

# Feasibility of Long-Range Mass Transit



January 2005



*Legislative Counsel  
Bureau*

*Bulletin No.  
05-12*



**FEASIBILITY OF LONG-RANGE MASS TRANSIT**

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 (File No. 90, *Statutes of Nevada 2003*)

**BULLETIN NO. 05-12**

**JANUARY 2005**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary of Recommendations .....	iii
Report to the 73rd Session of the Nevada Legislature by the Legislative Commission's Interim Study Concerning the Feasibility of Long-Range Mass Transit Within State and to Urban Areas of Neighboring States .....	1
I. Introduction .....	1
II. Review of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 File No. 90, <i>Statutes of Nevada 2003</i> .....	2
III. Review of Major Issues and Committee Activities .....	3
A. Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT) .....	3
B. The Las Vegas Monorail Project .....	3
C. Maglev and the California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission .....	4
D. Maglev Demonstration Project at Old Dominion University (ODU), Virginia .....	5
E. Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada and RTC of Washoe County .....	5
F. Rural Transit Services .....	5
G. U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Proposed Rail Line .....	6
IV. Final Recommendations of the Committee .....	6
A. Funding for Transportation Issues .....	7
1. Funding Rural Transit Operations .....	7
2. State Highway Fund Money .....	7
3. Fuel Taxes and Fees Related to the Operation of Motor Vehicles .....	8

	<u>Page</u>
B. Continuing the Study of Long-Range Mass Transit Needs in Nevada .....	9
C. Magnetic Levitation Technology .....	9
D. Transportation Services for Senior Citizens.....	10
E. Bike and Pedestrian Safety .....	10
V. Concluding Remarks .....	11
VI. Appendices .....	13

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### FEASIBILITY OF LONG-RANGE MASS TRANSIT WITHIN STATE AND TO URBAN AREAS OF NEIGHBORING STATES

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31  
(File No. 90, *Statutes of Nevada 2003*)

Following is a summary of the recommendations adopted by the Legislative Commission's Interim Study Concerning the Feasibility of Long-Range Mass Transit Within State and to Urban Areas of Neighboring States. These recommendations will be forwarded to the Legislative Commission and ultimately to the 2005 Session of the Nevada Legislature, as appropriate.

### FUNDING FOR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

1. Draft legislation to appropriate from the State General Fund, \$761,391 for each year of the 2006-2007 biennium, for Rural Transit Operations. The allocation from the State General Fund would be used to match local money for specific federal transportation programs. **(BDR 1046)**
2. Draft legislation to amend *Nevada Revised Statutes* 408.271 to allow Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT) to use money earned from interest from the State Highway Fund, when approved by the Legislature, to match money apportioned by the federal government for transit operations in the rural and urban areas of Nevada. **(BDR 1047)**
3. Draft legislation to amend the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* to allow revenue collected from license or registration fees, gasoline taxes, or other motor vehicle fuel to be utilized for other transportation needs, in addition to road construction, maintenance, and repair. **(BDR 1048)**
4. Include in the final report a statement of support directing the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to charge and collect a new fee for every newly issued driver's license, including a motorcycle license, to fund public transportation programs if Section 5 of Article 9 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* is amended.
5. Include in the final report a statement of support directing the DMV to charge and collect a new fee for each registered vehicle to fund public transportation operations if Section 5 of Article 9 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* is amended.

## **CONTINUING THE STUDY OF LONG-RANGE MASS TRANSIT NEEDS IN NEVADA**

6. Draft legislation to direct the Legislative Commission to continue studying the feasibility of long-range mass transit needs of Nevada. The study would concentrate on the transportation needs within and between communities in the urban and rural areas of the state. It must also consider technological advancements in transportation and the need for the state to utilize these advancements. The study must include a comprehensive evaluation of the available transportation options, such as vehicle types, routes, and frequency of service. The Commission and NDOT must utilize this information as a basis for providing public transit services throughout the state. **(BDR 1044)**

## **MAGNETIC LEVITATION TECHNOLOGY**

7. Draft legislation to express support for the California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission's efforts in constructing the 269 mile California-Nevada Interstate Magnetic Levitation (Maglev) Project between Anaheim, California, and Las Vegas, Nevada. **(BDR 1045)**

## **TRANSPORTATION SERVICES SENIOR CITIZEN**

8. Include in the final report a statement of support encouraging NDOT, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada, the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County, and other transportation organizations to provide transportation services for senior services between the rural and urban areas of Nevada.

