work every day. Changing that has been really important. I am excited about the new leadership in the department and the way that the state is recognizing that it has a role to play in making sure we are all talking to each other.*

Senator Brooks shared the following:

*I think the three biggest issues in transportation that the state is facing, in my personal opinion, is one, we should be delivering people – tourists – to the resort corridor and Downtown in the most efficient way possible and quickly as possible. Imagine when you go on vacation, that golden hour, that first*
hour when you want to spend as much money as you possibly can, why do you want to be waiting around to do that. Secondly, electrification of our transportation system. Because that’s the trend in manufacturing, that is the trend, in the automobile industry. Also, we have a mandate to decarbonize across the state, and the only way we are going to get there is through massive electrification of the transportation sector. And, the third thing is providing public transportation for the residents of Southern Nevada. And, that was an excellent presentation on some of the holes and what growth is going to look like. Those bright red spots where we are going to see so much industry and so many residents and business. Two of those really bright red spots are in my district, one is in Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno’s, and one is in Senator Cancela’s. Those are our residents and we have to figure out how we can get them to work and play in an efficient manner and affordable manner. I don’t know how your children are, or your younger constituents, they have a completely different relationship with the automobile than I had or my parents had, and their demand for public transportation and other options is far greater than that of my generation. Those are the three biggest issues I see that the state plays a role in.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno added her thoughts, which included the following: Thank you for having us here today. I guess I am the new one to the Transportation Energy, I am the baby. Although I am the chair of the Assemble Growth and Infrastructure Committee. But when you ask me about what those transportation needs are, it comes from what I hear from my constituents. And the first one is accessibility. I have a single mom in my district who does not have a car, so to get to work, she takes public transportation when she can. In the summer it’s easy, because her kids are out of school. But to get her kids to school and then get to work, she said she would have to leave an hour and a half to two hours early just to get to work on time. That’s just not reasonable for this mom, so the accessibility. As we move to a clean state as far as transportation. The electrification of our highways is probably number two, and I feel it’s important for our state. But then we have to have roads to ride on and drive on, and it’s the funding of those highways and our streets, and not just the funding, but the upkeep and maintenance of those streets. I think those will be the top three things that we should be, I feel we should be looking at as a state.

Ms. Foley recounted the conflict for electric and hybrid vehicles. They are great for reducing pollution and the use of fossil fuels, but still use the same roads that fuel taxes pay to build and maintain. She asked the legislators if they had ideas for a mechanism to capture revenue from these vehicles to help build and maintain roadways.

Senator Cancela responded first, saying the following: Nevada generally is an anti-tax state. Saying the word tax generates a lot of emails, at the very least to our inboxes. If you ask folks about taxing electric vehicles, the overwhelming majority of Nevadans, around 70 percent, say yep, we’re game, we are on board with that. It’s because the majority of Nevadans drive gas vehicles. I think the easy thing would be to say, we’ll just tax electric vehicles at registration and we’ll create some sort of additional fee or create some sort of tax and call it a day. That would be a very unimaginative and un-innovative way of thinking about what is less of a conflict and more of an opportunity in my mind. I am excited about the work that was done this session so that in the interim, we are looking at the vehicle miles traveled potential solution as well as a broad set of different ways that we can take into account the fact that electric vehicles are on our roads and will grow in number on our roads, and that we need to continue to pay for the upkeep and maintenance of our roads. I’m interested in seeing what comes out of those discussions. I am hesitant to prescribe a set solution off the bat, because I don’t think that we have done the deep work to really figure out a solution that works for Nevada. We need to have the projections as to how much money we’re going to be losing out on as the electric vehicle fleet grows in the state. We need to be thinking about what road
projects are immediate and need funding, and what the cost of having more electric vehicles without getting revenue from them towards those projects means. And we need to be cognizant of the loss, of the impact that fuel vehicles on our environment and what we lose by continuing to allow for fuel vehicles to be the majority of vehicles as it relates to air quality standards and what that means for our overall population. There are lots of factors to look at. I think we are going to come out with something that both makes sense in terms of what we need financially, but also speaks to the needs of the innovative and staying ahead of the curve on making sure that we promoting electric vehicles.

