



NEVADA LEGISLATURE REGIONAL RAIL TRANSIT ADVISORY WORKING GROUP

(Assembly Bill 256 [2025])

MINUTES

January 26, 2026

The first meeting of the Regional Rail Transit Advisory Working Group for the 2025–2026 Interim was held on Monday, January 26, 2026, at 1 p.m. in Room 165 of the Nevada Legislature Office Building, 7230 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3137, Northern Nevada Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and video recording of the meeting are available on the Working Group's [meeting page](#). The video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblymember Max E. Carter II
Hugh Anderson, Managing Director and Partner, Hightower Las Vegas
Tommy Blitsch, Secretary-Treasurer and Principal Officer, Teamsters Local 631
Justin Jones, Commissioner, District F, Clark County Commission
M.J. Maynard-Carey, Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Jacob Snow, Business Development Specialist, GCW Engineering, Inc.

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Skip Daly
Angela Fuss, Assistant Development Services Director, City of Reno
Jim Gee, Director of Public Transportation and Operations, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County, Nevada
John Hester
Christopher Martinovich, Transportation Manager, Transportation Division, Carson City Public Works

WORKING GROUP MEMBER ATTENDING REMOTELY:

Cole Mortensen, Principal Consultant, Parametrix

WORKING GROUP MEMBER ABSENT:

Richard Landon (Excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Alex Drozdoff, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division

Keely Latham, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division

Crystal Rowe, Assistant Manager of Research Policy Assistants, Research Division

Asher Killian, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Aaron MacDonald, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments or clarification.]*

AGENDA ITEM I—OPENING REMARKS

Assemblymember Carter:

Good afternoon, everybody and I apologize for that brief delay—we got things straightened out. Welcome to the first meeting of the Regional Rail Transit Advisory Working Group. Ms. Rowe, will you please call the roll?

[Roll call was taken.]

Assemblymember Carter:

Welcome to everybody here—packed house—in Las Vegas and those of us joining by teleconference and videoconference in Carson City and those listening over the Internet. To give everyone a brief lay of the land, we will begin this meeting with a public comment period. We will then move on to member and staff introductions, as well as procedural items—like the Working Group brief and certain expectations for the Group. Next, we will hear a short overview from our Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) members, and then we will have a discussion about this Group's upcoming work. Finally, we will close with our second public comment period.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Assemblymember Carter:

With that, let us get started with public comment. Public comment may be provided in several ways including in person, via phone, email, and mail. Detailed instructions to provide public comment are listed on the meeting agenda. With that, any public comment here in Las Vegas?

Aaron Harris, Member of the Public:

Hello, good afternoon. I am here because I believe in the transformative potential of passenger rail to help unlock Nevada's economy, our people, and our land. A healthy transportation system is one that balances all modes of transport, not just sinking all of our resources into one mode. If we can add a 12th and 13th lane to I-15, if we can build an interstate bridge across the Black Canyon; we can build a regional transportation system that works just as well.

Transportation policy should ask how many people can we move quickly, rather than how many cars can we move quickly? Nevada's road safety crisis underscores that urgency. In Nevada, we have seen traffic fatalities increase roughly 30 percent over the last decade and we are well above the national average—that trend highlights the need for safe alternatives to car-dependent travel.

We see models around the world, and closer to home, proving what is possible when bold leadership says “yes.” In Montreal, the REM [Réseau express métropolitain] is a 42-mile automated light metro—that recently opened up—that links downtown to the suburbs and the airport with 26 stations. It was built in under a decade, for a total cost of roughly \$6.5 billion or roughly \$150 million per mile. It demonstrates that large new rail networks are achievable, even in harsh climates and complex urban environments.

California State Rail Plan is another example. Currently, passenger rail and transit account for shifting nearly 200 million miles of passenger traffic away from highways and onto rail and transit—a dramatic shift that reduces the cost of maintaining our roads and other highway infrastructure, as well as reducing emissions and improving the safety on our roadways.

Closer to home, Brightline West is already underway. It will connect us to Rancho Cucamonga with all electric high-speed rail. On the Rancho Cucamonga side, passengers will be able to connect to a 500-mile passenger rail network, and I would like for people that come to visit Las Vegas to be able to do the same.

Nevada owes its existence to the railroad. Rail built this state, and rail can build its future—but rail is not just public transit, it is really about unlocking our land value by being able to put more resources into denser neighborhoods and more economic opportunities.

Assemblymember Carter:

We are reaching time there, if you can wrap it up, and please also at the end, state your name and spell it so we can make sure it is on the record.

Mr. Harris:

Yes. We have legal pathways to shave billions off of rail costs, and I would be honored to discuss these frameworks offline with any interested members, but the first step is the political will. If any of you have any reservations about the ability for this state to be able to build a passenger transportation network, I kindly and humbly request that you step down and give your position to someone who believes in that vision for the future. A better future is possible, but only if we dare to go boldly towards it.

Assemblymember Carter:

Thank you very much. Any other public comment down here in Las Vegas? None appearing. We will move up to Carson City, and please start by stating your name and spelling it so we can make sure it gets in the record. A reminder that there is a two-minute time limit on public comment. Thank you.

Gabe Christenson, State Legislative Director, Smart-TD:

I just wanted to really come up and introduce myself. I am the State Legislative Director for Smart-TD. I represent the conductors and engineers that work for Union Pacific here in Nevada. I am really excited for this Commission to get started and hopefully solve some infrastructure issues that we have up north and down south. I have been working independently with different groups to try to get something like this established for the last eight years, so to see something finally start coming to fruition—and possibly have something tangible at the end of this or at least be one step closer—is exciting. If there is anything you guys need with work that we have done previously with these other groups, I am available.

Assemblymember Carter:

Thank you very much. Next speaker.

Olivia Tanager, Executive Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

Thank you, Chair. I am the Executive Director of the Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter, the largest grassroots environmental organization in the State of Nevada, representing over 40,000 members and supporters across our great state.

Similarly, my organization helped found the Nevada Rail Coalition. We have had a lot of really interested members who are interested in rail for a very long time, and like my good friend Mr. Christenson, we are excited to see this get up and going. I just want to urge the Commission to put a lot of good time and work into this. We know that our state is lagging behind in our rail infrastructure, and we know that there are a lot of opportunities for public transit as it relates to rail and certainly a lot of economic development opportunities there too. I just wanted to offer my time and knowledge as a resource to this group as well. Feel free to reach out to me anytime. Thank you so much.

Assemblymember Carter:

Thank you very much. Is there anybody else in Carson City wishing to make public comment? [There was none.]

With that, we will go to the phone line. AVH [Audio Visual Hearings Unit], please add the first caller with public comment to the meeting.

AVH, Information Technology Services, Administrative Division, LCB:

Thank you. The public lines are open and working; however, there are no callers to provide public comment at this time.

Assemblymember Carter:

Thank you very much. With that, we will close this first period of public comment. Reminder that there will be a second period at the end of the meeting for public comment.

AGENDA ITEM III—WORKING GROUP MEMBER AND STAFF INTRODUCTIONS

Assemblymember Carter:

We are going to go now to Working Group member and staff introductions.

I am a state Assemblyman. I was born and raised here in Las Vegas; third generation. I fully understand the need for light rail. It was the Union Pacific Railroad that brought my family here back in 1942.

With that, we will start with Mr. Blitsch at the end and work back this way, and then we will move up to Carson City.

Mr. Blitsch:

A lifelong Nevadan, very in favor of this project here and honored to be able to participate.

Mr. Anderson:

I am representing the Vegas Chamber of Commerce and have been a resident since 1984.

Commissioner Jones:

I am a Clark County Commissioner and also Chair of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada and previously served in the Nevada State Senate. Excited to be here.