## **BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY**

9. Include in the final report a statement of support for the RTC of Southern Nevada's Alternative Mode Plan. This is a master plan for bikes and for pedestrians in urbanized southern Nevada.



**REPORT OF THE 73<sup>rd</sup> SESSION OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE BY THE  
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S INTERIM STUDY CONCERNING THE  
FEASIBILITY OF LONG-RANGE MASS TRANSIT WITHIN STATE  
AND TO URBAN AREAS OF NEIGHBORING STATES**

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31  
(File No. 90, *Statutes of Nevada 2003*)

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The 72<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Nevada Legislature adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 (File No. 90, *Statutes of Nevada 2003*), which directed the Legislative Commission to conduct a preliminary feasibility study of long-range mass transit within the State of Nevada and to large urban areas in neighboring states. The committee was charged with evaluating alternative future transportation systems; factors such as public safety, environmental protection, and efficiency; economic concerns; and infrastructure needs.

The committee held a total of five meetings, including a work session, during the course of the study. All meetings were open to the public. Four of the public hearings were conducted through simultaneous videoconferences between legislative meeting rooms at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas and the Legislative Building in Carson City, Nevada. One meeting was held at the Bristlecone Conference Center in Ely, which did not have videoconferencing capability.

During the course of the interim study, the Committee reviewed a variety of issues related to mass transit. The committee received extensive expert testimony regarding various transportation systems. For instance, state and local representatives contributed information regarding buses and other motor vehicles that travel on the streets and highways of this state; light rail service between urban, suburban, and rural communities; magnetic levitation (Maglev) trains and other forms of rapid mass transit, both within Nevada and extending to large urban areas in neighboring states; and monorail systems. The minutes from each meeting are available through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Research Library and through the Legislature's Web site at [www.state.nv.us](http://www.state.nv.us).

At the fifth and final meeting, members conducted a work session at which they adopted nine recommendations, five of which are bill draft requests. The recommendations address the following topics: funding for transportation programs; continuing the study of long-range mass transit needs in Nevada; Magnetic Levitation Technology; providing transportation services for senior citizens; and supporting bike and pedestrian safety.

The following legislators served on the committee during the 2003-2004 Legislative Interim:

Senator Joe Neal, Chairman  
Senator Warren B. Hardy  
Senator Mike McGinness  
Senator Raymond D. Rawson  
Senator Dina Titus  
Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson  
Assemblyman Chad Christensen  
Assemblyman Harry Mortenson  
Assemblyman David R. Parks  
Assemblyman Rod Sherer

The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) provided staff services to the Committee. Research Division staff included Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Senior Research Analyst; Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Senior Research Secretary; Ricka Benum, Senior Research Secretary. Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, and Mary Alice McGreevy, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, provided staff services from the Legal Division.

## **II. REVIEW OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 31** **(FILE NO. 90, STATUTES OF NEVADA 2003)**

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 directed the Legislative Commission to appoint a committee to conduct a preliminary feasibility study of the long-range mass transit needs of the state of Nevada and its communities. The resolution set forth the topics that must be included in the study, which includes:

- Buses and other motor vehicles that travel on the streets and highways of this state;
- Light rail service between urban, suburban, and rural communities;
- Maglev trains and other forms of rapid mass transit, both within Nevada and extending to large urban areas in neighboring states;
- Commuter trains and monorail systems; and
- Other forms of mass transit.