Next, Senator Brooks made the following remarks:

The reality of it is that, regardless of what we do as policymakers or what the collective, the brainpower in this room would like to see happen, the economics are going to drive this. In the same way they have with renewable energy, amazingly everybody supports it now that it is the cheapest form of energy that there is. It’s kind of amazing what happened politically between the last two sessions, as a result of really the finances associated with renewables. It is going to happen even more dramatically with electric vehicles. Like was mentioned, 2025, there’s going to be more, probably as many, options for electric vehicles or more than there are for internal combustion engine vehicles. There’s this kind of stigma attached to electric vehicles right now, that it’s for the wealthy and it’s this kind of niche market and tax them. Well it’s 98 percent of the population that say tax that 2 percent. That would be the simple and the expedient thing to do, but absolutely short-sighted. And that’s why I have said I will fight any bill, and I have, for any electric vehicle fee. I just think that sets the wrong precedent. If we are going to get over the hump on electrification and decarbonization, which are huge things that need to happen, the political reality is, we have to fix we have to come up with an equitable solution to road funding. I think that is step one before we can achieve our goals on decarbonization. For the shear politics of it, and so, we only get two more bites at the apple before that 2025 timeframe when I think we are going to see a hockey stick of adoption of electric vehicles. We will be in a situation, we will be in a crisis trying to fund our highways if don’t get out in front of it. In my particular opinion, it’s the VMT. However collected, VMT is the only option. We’ve looked at some and I am glad to see there are so many ideas floating around, but that’s definitely where I land as a policymaker.

Chair Snyder added to the conversation, saying:

It speaks to the fairness of it. We are using the roads and a vehicle miles traveled seems to be a pretty good common denominator that allows people to make the choices if they want to use carbon, internal combustion engines. It seems to add fairness to it.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno made the following comments:

Now, I would agree it does seem to pass the fairness test, but as she was saying that the emails during the legislative session, we did not feel comfortable passing legislation that would enact a fee upon electric vehicles. The data just wasn’t there that I felt comfortable with as chair of the committee. But surprisingly, in some of our stakeholder meetings we had during the session, the DMV, when we go and get our vehicles smogged and they take our mileage, I am sure most of my committee members assumed that information was getting reported back to the DMV and they could tell me how many miles I traveled in a year. We found out that was not happening. So that was one of the first fixes we had to do was to change that. But we also passed a bill where we are now gathering that information, not just how many miles were traveled, but the type of vehicle and what fuel source that vehicle has. We will have that data when we go back in so we can make an educated decision on what those fees should be. Even though we felt we were doing the right thing, we still got back emails saying I was “big brothering” and getting into their business. Those that with new rules – that currently do not have to give their vehicles smogged will now have to report miles that they travel. but you can’t sit here and say that this is the one solution. And this interim, we tasked our self with doing this study on EVs so we can
find out what that best solution is. And when we do that, it’s to have you all as part of that solution so that when we go back to the session, we know what the legislation is because we will have the data behind it to make that educated decisions for what’s best for us.

Ms. Foley noted that the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) will be interested in following up and participating in the conversations around transportation and funding solutions. She then segued into a conversation on transit and the current shortfall in the transit budget. She noted that the impact of Transportation Network Companies (TNC) on the Strip revenue was affecting the entire transit budget. She highlighted some of the options discussed to close this gap, asking the panel for their thoughts on the issue.

Senator Cencela made the following remarks:
I have the honor of representing the Strip and Maryland Parkway as part of my district. I am also on Maryland Parkway every day. I live off of Maryland Parkway. I go to school on Maryland Parkway. It is my street. Being able to have both in the district means that I think about transit both in how we move people who are visiting and are making sure that they are spending their dollars here that helps our economy run. So how do we help move people that are reliant on RTC services and are really trying to figure how to move from point a to point b to make their lives better whether it is for work or for school or to just get around town. And it’s very clear to me that our investment in transit relies on the thoroughfares where we are able to generate revenue. So the Strip revenues being down is a problem for the RTC system because those revenues drive RTC’s systems on thoroughfares that are in the red and not in the black. I understand the system balances itself. That is not a sustainable model as we continue to evolve. It is not sustainable for constituents on Maryland Parkway to rely on the Strip corridor to be successful for them to be able to get from point a to point b. It doesn’t work and it assumes that we will always a high level of revenue across our tourist-driven thoroughfares. Which we hope we do, but is not necessarily the case. So we need to be exploring different options that don’t burden the people that rely on our transit options today. So continuing to increase fees on individuals is not, in my opinion, the best way to go because it just burdens folks that are already potentially economically unstable or are in an economic hardship situation. We need to think bigger. I really believe it is a community wide effort, because even folks who don’t currently rely on public transportation know the value of public transportation. Because when you step outside of Las Vegas and you are able to take the light rail in Phoenix or the Metro in DC, whatever it is, people have had experiences with what happens high-functioning public transit systems. And we have the potential to really grow on what is already an excellent system. I’m interested in figuring out how we get community investment. Either through some sort of ballot initiative to increase our sales taxes. I think that is an interesting option. I think it’s interesting to talk about what public transit could look like in Las Vegas and use that as a catalyst to get folks bought into a wider investment whether that’s through a tax or it’s through some sort of other option. I think about this a lot because it’s part of my day to day. I rely on folks like you all who are in this work in a much deeper way, much broader way to help inform with how we come up with solutions.