Ms. Maynard-Carey:

I am the CEO [Chief Executive Officer] of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. Glad to be here with one of my bosses. I have got a great Chair, the RTC. I have actually been in Nevada since 1980.

Mr. Snow:

Good afternoon. I am Jacob Snow. I am also a lifelong Nevadan. My one claim to fame is that when I was the General Manager of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, I recruited and hired M.J. Maynard-Carey, and the organization has been very fortunate to have her because of her leadership and her skills in many areas. But one of the things that I noticed about her was she was one of the hardest working people I ever met and has exceptional background in customer service, which I thought was really important for the RTC, and she has demonstrated that since she has been there.

Assemblymember Carter:

Very good. Thank you. With that, we are going to move up to the Committee members in Carson City, starting with Senator Daly.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Mister Chair. I represent Senate District 13 in Washoe County. Looking forward to working on this Group to see what we can come up with in order to advance the issue of light rail—both north and south. I know the gentleman spoke in public comment; I will take all of the information I can get from anybody. I am not an expert on rail, but usually I know a good idea when I hear one. Thank you.

Assemblymember Carter:

Let us continue with Mr. Gee.

Mr. Gee:

Good afternoon, everybody. I am the Director of Public Transit for RTC Washoe in Reno, Nevada. Among other things, we are the public transit operator for the greater Reno-Sparks Metropolitan area.

Mr. Martinovich:

Good afternoon all. I am the Transportation Manager for Carson City Public Works and in that role, I also serve as the Director of the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, representing Carson City, western Lyon County, and northern Douglas County. Excited to be here.

Mr. Hester:

Thank you. Good afternoon. I am the Washoe County citizen representative. My experience in transit is that when I was with the City of Reno—when I served as Community

Development Director, Redevelopment Administrator, and Assistant City Manager—we worked with the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County on streetcar and light rail, what is now their BRT [Bus Rapid Transit] route for Virginia Street. Also, worked at the City of Reno on connecting the Amtrak station, the Fourth Street transit station, as a project under redevelopment. Now, I am the Chief Operating Officer at the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency—we are the metropolitan planning organization responsible for the Bi-State Regional Transportation Plan in the Tahoe Basin, and we are very interested in the transit, especially on the North Shore, also connecting to rail as well as the transit from Reno out to Industrial Park. Glad to be here. Thank you.

Ms. Fuss:

Good afternoon. I am the Assistant Director at the City of Reno in the Development Services Department. We deal with anything related to new development, old development, and redevelopment. I would say one of the biggest challenges we see with any kind of development is traffic, so this is something we are very excited to be a part of, and I am happy to be here.

Assemblymember Carter:

Thank you, and that leaves us with Mr. Mortenson—who I believe is online. Mr. Mortenson, please introduce yourself.

Mr. Mortensen:

Thank you. I am a fifth generation Nevadan. I worked for the Department of Transportation (NDOT) for 20 years, very familiar with transportation issues throughout the state. It is exciting to be part of this Group.

Assemblymember Carter:

Thank you very much. Those are the members of the Committee. Now, I just want to say that we run a “citizen Legislature” here in Nevada. It is a very good organization, but we have to have backup, us citizens that get put in these roles. With that being said, I want to introduce the real backbone here from the Legislative Counsel Bureau. First, we have Alex Drozdoff from the Research Division. Up north, we have Keely Latham, also from the Research Division; she is our policy analyst. We also have Crystal Rowe and Christina Harper supporting as policy assistants. Additionally, from the Legal Division, we have Aaron MacDonald and Asher Killian who will be serving as our Working Group counsel. Again, I cannot reiterate too much how the Legislative Counsel Bureau structure in our state really does support the ongoing efforts of our Legislature.

AGENDA ITEM IV—ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF THE WORKING GROUP

Assemblymember Carter:

With that, we are going to move on to Agenda Item IV, the election of Chair and the Vice Chair of the Working Group, and I just want to say thank you to everybody. We are going to take and move to Alex Drozdoff to run the election. This is a bit of a different situation, and we will move through this now. I will turn over the floor to Alex Drozdoff to run this election.

Ms. Drozdoff:

Thank you, Assemblymember. Just to quickly foreground for the Working Group members, as you know, during its December 17, 2025, meeting, the Legislative Commission appointed the members of the Working Group. At that time, the Chair of the Commission, Assemblymember Jauregui, expressed that it was her intention to have the legislative members appointed to the Working Group to serve as its Chair and Vice Chair so that LCB would be allowed to provide staff support for the Working Group; otherwise, LCB would be prohibited by law from doing so. However, the enabling legislation for the Working Group, which is Assembly Bill 256 of the 2025 Session, requires this Group to elect its Chair and Vice Chair from among the voting members at its first meeting.

At this time, I will now take note of any nominations put forward for the Chair of the Working Group. Does anybody wish to make a motion to put forward a name for nomination for Chair of the Working Group?

Commissioner Jones:

Mister Chair, I would like to nominate Assemblyman Max Carter as Chair.

Ms. Drozdoff:

Thank you very much. Are there any additional nominations? Seeing none.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

COMMISSIONER JONES MOVED TO ELECT ASSEMBLYMEMBER CARTER AS THE WORKING GROUP CHAIR.

SENATOR DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED.

Congratulations Chair Carter. Next, the Working Group will elect its Vice Chair. Does anybody wish to make a motion to put forward a name for nomination for Vice Chair of the Working Group?

Mr. Hester:

I nominate Senator Daly.

Ms. Drozdoff:

Thank you very much. Are there any additional nominations? Seeing none.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

MR. HESTER MOVED TO ELECT SENATOR DALY AS THE WORKING GROUP VICE CHAIR.

CHAIR CARTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED.

Congratulations, Vice Chair Daly. Back to you Chair.

Chair Carter:

Thank you very much, everybody for placing your trust in myself and in Senator Daly. We are both very interested in this issue and believe that we need to find a way to make things work here in Nevada.

AGENDA ITEM V—PRESENTATION ON THE WORKING GROUP BRIEF AND OPEN MEETING LAW REQUIREMENTS

Chair Carter:

I would like to move on to Agenda Item V, a presentation on the Working Group Brief and Open Meeting Law requirements. I will turn things over to our staff to lead us through this item. Ms. Drozdoff, please go ahead.

Ms. Drozdoff:

Thank you. I am going to provide just a quick summary of the Working Group Brief that you have in front of you ([Agenda Item V A](#)), and then I will turn things over to Mr. MacDonald to review Open Meeting Law ([Agenda Item V B](#)).

The goal of this Brief is to provide information on the Regional Rail Transit Advisory Working Group, including an overview of the Working Group's members and staff, its powers and duties, and background information regarding its charge.

First, the Working Group members are listed on the first content page of the Brief. The members were appointed by Leg Comm during its December 17 meeting last year. Additionally, as Assemblymember Carter mentioned, the LCB has been providing staff support to this Group. The LCB is a nonpartisan, centralized agency that serves the Nevada Legislature and is made up of five divisions, the: (1) Administrative; (2) Audit; (3) Fiscal Analysis; (4) Legal; and (5) Research Divisions. I am one of the Research staff providing support to the Working Group, along with Ms. Latham, Ms. Harper, and Ms. Rowe—who are in Carson City. Mr. Killian and Mr. MacDonald will be providing legal staff support.

To quickly review the powers and duties of the Working Group, Assembly Bill 256 created this Group to study matters related to rail development in regional communities across Nevada. Specifically, AB 256 requires that the Working Group study the current state of regional rail and public transit in regional communities across the state, including without limitation, any current or future rail or public transit projects that are currently in the planning stages or under development. Additionally, the Group must study the need for regional rail transit across the state; potential sources of federal, state, private, or nonprofit money to support the development of regional rail transit; and any public or private entities which should be involved or oversee the planning, development, and implementation of

regional rail transit. Furthermore, the Working Group must prepare a report on its findings and recommendations, including recommendations for legislation, as well as an actionable plan to develop regional rail transit. It must transmit both to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure no later than July 1, 2026.