The study must evaluate:

- Alternative future transportation systems;
- Factors such as public safety, environmental protection, and efficiency;

- Economic concerns; and
- Infrastructure needs.

### **III. REVIEW OF MAJOR ISSUES AND COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Legislative Commission's Interim Study Concerning the Feasibility of Long-Range Mass Transit Within State and to Urban Areas of Neighboring States considered a number of issues relating to transportation in Nevada and other states. The presentations made to the Committee were relevant to Nevada's transit systems and transportation issues.

#### **A. Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT)**

Members of the Committee received an overview of NDOT's responsibilities and its role in public transportation. The Department is responsible for the planning, construction, operation and maintenance of the 5,400 miles of highway and nearly 1,000 bridges which make up the state highway system. The NDOT is divided into three districts, with a district engineer and two assistant engineers in each. The districts are responsible for supervising all state transportation activities within their local areas. NDOT's headquarters building is located in Carson City, with the three main district offices located in Las Vegas, Reno and Elko. Major maintenance stations are in Ely, Tonopah, and Winnemucca.

Representatives of NDOT provided information regarding its' strategic plan and goals, which includes improving safety in public transportation; developing and delivering beneficial projects in a timely manner; effectively communicating to improve customer satisfaction; and making the most of the Department's assets and minimizing its risks. Additionally, the Department discussed various types of mass transit systems currently being utilized and those that may be considered in the future. The transit systems include bus service, railroads, Amtrak service, high-speed trains, monorail, Maglev technology, and airports.

#### **B. The Las Vegas Monorail Project**

The Committee heard testimony from representatives of the Las Vegas Monorail regarding the Las Vegas Monorail Project. They explained that the Monorail is a driverless, state-of-the-art, urban public transportation system that operates on a four mile route along the Las Vegas Strip. It has stations at eight major hotel-casino resorts and nine convention facilities.

The 1997 Legislature created the legal framework for building a monorail with the enactment of Assembly Bill 333 (Chapter 513, *Statutes of Nevada*). The measure included provisions allowing Clark County to grant a monorail franchise for the private sector to own, operate, and charge a fare for a public monorail system. A private consortium comprised of Bombardier

Transportation and the Granite Construction Company, Gensler and Associates, Carter-Burgess, and Salomon Smith Barney is building and operating the monorail.

The Committee learned that \$650 million in industrial revenue bonds were issued to finance the project. The bonds are non-recourse bonds and are not general obligations of the state. Therefore, bondholders are not able to sue the State of Nevada if revenue from fares is not enough to meet the debt payments. Additionally, the Las Vegas Monorail Company plans to sell advertising space on each of its trains and in the monorail stations to increase the Project's revenue.

To ride the monorail, a person may purchase tickets at one of the integrated ticketing systems located at each hotel-casino resort located along the monorail route. The cost is \$3 for a one-way fare and \$10 for a daily pass. Operators of the monorail anticipate having nine trains operating when fully operational with an average wait time of one minute between each train.

### **C. Maglev and the California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission**

The Committee was provided information on Maglev technology which operates by using a non-contact electromagnetic system. Instead of wheels and rails, super speed Maglev trains utilize state-of-the-art electric power and noncontact electromagnetic levitation, guidance, and control systems to hover above the tracks or guideways. As a result, there is not physical contact between the train and the guideway, which eliminates friction and enables Maglev trains to reach speeds of more than 300 miles per hour. Currently, Maglev systems are fully operational in countries such as China, Germany, and Japan.

For more than 20 years, the idea of a super speed train to connect Las Vegas with southern California has been discussed. People expressed interest in a high-speed maglev train system along the 269-mile corridor between Las Vegas and Anaheim, California. In response, the Legislature created the California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission to study the feasibility of such a system in 1987. In 1994, the California-Nevada Commission selected the American Magline Group (AMG) as its private partner to build a Maglev system along the Interstate-15 corridor between Anaheim and Las Vegas via the California cities of Ontario, Victorville, Barstow, and Primm, Nevada. Members of the Commission testified that when completed, this project will connect the fastest growing city in the United States (U.S.), Las Vegas, with the second largest county (Orange, California) in the U.S.