Ms. Foley recounted that the Legislature gave the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) the ability to propose a sales tax increase via ballot measure and then extended that ability for a few years. Unfortunately, Ms. Foley continued, the Legislature also gave Clark County the ability to increase the sales tax. On another note, Ms. Foley wondered how the panelists felt about a possible assessment on TNCs. She added that this would require legislative action since the state law does not allow for an increase on TNCs specific to transit.
Senator Cancela provided the following comments:

We now have enough data on TNCs to figure out whether or not the legislation we put into place when we enabled them to operate in our state, got it all right. Usually when you have something as large that creates such an overhaul in that way that we move people in the state, like what happened with TNCs, there’s usually pieces that need to be fixed. It’s interesting to see what’s happening in places like California where they are changing the pay structure for TNC drivers to offer to treat them like employees instead of independent contractors. That may change the way that those companies operate overall. I think that we need to look at TNC revenue and how it’s affecting our overall transportation industry, especially as it pertains to public transportation and our taxicab companies. And we need to be thinking about future projections for TNCs, because what we have seen is that in some cities, they increase congestion, which is certainly true here where we have more and more TNC drivers on the road, more cars on the roads, and what that means and whether or not there should be a privilege to operating a TNC license, attached to some sort of fee or revenue generating system.

Ms. Foley recalled the TRAC’s previous conversations about expanding the sales tax bases versus increasing the sales tax rate. She asked what the panel thought about this idea.

Senator Brooks replied, saying:

I answered kind of both of those questions. I don’t think that sales tax is the best method for funding this. I think it’s regressive and we keep going back to the well because we constitutionally have allowed municipalities in the state to do that. I just don’t think that’s sustainable. I think ultimately it hurts those that can afford it the least. As far as expanding the base, I think that any great community has great public transit. When we look at all around the world, look at the community. So, we want to model ourselves after, for our residents in the state of Nevada, they have robust public transit. It allows folks that have mobility without having to invest their own transportation. That is a key component. I think that that is a public good that helps our economy overall and that our state and our municipalities should be helping to fund that and encourage that. So, I think that expanding our revenue flexibility in a more broad sense as a state is necessary. For me, that means that the property tax, we wanted to take that off the list because it’s such a hot potato, but until we fix, what I consider is a horribly flawed property tax system in the state of Nevada. This hole we are talking about, this budget hole, is just one of the many. I think that it is a responsibility of the state to invest in public transportation and it is also necessary to fix our horribly flawed revenue system to be able to meet that responsibility among many others.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno added her thoughts, saying:

I agree with that, but if you are not a part of this group in this room, Joe Blow citizen doesn’t know there is a $12 million hole in the budget. They just don’t. We have to figure out a way to message that to our constituents so that they buy into it, so when they are talking about, we need education in the state of Nevada. We need great hospitals and doctors and nurses. We also need our constituents to also say, we need to have a better transportation system. We are ready and willing to invest in that. How we can get that accomplished, so that the messaging. I don’t know that if there is a fee or an additional fee, we do need to look at the legislation. I wasn’t there when it passed. I can say it was wasn’t my fault. But we do need to go back and look at and tweak that. I don’t want to see the additional fees put on the drivers themselves. Only because so many of the drivers are people who are using this as a second income – a way to make ends meet, to make rent, to feed their kids. It’s the company that if there’s an additional fee that’s in place, that I feel that it should go to, I know it will be probably trickled down to the riders that are using those services. Perhaps that is where it should be. When I call for a ride, I have to take responsibility in helping that driver to pay that bill. They’re using the road to help me get somewhere
as a rider in their vehicle. But I don’t want to see those that are the least of these taking on the bulk of filling that hole.