Pursuant to AB 256, the Working Group is directed to meet at least once a month at the call of the Chair. As you likely saw, Agenda Item VIII will include a discussion of future meeting dates for the Working Group.

Finally, the Working Group must abide by the Open Meeting Law. To speak more specifically about what that entails, I am going to turn things over to Mr. MacDonald now, thank you.

Mr. MacDonald:

I will be discussing the Open Meeting Law, commonly known as the OML ([Agenda Item V B](#)). For the sake of brevity, this will not be a full and comprehensive overview of the OML. Rather, I will be discussing the provisions of the OML that, I think, are most significant to this body.

First and importantly, why should this body care about the OML? Well, for two reasons. First, as Ms. Drozdoff stated, the Legislature declared that all public bodies exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business and that their actions be taken openly and that the deliberations be conducted openly. Second, noncompliance with the OML subjects a public body's individual members to possible criminal and civil penalties. Additionally, any action taken by a public body in violation of the OML is void. Also, this is not part of the OML, but statute—NRS 283.040 provides an office becomes vacant upon conviction for OML violations, so an elected official can lose their office for OML violations.

Now that we know the consequences for its violation, what is the OML? Simply put, it is a set of laws that govern meetings of public bodies. The OML defines both of these terms. The definition of public body is quite broad and includes certain exceptions, but for the sake of brevity, the OML includes this Advisory Working Group within its definition. What is a meeting? Certain gatherings of members of a public body are considered a meeting, and some gatherings are not considered a meeting. By definition, a meeting occurs when there is a quorum of members, which is a simple majority of the total body, present to deliberate towards a decision or to take action on any matter over which the public body has supervision, control, jurisdiction, or advisory power. But a series of gatherings in which a quorum is not present can also be a meeting. If the members are not meeting collectively but separately—and they are doing things like deliberating and the members of the public body attending the gatherings collectively constitute a quorum—what the Attorney General looks at, particularly, is whether the series of gatherings was held with the specific intent to avoid the provisions of the Open Meeting Law. Well, this is called a constructive meeting and is subject to the OML.

Something else to be aware of is, serial communications can constitute a constructive meeting. For example, "reply all" email chains or text message groups can constitute a meeting, because it can be used to build a secret consensus or vote of members of the body. An example of a constructive quorum is if two members of a public body that has five members discuss how they intend to vote on an issue. Then, they have the same discussion with a third member, including how both those first two members intend to vote and why. A quorum, here three members of the hypothetical five-member body has deliberated on an issue outside of a meeting in violation of the Open Meeting Law.

Importantly, a gathering or series gatherings is not a meeting for the purposes of the Open Meeting Law if the members do not deliberate towards a decision or take action on any matter over which the public body has supervision control jurisdiction or advisory power. Therefore, under the Open Meeting Law, most social events or conferences where members are present is probably not a meeting. But at a social event or conference, if members start deliberating or taking action on an item, what started out as not being a meeting can turn into a meeting, so members need to be careful so that what did not start as a meeting morphs into a meeting.

Also excluded from the definition of meeting is a gathering of members to receive legal advice from the attorney employed or retained by the public body regarding a matter over which the public body has supervision, control, jurisdiction, or advisory power and to deliberate on the matter provided such deliberation is limited to the legal advice.

There are also certain limited circumstances in which a public body may hold a closed session. For example, to consider character, alleged misconduct, professional competence, or the physical or mental health of a person, with some exceptions. However, it should be noted that closed sessions may not be held to discuss the appointment of any person to a public body.

I would like to turn away from the definition of a meeting, and now discuss other requirements of the OML. The Open Meeting Law has numerous notice requirements including written notice of the meeting at least three working days before the meeting unless there is an emergency. The written notice must include the time, place, and location of the meeting; information on how the public can participate in the meeting; a list of locations where the meeting notice of the meeting is posted; and the written agenda. There are also numerous requirements for supporting materials and the agenda itself. But as the agendas are generally prepared by staff, and for the sake of time, we will not go into additional detail. However, many of these requirements are set forth in the written handout prepared and provided for this presentation.

The final item I want to discuss is public comment. There are two options for public comments at this meeting: (1) either the public body must have comment at the beginning of the meeting—before any action items are heard, and again before adjournment; or (2) must have public comment after each action item is discussed—but before the public body takes action on the item. Also, regardless of which of those two options is used, the public body must allow public comment on any matter not included on the agenda as an action item before the adjournment of the meeting. A public body also cannot deliberate or take any action on any item raised in public comment until the matter has been properly agendaized. Finally, there are limitations on restrictions on public comment. Restrictions must be reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions. This means that a public body may not halt comments based on viewpoint of the speaker, belief defamation is occurring, or comment critical of a public official. However, the OML does not prevent the removal of any person who willfully disrupts the meeting to the extent that its orderly conduct is made impractical.

Thank you for allowing me to briefly present on the Open Meeting Law. I have no further comments at this time Chair.

Chair Carter:

Thank you. Members, do you have any questions regarding what we just listened to? Skip?

Vice Chair Daly:

No, I do not, and I do not believe any of the other members do as well. They are all members of public bodies and are probably more well versed than you and I.

Chair Carter:

Thank you, Senator Daly.

AGENDA ITEM VI—OVERVIEW OF GUIDANCE AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE WORKING GROUP

Chair Carter:

With that, we are going to move into Agenda Item VI; overview of guidance and expectations for the Working Group. Moving forward, I am going to give a bit of what I see as where we are going, and I want to outline a few expectations for the Working Group to ensure our meetings are productive as well as courteous.

First, as a courtesy to other members and testifiers, please be prompt so the Working Group meetings may begin on time. Please let me know if you will be late to a meeting or will be absent. We may not always agree with each other, it is critical that this Group maintains an atmosphere of courtesy, professionalism, and equal interest for all group discussions and towards all presenters that come before us. During meetings, members of the Working Group should give their full attention to those speaking and presenting and limit the use of laptops and other electronic devices—except for matters pertaining to our work and efforts. Please mute/silence laptops and handheld devices. Since we are a large group and spread out across locations, I would ask that members raise their hands or notify me to be acknowledged when we open agenda items up for questions. This is to ensure we are not speaking over each other, and so we can move through our agendas in an orderly fashion. Please mute your microphones when you are not speaking to avoid feedback and other issues with the broadcast. Everyone attending a meeting—this is for those in the audience, whether testifying or not—needs to sign in on the sign-in sheet located by the door. For all presenters and those speaking during public comment, please state and spell your name for the record. Finally, I encourage the Working Group members to ask questions, take part in discussions, and engage in the material presented.

Thank you for your consideration. Is there any questions or comments? [There were none.] Very good.

AGENDA ITEM VII—OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT STATE OF WORK, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT RELATED TO REGIONAL RAIL TRANSIT

Chair Carter:

We will move on now. I will close that item and move to Agenda Item VII, which is an overview of the current state of work, research, and development related to regional rail transport. It is important to recognize that we are not starting this from scratch and there are entities in this state, including those represented on this Working Group, who have been involved in rail transit discussions for a considerable length of time. This is intended to be an introductory meeting, but I believe it would be helpful for the members to hear a brief overview regarding some of the work being done in the transportation space, especially as it relates to rail transit. Accordingly, I asked our representatives from the Regional Transportation Commissions of Southern Nevada and Washoe County to speak briefly on

their work in this space to help get everyone on the same page. We will begin with southern Nevada representatives. Please approach the table, and we are ready when you are.