It was noted that the California-Nevada Interstate Maglev Project was one of seven corridors throughout the country selected as part of the Federal Railroad Administration's Maglev Deployment Program. Although the Project was not selected as one of the final two projects to receive \$1 billion in federal grants for "Preconstruction Planning Activities," the Commission received \$1 million in federal grants to continue planning and preparing for the Project. The Project remains eligible for funding of the "final design, engineering, and construction activities." The Commission and AMG are seeking \$1 billion in any remaining pre-construction and construction grant funding in connection of the Transportation Equity Act for

the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) for the project's first phase, the Las Vegas-Primm Segment, also known as the "First 40 Miles," based upon its eligibility as determined by the federal government.

Currently, the Commission is preparing a programmatic environmental impact statement for the "First 40 Miles." As a result of this study, the Commission will be able to determine what specific environmental needs should be further studied in order to move forward on the project.

#### **D. Maglev Demonstration Project at Old Dominion University (ODU), Virginia**

Dr. Robert L. Ash, Interim Vice President for Research, ODU, presented information concerning the Maglev Demonstration Project at ODU. The Project began in 2002 with the construction of an elevated concrete guideway and track. He noted that the guideway (seven-tenths of a mile) was constructed in 39 days and the maximum speed of the train is 40 miles per hour. A maglev vehicle arrived at the University and test runs began in July 2002. However, ride-quality problems surfaced and work was halted in October 2003 due to funding and the need to refine the vehicle's complex control system. Dr. Ash anticipates that the system will begin operation in late 2004.

The Demonstration Project was funded with a \$7 million loan approved by the Virginia General Assembly and is administered by the Virginia Department of Transportation. The loan will be repaid from proceeds of future high-speed, revenue producing maglev projects in Virginia. The project is also funded with \$7 million from private companies. Dr. Ash explained private funds were utilized since federal funding was unavailable at the time of construction.

#### **E. Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada and RTC of Washoe County**

The RTC of Southern Nevada and the RTC of Washoe County are regional governmental agencies that perform many transportation activities in their respective areas of the state. The agencies have been designated as Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) for the Las Vegas Urban Area and Washoe County, respectively. As a MPO, each RTC is responsible to the state and federal government for maintaining a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process. Additionally, each RTC owns and operates a public mass transit system, known as Citizens Area Transit (CAT) in Las Vegas, and Citifare in Washoe County. The transit systems are fixed-route services and operate on a schedule. Each system also provides services to disabled persons.

#### **F. Rural Transit Services**

The Committee heard testimony on several occasions regarding the needs of existing rural transportation programs and the lack of available funding for rural transportation in Nevada.

Operators of rural transit systems provided examples of the positive difference transportation makes in rural communities. For instance, the Churchill Area Regional Transportation (CART) is a coordinated, self-sufficient program serving the elderly, disabled, unemployed, and youth. The CART provides transportation service so that people may access educational opportunities, employment, medical appointments, grocery shopping, social outings, and recreational activities. Without CART, the quality of life for many Churchill County residents.

The operators of rural transit systems also noted that local counties often have difficulty matching federal funding for transportation programs. The federal government provides funds for capital and operating assistance for public transportation services. The Programs utilized by local governments in Nevada include: The Capital Bus Program (Section 5309 Federal Funds); The Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (Section 5310 Federal Funds); the Rural and Nonurbanized Rural Public Transportation Program (Section 5311 Federal Funds); and the Job Access Reverse Commute Discretionary Funds. Transit operators cited that local governments must match a portion of the federal funding (between 20 percent and 50 percent depending on the program). Operators of rural transit programs indicated it is an economic and social loss for an entire community when a county is unable to meet the federal match requirement.