Ms. Foley then asked if there were any questions for the panel. Mr. Ram Kumar made the following comments:

I just wanted to expand the scope of our conversation a little bit. Historically and traditionally, most transit capital projects were funded predominantly funded by the FTA. Where FTA would fund 80 percent and the local agency would fund 20 percent. That funding depended a lot on the Highway Trust Fund, which again, depended on the gasoline tax. Now, we know that both the gasoline tax at the federal level is going down. Highway Trust Fund is likely to go bankrupt pretty soon. The administration, depending on the administration in power, the contribution to transit could be anywhere from 40 percent to 50 percent, not 80 percent. So, when we are convinced that transit capital projects need to move forward, how do we, and we know that federal funding is going to be very limited, how do we create a consensus among both the elected officials and the population here to say we need to do this in order to build these projects. Most of the funding sources that we have talked about, they are great for operational expenses, which are going up as well. But we are looking at a funding for capital projects, one project at a time, and the main roadblock is the funding that we can come up with locally for capital projects. I was wondering if you had any thoughts on that issue.

Senator Brooks replied with the following:

It’s a huge problem. In our state, we are probably one of the worst states at capturing federal funding – whatever that type of funding is – because of matching funds, our inability to match funds. Which speaks to our overall revenue structural revenue problem we have in the state of Nevada. Until we fix that, I think we will always have issues with any matching funds, matching federal funds. But I think that what you mentioned earlier and was mentioned by someone else as well, having flexibility in how we move forward with our projects, so that we don’t box our self into massive infrastructure spending projects that may not be the most effective or will find themselves complete out of date by the time we finish them. I think that having the demand-response that the consumer demands, regardless of what great ideas we come up with, on large grand infrastructure projects, but also that rapidly changing technology, which we just mentioned today, the Boring Company, autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles, all of these things. We can’t box our self in from a technology or infrastructure standpoint. I think that that lightens the load of federal dollars needed. Whether it be elevated highways or rail systems. All of these kind of really infrastructure heavy projects that I don’t know are going to look so good 10 or 15 years from now. I think we need to look at it in a different way. Until we kind of come up with, we grow up as a state and are prepared to have matching funds, we are going to leave a lot of federal dollars on the table.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno added the following comments:

What we did do this last legislative session, we did not have a federal matching fund account in this state. We were able to pass that the last legislative session. The last day of the session we were able to get a few dollars put into that. I would like to grow that coming back next session. But to do that, we have to find those unique projects that we can go after and then find those fertile funds and prove that, yes, if we put a million dollars out there, we can bring three million dollars in. We have to find those unique projects within our state to go after those smaller dollars in the beginning so that we can go back and say, here’s the data, this is what we brought in, and perhaps it will be easier to get through those money committees to get more money put within that federal matching account.
In closing, Ms. Foley thanked Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno for her foresightedness as the sponsor of the legislation for the federal matching fund account. She thanked the panelists for their participation and insight into transportation funding.

Senator Brooks announced the Legislative Committee on Energy would be meeting in November. Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno confirmed that the meeting would be held on Friday, November 16, 2019. Chair Snyder said RTC staff will provide that information to TRAC members.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
7. **DISCUSS POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS AND DIRECT STAFF ACCORDINGLY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**Comments:**
Chair Don Snyder suggested that further discussion was needed regarding the potential transportation funding options and any recommendations should be held until a later date.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
9. **DISCUSS UPCOMING EVENTS**

**Comments:**
Ms. Helen Foley, Meeting Facilitator, noted that there were not any events or announcements. Chair Don Snyder reiterated the importance of the Legislative Committee on Energy mentioned earlier in the meeting.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