M.J. Maynard-Carey, Chief Executive Officer, RTC of Southern Nevada:

Chair Carter, members of the Working Group, thank you for allowing us to be here today. I would like to—this is a full circle moment if you will. Jacob Snow, who was the General Manager of the RTC, we have been talking about rail, studying rail, modeling rail since the early 2000s when it started with Jacob. We looked at the regional fixed guideway in the resort corridor. A few years later, we also looked at rail and the positive impact of rail both for congestion, mitigation, and, certainly, economic development—that was with the Transportation Investment Business Plan, which again suggested that rail would be very significant here in southern Nevada.

I am joined here today by Andrew Kjellman. He is our Senior Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization. I will say that we are a very unique agency. We are the only agency in the United States to do all of the things I am going to tell you. We are the public transit provider. We are the Metropolitan Planning Organization. We are the traffic manager for the region. We are the roadway funding agency, and then we operate and oversee the bike share system in southern Nevada—makes us very unique.

Our core mission is connecting people, whether you are riding the bus, you are driving your car on a roadway, you are waiting for that red light to turn green. We have a working say in all of that. I do want to introduce again, Andrew. He is going to go over just the basics, terminology of the modes of transportation, and the different modes that you will find around the country. Andrew Kjellman for you.

Andrew Kjellman, Senior Director of Planning, RTC of Southern Nevada:

Thank you M.J., Chair Carter. I am the Senior Director of Planning for the RTC. One of the requests, like M.J. mentioned, was just to go over, just a cursory overview of some of the different terms and terminology for transit technologies, I think it could be helpful ([Agenda Item VII A](#)).

Just for a little bit of background though about some of the planning work we do. As the region's designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, we work a lot with the local entities, regional stakeholders. We do public outreach. We try to identify what transportation challenges are out there and then how can we solve them? This really helps line us up for federal funding, state funding, local funding, and especially as we go after discretionary grant funding opportunities—having a prioritized list of projects really helps us out.

One of the plans that we developed, that ended in 2020, was the on-board mobility plan. This is really our region's vision for how we want to move about in the future. It is specific to transit, but it also includes roadways as well. We wanted to look at our traditional transit network. How can we make the current bus better? How can we better connect people walking and biking to our transit network? And then the subject of this Working Group is really high-capacity transit. How can we leverage bus rapid transit, light rail, to better enhance mobility in southern Nevada? Then we also wanted to have an eye towards the future with On Board. That is where we looked at emerging transportation technologies and how we can leverage those with our regional partners to enhance mobility in southern Nevada. As you continue your work; I encourage you to reference the On Board Mobility Plan. There are a lot of good resources there that you can leverage your findings on.

Starting out, just so we are all playing from the same playbook of what we mean when we say streetcar. What do we mean when we say light rail? I am going to highlight six transit modes. I am going to talk about three bus modes, and then three rail modes; and I am going to start from the bottom and then go to the top. We are looking at things like speed and overall carrying capacity.

I am going to start with just the regular bus. These are buses that you see the RTC operating and maintaining in southern Nevada; we have about 39 routes. Even though I am starting with the bus, I do not want to discount the bus. We carry about 55 million trips every single year on RTC buses. That is a significant number and has a significant regional impact. We also operate the bus in a lot of different environments—so we have the regular bus on the Strip and then we also have the bus in outlying suburban newly growing areas. How are we able to take the flexibility of the bus and serve both of those environments? It is really the type of service that we provide. On the Strip, we have headways or frequency every 15 minutes and it runs in the overnight hours. In the outlying areas, it does not run every 15 minutes, it runs maybe every 30 minutes or every hour and not into the overnight hours. We really customize that service to meet the demand that we see out there.

When we talk about, what does the transit station or the transit amenity look like? The RTC has about 4,000 transit stops in southern Nevada, and they look really different. At the lower end of the spectrum, you will see a post with a sign on it that says, "This is an RTC transit route," all the way up to a really well-designed general market shelter. Sometimes you will see two general market shelters. We are really responding to demand in terms of ridership of who we see taking the bus at those stops. We also have stops about every quarter of a mile, every third of a mile. With the regular bus, you are really looking to enhance access into that transit system. One thing to remember when we are talking about the bus, is that it does get stuck in traffic. That is the benefit of some of the higher order transit modes is that they are not subject to traffic congestion. Even though the bus carries about 20 passengers per service hour, it is still stuck in the same congestion as single occupant vehicles.

Now we are moving up—we are going up a mode here. This is something that we call a Rapid Bus. This picture here is from Seattle, Washington. Rapid Bus would be very similar to what we have on Flamingo Road, Sahara Avenue. It really serves more dense urban environments. You see that with the frequency; we operate typically every 15 minutes or less into the overnight hours. The big thing here with Rapid Bus is you can see the transit amenity environment here—so the bus stop. It is more prominent, it is not just a bus driving on a road, this is kind of a transit friendly environment that we are trying to cultivate. You see a well-designed transit shelter, it protects from the elements, it provides shade. You have wayfinding passenger information, and you also see a higher station area. That really helps speed boarding, especially for people who are rolling on or rolling off of the bus.

Next level of bus transit is what is called Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). This is the final mode of bus transit that I am going to share here. The real difference here is that it has the dedicated lane; where Rapid Bus only had portions of a dedicated lane; where it is exclusively for the bus to operate in, bus rapid transit has dedicated transit lanes throughout the pretty much the whole route. The RTC is implementing bus rapid transit on Maryland Parkway currently. That dedicated lane can either be in the middle of the road, like you see here in this example, or it can be on the side—curbside running lanes. When the region makes a decision to invest in bus rapid transit, typically you will see a little more prominent station areas, and you will see some better branding and route branding. On Maryland Parkway, our buses will be dedicated for Maryland Parkway. They will be hydrogen

buses, and they will have a specific livery on them so you can tell that they are different from the normal bus.

Now, we are going into different types of rail transit. This is the first of three different types of rail transit. The first one is a Streetcar. You see here in this example from Kansas City, it is powered by an overhead catenary electrical line. Where Streetcar really operates well is in smaller urban environments. The key here is smaller environments. It is not really designed for regional trips that really enhance connectivity into the core. It is really a much smaller district area, kind of a business improvement district or downtown. That is really where Streetcar does well. There is really good examples in Portland where they use Streetcar to redevelop their waterfront area. Seattle has a Streetcar in the South Lake Union area that is near a lot of the tech and innovation hubs. Streetcar tends to be a little bit slower. It operates in mixed transit without a dedicated lane, and it has really high station density. That means it is stopping a lot. It does kind of operate at a walking speed, but that is not the point of a Streetcar. The point of a Streetcar is really to enhance place making and be an urban amenity. Also, you will see that fares are typically not collected on streetcars. It is more of a hop on, hop off.

The next mode of rail technology that I am going to talk about is Light Rail (LRT). There is many common examples of light rail throughout the United States. Light rail, a lot like bus rapid transit, it does operate in a dedicated transit guideway. In this example picture from Phoenix, it is at grade. That means it is operating on the roadway, at intersections you can drive over the tracks, but no one is going to be driving their car in that train lane. The station areas tend to be longer to accommodate multiple train sets, and you can accommodate that growth. These station areas are also fare pay zones. That really speeds up boarding and lighting because typically our current transit system does get bogged down because everybody pays through the front door. Light rail really streamlines that because you are paying before you get on board. And typically, what you see when a region makes the decision to invest in light rail is that they will accompany that with adjacent transit-oriented development to better ensure jobs and housing are located in that areas so there is more users for the system.

The final rail mode I am going to talk about is something called Commuter Rail. Commuter Rail really operates for access into the downtown core from outlying cities or towns. You will see commuter rail routes of 20 miles or greater with a very few number of stops in between there. You will see maybe a 20-mile route with two to three stops along towns along the way. There are common examples in southern California, in the Bay Area, Seattle also has a commuter rail route, and then the Long Island railroad—these are other examples of commuter rail. They are really designed to get workers into the core, in the morning and then the train will typically take a break during the middle of the day, and then you will have reverse the trip in the afternoon to get people home from their day at work—typically really long train sets, really big station areas. The key thing here though is that you see in this picture, there is no overhead catenary. The reason why there is no overhead catenary is because this is a diesel multiple unit, also called the DMU, and it is operating on freight railroad tracks or freight rail spurs. Oftentimes there is a lot of coordination that needs to go on with the class one railroads, UP or BNSF, to co-locate this type of transit service on top of those freight rail routes.

Hopefully that was helpful, and now I am going to turn it back to M.J. to provide an overview of the transit system in southern Nevada.

Ms. Maynard-Carey:

Thanks Andrew, great job. I want to talk a little bit about transit here in southern Nevada, and what we do at the RTC, and how we are funded in the slide. Mobility, how is it funded? We rely on sales tax, which is a bit unusual. Most transit agencies around the United States rely on more than one revenue stream. Usually, it is a, generally speaking, it is some property tax or sales tax, it could be a DMV fee, it could be a TMC fee. We rely on sales tax. We receive 3/8 percent of sales tax. We know that we fall well below the mean in terms of the strength of our funding source here in southern Nevada. Also grants, as a public agency, we go after every grant, and we usually use the grants to buy our rolling stock, make capital improvements or shelters; things of that nature—also, passenger fares. Then other, in this case, we rely on sometimes tapping into our fund balance. Also, transit advertising revenue. It is interesting to note that our rate has not increased since 2002, when voters approved an advisory question to support mobility.

I am proud of this. We have got a great team at the RTC. We take our job very seriously and in terms of managing taxpayer dollars, we are the most efficient transit system in the bus mode in the United States. We have been, and that is, we are going on nine years now. We have the highest farebox recovery ratio. What does that mean? We collect more— I am sorry, with number two now. We collect more money at the farebox than our peers. We have the lowest subsidy, and a lot of that, again, is we receive 3/8 percent of sales tax. The lowest operating cost in the United States for all the bus modes. We operate the 13th busiest bus system. Andrew said, it is almost 56 million annual trips that we are providing now.

When you are the public transit provider, the law, the federal law says that you must also provide pure transit service within a three-quarter mile boundary. There is no law that says you must provide any other service, but we do. We provide service for our seniors. We provide service for our veterans. We provide service for our students, and then we have an on-demand zone. It is really understanding the way the community moves, the quality of life, it takes all of those modes to ensure that everyone gets to where they need to go.

This is what our service looks like if you could— Let us see, those gold lines there, that represents our 39 transit routes. As you can see, we cover the entire valley. Those stars, that is where we take— This is the happy route. This is a Game Day Express. We take folks to Raiders games, to UNLV [University of Nevada, Las Vegas] games, and Vegas Golden Knights games. I will point out, as the traffic manager of the region, having this Game Day Express service means that on any given game day, there are at least 1,500 to 2,000 cars that are not on the road trying to find a place to park. The shaded, the pink shaded area there, that is our on-demand service area. If you— Again because we, as we operate fixed route, we have a three-quarter mile boundary around fixed route where we operate paratransit service. If you see the black line on the outside that working its way in, that represents the paratransit service area. Again, we understand we are a community where we have a lot of retirees that move here, and we provide a lot of— We provide 13 Silver STAR senior routes. We also provide, in areas that for a long time have been outside the service area, flexible demand response (FDR) and that, again, is geared towards seniors. It is two days a week for limited service. We try to get folks to the grocery store, to the doctor's office, things of that nature.

You can see we— The population, it is about 1.8 [million] in terms of what we are serving. This is key, and I will get to another slide, the jobs that are available by way of public transit, as you can see here, it is over 970,000 jobs that are made available because of public transit.

You will see our weekly boardings—that is over a million weekly boardings. We have 145,000 on-demand trips annually. We have, in our database today, almost 24,000 paratransit eligible customers. We operate the seventh busiest paratransit system in the United States. Last year, there were about 1.8 million paratransit trips taken on our system. Of almost 38,000 veterans, we take them to their medical appointments at no cost. We have close to 60,000 seniors that we move every single day on our Silver STAR and FDR service. Our community mobility training program we have got over 67,000, and then of course, and what that is, we make sure that we have folks we train to take fixed route, particularly for paratransit customers. It not only enhances the customer experience. We save money, and then we are the match for the Southern, for the rural system, the Southern Nevada Transit Coalition. It is a busy system.

If you do not take public transit, you might think it is just for folks that do not have cars or maybe they are poor, right? Money is an issue. A few months ago, we did a two-week survey just to ask our customers what route they were taking, and where they are going to work. In less than two weeks, we heard back from 1,200 customers that told us every day where they go to work and what route they take. This map represents just a few of the places of employment that, again, public transit is connecting employees to employers every single day. Eighty percent of our 160,000 daily boardings are folks going to work or looking for work. Public transit all, actually all transit rail, if we are moving people or connecting the, again, employees to employers—we are part of the economic ecosystem.

I am, this is a slide that talks about just how important mobility is in southern Nevada.

[Video was shown.]

Shawn Best, Banquet Cook—My work starts at four in the morning. So when I get up, takes me maybe five minutes to walk from my home to the bus stop. It is reliable. So I only have to wait five minutes at the bus stop. It gets me to Flamingo and the Strip, and then it is just a short three- or four-minute walk to the Cosmopolitan.

Misty Hamilton, U.S. Army Veteran—I was in the Army; I ride the transit system every single day. I depend upon RTC transit system for everything I do. You know, I could take anywhere from two to three or even four buses in a day. If I did not have that, if a lot of veterans and a lot of people did not have that, we would not be able to have quality of life.

Eddie Barrios, UNLV Student—I am a UNLV student and worker. I have been taking public transit since I was 12. I rode the bus about four or five times a week when school starts.

Paulette Henriod, V.G.K. Fans—I am a physical therapist. My husband is an attorney, and we are just a family that loves the Vegas Golden Knights. And we use the public transit system to take the Golden Knights Express to the games.

Evadne Martinez, Housekeeper—I work at the Luxor from day one; I do housekeeping from day one. I have been catching the RTC buses, and I never been late to work. That is how the RTC, for me, is the best transportation that I ever could recommend to anyone. I never missed a day of work, and I never been late to work for 20 something years. And that is how I gained the employee of the year at the Luxor.

Jared Hollingsworth, Paratransit Client—I use the RTC transit for getting to work and doing other things I enjoy. I get to independently move throughout the community where before that would be, I would have to rely on friends or family to take me places. And with paratransit, I get to choose where I want to go and when I want to go there. I use it on a daily basis to get to and from work or the grocery store, but I also have used it to be able to go down to the Strip or go down to the T-Mobile Arena and watch hockey.

Eddie Barrios, UNLV Student—I take the bus downtown to meet up with friends.

Evadne Martinez, Housekeeper—To the shopping center, to the casinos.

Shawn Best, Banquet Cook—Go see a movie or get to the doctor.

Misty Hamilton, U.S. Army Veteran—It is important to veterans. It is important to mothers. It is important to college students. I mean, anybody.