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

**Comments:**
Mr. Michael Brown, Nevada Department of Business and Industry, contributed the following:

*The Department of Business and Industry regulates taxis, it regulates Uber, Lyft, rideshare, towing companies, a whole variety of transportation mechanisms. The disruption you are seeing in public transit has also occurred for the regulatory agencies as we attempt to figure out how we regulate an industry that is constantly changing. Scott Whittemore has worked diligently this year to sustain the regulatory regime for taxis, and advance steps to help protect, keep the taxi industry, help keep it viable on the Strip with his new program. It was data driven to try to move to a zone system. In trying to figure this out, Governor Sisolak challenged us to think outside the box. I went to DC in April and met with Pew, and I met with Brookings and talked to them about how do jurisdictions regulate industries that are in the process of being disrupted. And a fellow at Brookings said to me, of course you are meeting with your regional transit planners, aren’t you? I said, no, I don’t think we are. So, that’s why...***
we are here today. We are here to learn and understand what’s going on. David Newton is the commissioner based here in the south, just a few blocks away. Scott Whittemore is based here in the south on East Flamingo. We look forward to working with the RTC staff. We have data that perhaps could be helpful in your decision making process. Ultimately, these two gentleman are still regulators, and there are lines that separates where we go, I guess that fine line between gospel and heresy. We will stay on that side of the line, but we are available to provide the subject matter expertise we can, as you deal with these challenges as Brooking suggested we do.

Ms. Mauricia Baca made the following comment:
I just want to echo the comment that was made during the panel about the need for public education. MJ and I were just talking about that earlier. I find myself having so many conversations with individuals who comment that, “I’d like to see a bus route to Red Rock or up to the Wetlands Park.” I go into a conversation about how difficult it is and costly it is to add routes and the types of things that go into it and the fact that we now have lost our profit-making route in that capacity. I agree, I think the vast majority have no idea how much it costs or the fact that our transit system runs at a loss and so, when you talk about the need to increase the funding, a lot of folks don’t realize what kind of disadvantage we are already at.

Ms. M.J. Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), added that she recently had that comment with staff, noting it can be a difficult conversation when the economy is doing well.

Chair Don Snyder suggested that further discussion was needed regarding the potential transportation funding options and any recommendations should be held until a later date.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
11. 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 4:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marin DuBois, Transcription Secretary
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 3** – Thursday, November 7 at 2:30 p.m.
- **Meeting 4** – Thursday, December 5 at 2:30 p.m.
AGENDA REVIEW

• Potential Transportation Funding Recap
• On Board Immediate Transit Unfunded Needs Discussion
• Legislative Update Panel Discussion
• Potential Transportation Funding Options Discussion – For Possible Action
• The Boring Company Field Trip Recap
• Upcoming Events

Item #4

MEETING RECAP OF POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING
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
- Vehicle sales surcharges (used in Europe)
- Parking fees
- TNC fees and assessments
- Congestion mitigation pricing
- Vehicle miles traveled
REVENUE OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION

- Event surcharges
- Electric utility-related charges
- Value capture
- Property tax
- Transient lodging tax
- Sales tax

POTENTIAL REVENUE OPTIONS

- Vehicle registration fees (EVs, hybrids, etc.)
- Transportation network company (TNC fees)
- Congestion mitigation pricing
- Value capture
- Sales tax
ON BOARD IMMEDIATE TRANSIT
UNFUNDED NEEDS DISCUSSION

FY 2020 $12 MILLION
PROJECTED FUNDING GAP
2020 COMBINED POPULATION & JOB DENSITY

2020 Combined Population & Job Density with Current Routes
2025 POPULATION DENSITY

2025 JOB DENSITY
2025 COMBINED POPULATION & JOB DENSITY

2025 COMBINED POPULATION & JOB DENSITY WITH CURRENT ROUTES
SHORT-TERM UNFUNDED NEEDS

- New routes
- Route extensions
- Frequency increases

SHORT-TERM UNFUNDED NEEDS: ENTIRELY NEW ROUTES
SHORT-TERM UNFUNDED NEEDS: ROUTE EXTENSIONS

SHORT-TERM UNFUNDED NEEDS: FREQUENCY INCREASES
2025 COMBINED POPULATION & JOB DENSITY WITH PROPOSED NETWORK

Year 1

- Fixed Route - Operating: $16.50
- Paratransit - Operating: $1.20
- Capital: $8.40

Year 2

- Fixed Route - Operating: $11.10
- Paratransit - Operating: $2.10
- Capital: $17.40

Year 3

- Fixed Route - Operating: $8.60
- Paratransit - Operating: $2.60
- Capital: $26.90

Year 4

- Fixed Route - Operating: $7.50
- Paratransit - Operating: $2.90
- Capital: $36.80

Year 5

- Fixed Route - Operating: $4.20
- Paratransit - Operating: $3.10
- Capital: $47.30