Ms. Maynard-Carey:

Finally, I will finish up with this. We understand how critical access to public transportation is. But right now in Nevada, our biggest struggle, our biggest challenge is securing long-term sustainable funding for public transit. While we are able to maintain service in the short term for the next couple of years without—absent a successful revenue initiative; we are going to be very limited by revenue. We have had to do, whether it was the great recession or during the pandemic, we will have to retract again, service that people rely on where they need to go. Over the past years, southern Nevada's population has doubled. Again, our funding sources remained static since 2002. The investment— You are finding that whether it is the public sector, the private sector, the cost of doing business continues to increase just by way of the cost of inflation, wages, that sort of thing. We are seeing the same things in public transit. At the same time, the cost of providing transit service continues to rise, further straining the system. I will conclude my presentation; be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Carter:

Thank you very much. Are there, briefly, remembering that this is a high-level overview, is there any questions?

Mr. Anderson:

Thank you, Mister Chair. M.J., can you just clarify on-demand area? To my mind, that is on demand, but it is a very limited part of the Valley.

Ms. Maynard-Carey:

Thank you, yes. We—pre-pandemic, again, knowing that we had a fiscal cliff, we started to cut transit service and then the pandemic occurred. We received three tranches of stimulus funds—\$304 million as a matter of fact. At that time, there was zero transit service in the southwest area, one of the fastest growing regions in 2019, particularly. We received calls from employers, folks that live there wanted transit service, and we did not have the funds to expand. During, when we received the funds, we did an analysis. Instead of implementing your traditional fixed-route service in that area and traditional paratransit service, we went along with a concept called, it was a sort of our “love all serve all.” In that area, paratransit customers, students, and folks that relied on fixed route, could on

demand, hail a vehicle to a virtual stop, or an area close to their homes. We would pick them up and take them anywhere within that shaded area or connect them to our existing fixed system.

Chair Carter:

Any other questions? Thank you very much. We appreciate that. With that, let us move up north and hear the presentation from the Washoe RTC. Mr. Gee—

Vice Chair Daly:

Any questions up here, Max or Assemblyman Carter? Sorry.

Chair Carter:

That is just fine. I apologize for that. Were there any questions from up north?

Vice Chair Daly:

I had a couple. I do not know if anybody else does; if I can real quick.

For the RTC Southern Nevada, how do you guys interact or integrate with, if at all, or work with the Monorail in southern Nevada? I understand there is supposed to be some expansion there and then of course, The Boring Company. I am not sure that is a way to go, but, nevertheless. Just curious how your interactions. I have a second question after that.

Ms. Maynard-Carey:

Thank you, Vice Chair Daly, for the question. They are separate organizations aside from the RTC. We talk about, you know, the best transit in any system is one that is connected. As an example of partnership with Monorail for the F1 race, we integrated a pass so that we could connect employees needing to work in the resort quarter. They could take a bus and connect to the Monorail system using the same fare method. Otherwise, we are completely separate.

In terms of The Boring Company, we have had multiple discussions with them. Again, just to inquire about future stations and if there is an opportunity to ensure that we have, again, ensuring the funding is available, have an opportunity to ensure that we connect. Again, a connective system is the best for the folks that are living there and using it.

Vice Chair Daly:

Follow up on that if I can, Mister Chair. Separate organizations, but so are you guys the— I think one of the slides said you are the planning agency for transportation in the Las Vegas Valley. Do they have to come through you for the planning of that stuff, or do they go to the County Commission or a different body if they are separate organizations? So they are working independently? Are they outside of your planning purview?

Ms. Maynard-Carey:

Yes and no. As the Metropolitan Planning Organization, as part of our Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), that is our long-range plan, we have to include projects of regional significance, even if they are not projects that are under the purview of the RTC. You will find projects like that, even to include the upcoming Brightline. Many times the projects noted in the RTP are not necessarily all funded. But that is about the only way that

we deal with them. They are— The Monorail has its own board so, you know, it belongs to the LVCVA [Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority]; that is who they report to. The Boring Company, private company, but they work directly, or very closely with Clark County seat of Las Vegas.

Vice Chair Daly:

I understand and thank you for the yes and no sort of answer. I understand that. I am not saying that is bad. Second question is an overview, big picture. I know you guys mentioned the number one critical need is going to be the funding source in order to build infrastructure, expand, and do all of the things you need. It is a similar question up here as well. On your long-term planning, I am sure you have thought about that. Not getting ahead of ourselves. What is your best-case scenario or best resource? Obviously, you guys have some gas tax or fuel money that comes in, which is a diminishing source with improved gas mileage and various things. What is it that you guys are looking at? Is it a potential ballot question that you would do to change something? Obviously, you cannot do it all by fare. Although you could increase fares, but then that has a diminishing return as well on ridership. What are your long-term projections and thoughts on the direction you would be heading for that?

Chair Carter:

Yes, Senator Daly, you skipped way ahead, and that is anticipated to be dealt with in an in-depth presentation at a later date and a separate discussion and research about funding mechanisms.

Vice Chair Daly:

I will defer to a later date.

Chair Carter:

Thank you. Any other questions from up north?

Vice Chair Daly:

No, thank you.

Chair Carter:

With that, now we will move on to Mr. Gee representing the Washoe Regional Transportation Commission.

Jim Gee, Director of Public Transportation and Operations, RTC of Washoe County, Nevada:

Members of the Working Group. Good afternoon members in the audience, both in person and online. I am joined today by our Government Affairs Officer, Mr. Paul Nelson. Paul will be handling the slides for me, and thank you Paul. I appreciate that.

We have a very short presentation outlining RTC's work in this space so far and a little bit of a one-on-one on what RTC services are ([Agenda Item VII B](#)). I will do my best not to be redundant with the previous presentation because, simply, they did an excellent job outlining the different types of public transit and the roles that each type of service have. Without being redundant. Let us advance the slide, Mr. Nelson.

First, very similar to the RTC in southern Nevada. We are an organization that has multiple purposes. As the Regional Transportation Commission, we are the MPO, or Metropolitan Planning Organization. That basically means that all federal transportation funds for the region flow through RTC. We are also the engineering and construction side—where we handle construction projects for the region, and we also are the public transportation provider.

Our public transit service is primarily RTC Ride—that is the backbone of our transit service. It is transit buses—full-size buses operating on a set schedule. For us, last year we had about 5.8 million trips—that is 41 straight months of ridership growth. We are very proud of that. That growth is primarily with people going to work and that is the backbone of our service. It is people who are using our service. The old adage in public transit is you are on the bus either to make money or to spend money. We really, we like pushing that ridership. Our service itself, we have a fleet of one-third all electric vehicles. We have a number of diesel hybrid vehicles, and now most recently have eight hydrogen fuel cell vehicles to provide our service.

As a part of that RTC ride, we have what we call RTC Rapid, which is our Bus Rapid Transit system. We have two Bus Rapid Transit lines. Exactly as southern Nevada pointed out, these are high-frequency services that, for us here in Reno, are the backbone of our service. They have the two spines. One is at northwest, I am sorry, north/south line, the Virginia Line and the other is the east/west line called the Lincoln Line. Service every ten minutes, seven days a week. With that type of service frequency, passengers do not need a schedule. They can simply walk out and see their bus coming and that promotes, it is one less hurdle for folks to not use our service. It has been very popular for us, and we have seen it around our region.

Our first BRT system started in 2009 with the Virginia Line. It connected Downtown Reno and Meadowood Mall. We then followed up with the Lincoln Line connecting Downtown Reno with Downtown Sparks. Most recently, in 2021, extended the original Virginia Line up to the University of Nevada, Reno. That extension has helped to build our ridership. We see a large student contingent of college students who are using the Virginia Line to not only just to get downtown and get the other services, but they are using it to get to grocery shopping. They are using it for entertainment at the mall and in our midtown district. It has been a very popular service for them.