SHORT-TERM UNFUNDED PRIORITIES – COST

PROJECTED COST OF ADDITIONAL FUTURE SERVICE

MILLIONS $
Item #6

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE PANEL DISCUSSION

Legislative Panel Discussion

Senator Yvanna Cancela
Chairwoman, Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure

Senator Chris Brooks
Vice Chairman, Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Chairwoman, Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
Item #7

POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING OPTIONS DISCUSSION

POTENTIAL REVENUE OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION

- Vehicle registration fees (EVs, hybrids, etc.)
- Transportation network company (TNC fees)
- Congestion mitigation pricing
- Value capture
- Sales tax
THE BORING COMPANY
FIELD TRIP RECAP

Item #8

THE BORING COMPANY
FIELD TRIP RECAP

Item #8 – The Boring Company
Item #9

UPCOMING EVENTS OR ANNOUNCEMENTS

Item #10

OPEN DISCUSSION
Item #11

FINAL CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: TRAC MEETING OVERVIEW

PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, 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 3 agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #3
December 5, 2019
Non-Consent
AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: LAS VEGAS CONVENTION CENTER LOOP PROJECT UPDATE

PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE LAS VEGAS CONVENTION CENTER (LVCC) LOOP PROJECT

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 an update on the Las Vegas Convention Center project.

Respectfully submitted,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

js
### SUBJECT: NEAR-TERM UNFUNDED TRANSIT NEEDS

**PETITIONER:** M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

**RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:**  
THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) DISCUSS NEAR-TERM UNFUNDED TRANSIT NEEDS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

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

---

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None

**BACKGROUND:**

At its October 3, 2019 meeting, the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) received information about the immediate needs and gaps in service costs of the current transit system in the Las Vegas Valley. Additionally, TRAC was presented with, and discussed, potential transit funding options.

This item is to provide TRAC with a recap and update on the discussions from its October meeting. Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) staff will also provide a summary of near-term funding briefings with local jurisdictions. TRAC will then discuss potential near-term transit funding options for the RTC to consider.

---

Respectfully submitted,

M.J. MAYNARD  
Chief Executive Officer
RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANIES

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 an update from Holland & Hart staff on transportation network companies (TNC), including Nevada’s legislative and policy structure of TNCs. Following this, a representative from the Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA) will provide a presentation on the NTA’s role as it relates to TNC operations in Nevada. Mr. Guy Hobbs, Managing Director of Hobbs Ong & Associates, will also provide a brief summary of TNCs in other cities and states.

Respectfully submitted,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #6
December 5, 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><strong>SUBJECT:</strong> TRANSPORTATION FUNDING INTERIM STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETITIONER:</strong> M.J. MAYNARD, 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><strong>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</strong> THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY WORKING GROUP’S INTERIM STUDY RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION FUNDING IN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL:</strong> ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None

**BACKGROUND:**

Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) No. 3 was adopted during the 2019 Nevada State Legislature. SCR 3 directed the Legislative Committee on Energy to conduct an interim study to consider alternative solutions for transportation funding in Nevada. The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) will receive an update on the interim study.

Respectfully submitted,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #7
December 5, 2019
Non-Consent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT:</strong> TRAC NEXT STEPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETITIONER:</strong> M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</td>
<td></td>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</strong> THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) DISCUSS TRAC NEXT STEPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL:</strong> ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None

**BACKGROUND:**

The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) will discuss TRAC Phase 5 and next steps for TRAC in 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

Respectfully submitted,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC    Item #8
December 5, 2019
Non-Consent
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: UP COMING EVENTS

PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, 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,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC    Item #9
December 5, 2019
Non-Consent
### AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT:</strong> OPEN DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETITIONER:</strong> M.J. MAYNARD, 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><strong>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</strong> THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (TRAC) CONDUCT AN OPEN DISCUSSION ON TOPICS AND DISCUSSIONS FROM THE TRAC AGENDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL:</strong> 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 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 December 5, 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,

M.J. MAYNARD
Chief Executive Officer

TRAC Item #10
December 5, 2019
Non-Consent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT:</strong> CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETITIONER:</strong> M.J. MAYNARD, 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><strong>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT THE TRANSPORTATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL:</strong> 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,

M.J. MAYNARD  
Chief Executive Officer  

TRAC Item #11  
December 5, 2019  
Non-Consent