As a part of looking at BRT, we did study, and have studied in the past, different forms of public transit. Most recently for BRT, we looked at TSM, or transit system management, monorail, and light rail; and eventually settled on the BRT as the most effective solution for not only building ridership, but also creating and promoting economic development at, quite simply, a price tag that was affordable for the region. We are very proud of that. When the BRT was developed, the thought was we would eventually have it be promoted to a streetcar, but because of the success of the BRT, really, there are no plans to do that right now.

Very similar southern Nevada, we have what we call FlexRIDE. It is a micro transit on-demand service. For us, it is curb-to-curb. We have four different zones operating in our region, and we like to advertise it as our form of Uber or Lyft, where passengers use an app. If they wish, they can track their vehicle in real time, as they wish. They can schedule in real time and travel within those four zones. Unlike Uber and Lyft, though, we addressed some of those shortcomings that those private companies have in that we have a driver that has been vetted and trained. It is the same drivers that are used for our paratransit service that are used for our microtransit service. It is a consistent pricing 24 hours a day, so that there is no peak pricing. It is a vehicle that is able to accommodate large things like

strollers and wheelchairs and service animals and things that Uber and Lyft and the other rideshare services really struggle with.

I mentioned our Access service. This is a service for the disabled, as mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act. We have to provide the service within three-quarters of a mile of fixed route, and we do so. That is a service that is a lifeline for our customers and for many of those folks with disabilities, they, quite simply, have no other option to easily move around the community. Additionally, like our fixed route service, the number one reason that people use Access is to get to work. These are disabled people who are needing to be employed to pay their bills and get to the doctor, and that is what they are using the service for.

We have a number of special programs that we have started over the years. Our Taxi Bucks program is very successful. It is a stipend that passengers can use to do cab rides or Uber/Lyft or different programs that basically if there is public transit not available, these are options that are open to seniors, disabled, and veterans that they can use to move around the community. Additionally, we have a very aggressive VANPOOL program. One of the top ten in the country with 320 plus vehicles using van pools who are basically using that to go to work. Last year, we saved over 20 million miles of travel just within that van program. Our number one pass, our number one trip destination is the TRI Center [Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center], which I know we are going to talk about with this Committee, which is a large industrial park with Tesla, Panasonic, and some major, other major employers out there.

Currently, RTC has a couple rail-related studies going on. First, is a commuter rail feasibility study. We have contracted with WSP to provide that service. To look at the feasibility of using the existing Union Pacific tracks between Downtown Reno, Downtown Sparks, and the TRI Center or the Tahoe Regional [sic] Industrial Center. We are really excited about that project. That was not only funded by RTC, but we had assistance in funding from NDOT [Nevada's Department of Transportation], Storey County, Panasonic, and Tesla. We had a good private-public partnership of folks getting together to, hopefully, look at if there are other transportation options that we can use to get folks to work out there. I am sure we will be talking about that study in future meetings.

Additionally, we have also been a part of the Trans-Sierra Transportation Coalition, which has looked at extending Amtrak service from Sacramento with additional frequencies between Sacramento, Roseland, Truckee, and Reno. Part of that market is, of course, to get the work. Another market is also the recreational opportunities that we have here in Reno, and specifically Truckee and the Lake Tahoe area.

With that, I would be happy to answer any questions. But thank you very much.

Chair Carter:

Thank you very much. Are there any questions here down south? Senator Daly, are there any questions up north?

Vice Chair Daly:

No, sir.

Chair Carter:

Very good. Thank you to both of the RTCs for a very good presentation.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND POSSIBLE MEETING DATES

Chair Carter:

Now we are going to move on to Agenda Item VIII, discussion of future agenda items and possible meeting dates. It is incredibly important that this Working Group collaborates its drive, its mission, and work over the next few months. We got a very tight timeline where we are legislatively mandated to submit a report to the Interim Growth and Infrastructure Committee by July 1st. Along that line, a little bit later, we will be talking about the goals of setting meetings monthly, an aggressive schedule. I also want to make sure that we are not missing any opportunities and information that we need to hear. I have got a few ideas, but first, I am going to open it up to the Committee. Any thoughts or ideas on organizations or groups that we should have come through presentations or agenda items.

Commissioner Jones:

Mister Chair, I would suggest, given that Brightline is moving forward with its regional rail operations, that would be beneficial to the Committee. Then just, generally, as you have already referenced, financing is the key priority here.

Chair Carter:

Thank you. Any others down here? Mr. Snow.

Mr. Snow:

Thank you, Mister Chairman. I would recommend that we possibly consider inviting representatives from the Clark County Department of Aviation to talk about what their plans might be. We are talking about a second commercial service airport 30 miles to the south of us here in Las Vegas. Also, I do have some history working for the Clark County Department of Aviation when we put the tunnel underneath the two runways at, then, McCarran International Airport; we did the planning. If you notice there is two bays in those tunnels, there is one going to the north and one coming to the south, from the north to the south, and then there is a section in the middle that you cannot see because it is covered up. But we dedicated right-of-way for a future rail transit system to go in that tunnel, in that middle section of the tunnel, because we anticipated there would be something like high-speed rail that would be near or to the south of the airport at the time. We also thought it would behoove us to make the airport easily accessible to a regional rail transit system and that bay was dedicated for public transit in the middle of that tunnel operation. I know that there are some discussions that are happening about how are we going to get to and from the new supplemental airport to the south of us, et cetera. It is come to mind because of that.

Chair Carter:

Very good. Thank you. Any others down here?

Mr. Anderson:

I think we should hear from any of the environmental groups who would have any reservations about any of these plans to find out what their concerns would be and what could get in the way of a well-designed plan.

Chair Carter:

Very good. Thank you. Senator Daly, up north?

Mr. Hester:

I would be happy to work with the RTC Washoe folks as the people responsible for planning in the adjacent region up at Lake Tahoe, working on how we could interconnect with that work that we are doing, and their work, and the work out to the east of the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center. I think there is some synergies there and maybe even involve the City of Reno talking about downtown and how the Amtrak Station and the RTC Fourth Street Station connect. I guess the three of us without— They are all nodding their head. We would be happy to collaborate on a presentation.

Chair Carter:

Very good. Thank you, Mr. Hester. Are there any other suggestions from up north?

Vice Chair Daly:

Mister Chair? Yes, thank you. Just one, and I think in the Washoe presentation, they said that they partnered in their study with Panasonic, Tesla, I know there is other major employers, Redwood and some others. I think at some point it might be useful to have, not all of them individually, or maybe a representative for all of them, on if we are able to plan something, get something done, and moving people out to a station. I do not know that we are going to have multiple stations, but then what would the secondary transportation be and would some of those private companies be willing to partner with getting them from the station to their actual work locations? I think that would take some of the pressure off, the transit, the Transportation Commission to get that last leg, it might be useful to talk to those people.

Chair Carter:

Thank you. Any other questions up there or suggestions up there?

Mr. Martinovich:

I wanted to ask, kind of, a clarifying question related to— We are tasked with the items that we have talked about today and through the bill that has been created all of this Commission. I was curious with the issues we see at the TRI Center and some of the other areas of the state, southern Nevada in particular is there a need, is there an interest to look at other areas, areas of the state that are growing or continuing to grow where we can address or start to address regional rail needs before we get to the point of requiring massive new rail systems or widening of freeways or something like that. I do not know if that is quite in the purview of this group, but how can we look at those areas ahead of trying to mitigate something once it is already constructed?

Chair Carter:

That is a very good point. I think that we are going to have to put our heads together with myself and LCB and the Vice Chair and we will figure out how to address that, and how to bring that information in. Is there any other suggestions?

Mr. Snow:

Well, Mister Chairman, if I may, I am having a lot of thoughts today, and they are not all coming all at once. It occurs to me that it has been made public that the Las Vegas Monorail will be phased out at some point. I think it would be interesting to hear from the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority and/or their operator, the Monorail, to talk about those plans and what we are going to do— I mean, they are, in essence, a regional rail service, and what the impact of that phasing out will be on transportation and possibly what they might be looking at doing to ameliorate the phase out.

Chair Carter:

Very good. Did somebody steal my notes? We are all thinking alike up here. Is there one last going through?

Those are all great suggestions, and I want to say that first off, we have already alluded to it, I think that we need an in-depth picture painted by the Regional Transportation Commissions in Washoe and in southern Nevada. That is going to be one thing I request, and a higher level, well, a deeper dive and getting into those issues that Senator Daly brought up of financing and the like.

Also tying into that, I think we need to reach out to Las Vegas Visitors and Convention Authority and to bring them in, and actually more like have them bring in the representatives from, do a coordinated presentation that pulls in both the Monorail, The Boring Company, and their vision of an integrated plan. Then that falls over to Brightline. I think that the way we should go at that is to invite NDOT to do a presentation, hopefully that includes the Brightline representatives, of what their plans are and goals with that are. Yes, we definitely need to have the environmental groups. Have a know, that this is, we are listening and that they are involved. So yes, we are going to suggest that. I am sitting there looking, seeing what we missed. I think that we are, we are pretty comprehensive with this, and I am going to ask staff to track that. If there is any other items that I have missed or come to mind, please speak up and let me know. Did I miss anything? Very good.

Next, I would like to outline our future meeting dates. My intention is to have the Working Group meet once a month, as I stated, for the next five months. As staff presented, our work must be submitted by July 1st, so we need to be wrapped up by then. I would like to propose the following dates to the Working Group as suggested for our meetings:

- February 18th, 23rd, or 27th;
- March 16th, 18th, 19th, or 20th;
- April 9th, 10th, or 13th;
- May 5th, 6th, or 11th; and
- June 3rd, 5th, 8th, 9th, and 10th.

That is recognizing that we are going to have to—that staff needs time to draft the report that we are going to submit. There is likely to be a second meeting in June to approve that report. With that being said, I want to get those marked down today. We are going to take a brief five-minute recess so that we are not all up here like fish in the fishbowl looking at our calendars and trying to figure out. We are in recess for five minutes, and not a legislative five minutes.

Vice Chair Daly:

Mister Chair—

Chair Carter:

Yes, sir. I am getting ready to gavel back in Senator.

Vice Chair Daly:

Well, I was letting you know that we are done before you guys. We are ready when you are.

Chair Carter:

Thank you. We are going to return from our recess, and we are back in session. I would like to work from one end to the other. Seeing how the north is so rapid and so efficient, let us start with the north. What we want to hear is what does not work. We understand, it is understood that we are going to, that there may be meetings that one or two people have to miss. We are going to do our best to coordinate a schedule that minimizes that and have it out ASAP. Our goal is by the end of the week, so that we can all block it in our calendars and not let it get overwritten. With that being said, Senator Daly?

Vice Chair Daly:

Mister Chair, our able staff here has written down everybody's notes and has it. I will defer to Keely, and she can let you know the dates. February was the toughest for everybody because their calendar; further out we got, the more open it was. I will let her proceed.

Ms. Latham:

I wrote down all the dates if you want me to send it to you, or do you want me to put it on the record here?

Chair Carter:

Please do it on the record.

Ms. Latham:

For February, Senator Daly can do the 23rd. We have one member who can do the 18th or the 23rd, 27th virtually. Then we have another member who cannot do the 27th; then for March, we have one member who cannot do the 20th. For April, we have the 9th, and the 13th would be good days. For May, there were no dates that members said they could not make it. For June, we have a member who cannot do June 10th and that is it.

Chair Carter:

Starting down here. Well, Mr. Blitsch, tell us what days do not work for you.

Mr. Blitsch:

April 10th.

Chair Carter:

Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson:

February 27th.

Chair Carter:

Commissioner Jones.

Commissioner Jones:

[Inaudible.]

Chair Carter:

I can make myself available any of those times. I will say that I am going to ask that we try to avoid the second and fourth Mondays in the afternoon, but we will address that further on in the agenda. That goes down to M.J.

Ms. Maynard-Carey:

Thank you, Chairman. The dates that do not work: March 20; April 9; 10; and June 8; 9; 10.

Chair Carter:

Finally, Mr. Snow.

Mr. Snow:

The only dates that will not work for me are March 19th and March 20th.

Chair Carter:

Very good. Thank you very much. With that being said, we will get back into the agenda. I say we are for our goal is to have that calendar, a set meeting calendar out by the end of this week.

That brings us to, me being lost where we are at, but I will find it rapidly. Is that— I am going to take and I would like to— I am going to recommend to the Legislative Counsel Bureau, not them, the Legislative Commission to make one substitution on our Committee, and that would be Mr. Lander—he does not have the time. Substituting in Ross Kinson, Teamster from up north—that is a seat that is designated for labor from up north. I have four people that I am going to take and propose that they appoint as nonvoting members and its to fill gaps; that is Tara Frank from NDOT, Chris Burke as a representative of the Contractors Association in the north, Ann Barnett as a representative of the Contractors Association down here in the south, and finally, Ed Lawson, Mayor of Sparks. I think that he is critical because, at least from my point of view, that route from Sparks to TRIC is critical to figure something out for that community and actually all of that area of Washoe, Reno, the Greater Reno-Sparks area. Thank you. I am saying this so we can get it on the record that way we can transmit it to the Legislative Commission.

Vice Chair Daly:

Mister Chair?

Chair Carter:

Yes, Senator Daly.

Vice Chair Daly:

Just FYI [For Your Information], the next Legislative Commission meeting is scheduled for February 26th, so it is a little ways out, but, we probably have to have another meeting without that additional people, but the 26th is the next Legislative Commission.

Chair Carter:

Yes, sir. Thank you very much, and we are taking that into account. That is why it was critical to get those names in the record today so that we can get started. If we do not get started, we are never going to finish.

With that being said, we are going to move on to actually what I would like to do before we go before we move into public comment is just see if there is any comments that the Board has on going forward before we move into the final step of public comment. Is there any burning [Inaudible]. Senator Daly? I know it is a danger offering you the mic, but is there any burning questions that need to be put on the record from up north?

Vice Chair Daly:

No comment.

Chair Carter:

Thank you so much.

AGENDA ITEM IX—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Carter:

With that, we are going to move into the second period of public comment. Like before, public comment may be provided in several different ways including in person, via phone, email, and mail. Detailed instructions to provide public comment are listed on the meeting agenda. With that, is there anybody here in Las Vegas wishing to make public comment? None appearing.

We will move up to the north. Is there any public comment in Carson City?

Vice Chair Daly:

There is none.

Chair Carter:

Thank you. Finally that moves us up to AVH, are there any callers on the line?

AVH:

Thank you, Chair. If you would like to participate in public comment, please press *9 to take your place in the queue.

There are no callers wishing to provide public comment at this time.

Chair Carter:

Thank you very much, AVH.

We will close public comment and move into the final agenda item, which is adjournment and our next meeting will be posted hopefully by the end of the week. Thank you all.

AGENDA ITEM X—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Working Group, the meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Crystal Rowe
Assistant Manager of Research Policy
Assistants

Alex Drozdoff
Principal Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Max E. Carter II, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item V A	Alex Drozdoff, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)	Working Group Brief
Agenda Item V B	Aaron MacDonald, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, LCB	Handout
Agenda Item VII A	Andrew Kjellman, Senior Director of Planning, Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VII B	Jim Gee, Director of Public Transportation and Operations, RTC of Washoe County, Nevada	PowerPoint Presentation

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.