#### **G. U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Proposed Rail Line**

The Committee was provided an update by the DOE regarding its proposal to plan, develop, and operate a rail system to move spent fuel and high-level waste from private and Federal facilities and storage sites to a repository at Yucca Mountain. A representative of the DOE explained that the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Yucca Mountain Repository was issued in 2002 and a preference was stated for rail as the transportation mode for moving waste both nationally and in Nevada. However, it was noted that there have been no formal decisions on the mode of transportation or rail corridor in Nevada. If it is determined that rail is the best mode of transportation, then DOE prefers the Caliente rail corridor and Carlin as the secondary preference.

The DOE will evaluate other potential uses for the Caliente rail corridor if it is chosen for development, such as moving commercial freight and providing passenger rail service. The DOE will work together with Nevada's government officials and residents of Nevada to develop a rail corridor, if Yucca Mountain is chosen as the nation's repository for high-level radioactive waste.

#### **IV. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE**

At its work session in June 2004, the Committee considered several recommendations relating to mass transit in Nevada. The Committee members adopted nine recommendations, including five recommendations for bill drafts to be considered by the 2005 Legislature.

## **A. Funding For Transportation Issues**

### **1. Funding Rural Transit Operations**

Throughout the study, the Committee heard testimony by representatives of the Nevada Rural Transit Coalition regarding the need to fund rural transit operations. Representatives explained that local and federal monies are the primary source of funding for rural transportation programs. The Committee heard testimony that indicated rural counties often have difficulty meeting the federal match rate for federally subsidized rural transportation programs. Counties that match less money than the federal match amount receive funding for only the amount it matched, thereby losing out on the total funding available for rural transit operations in their area. The Committee acknowledged the importance of obtaining all available federal funding since it benefits transit systems in both urbanized and nonurbanized areas of the state.

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

- **Draft legislation to appropriate from the State General Fund, \$761,391 for each year of the 2006-2007 biennium, for rural transit operations. The allocation from the State General Fund would be used to match local money for specific federal transportation programs. (BDR 1046)**

### **2. State Highway Fund Money**

The Committee was informed by representatives of the Nevada Rural Transit Coalition that under state law, NDOT may expend money earned from interest by investment of the State Highway Fund, when approved by the Legislature, to conduct studies and match federal money for capital acquisition only. Representatives of the Coalition requested that this provision be broadened so that money earned by the interest could also be used to match money apportioned by the federal government for rural transit operations in counties with populations less than 200,000.

Based on this request, Committee members asked representatives of NDOT how the existing money is used. Representatives indicated that between \$8 million and \$10 million a year is earned in interest. This money is returned to the State Highway Fund each year to fund a variety of capital acquisition projects and transportation studies.

The Committee supported the recommendation to broaden the law to include matching money apportioned by the federal government for rural transit operations. However, the Committee noted that the money should be used for rural and urban transit operations throughout the state.

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

- **Draft legislation to amend *Nevada Revised Statutes* 408.271 to allow Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT) to use money earned from interest from the State Highway Fund, when approved by the Legislature, to match money apportioned by the federal government for transit operations in the rural and urban areas of Nevada. (BDR 1047)**

### 3. Fuel Taxes and Fees Related to the Operation of Motor Vehicles

Representatives of the Nevada Rural Transit Coalition suggested charging and collecting a fee for every newly issued driver's license, including a motorcycle driver's license, to fund rural public transportation programs. The fee, collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), would be deposited into a newly created account in the State Highway Fund. The Committee generally concurred with this recommendation.

However, Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, had explained in a previous meeting that under Section 5 of Article 9 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada*, proceeds from the imposition of any license or registration fee and other charge with respect to the operation of any motor vehicle upon any public highway in this state and the proceeds from the imposition of any excise tax on gasoline or other motor vehicle fuel shall, except costs of administration, be used exclusively for the construction, maintenance, and repair of the public highways of this state. Therefore, to add such a provision to law that allows the use of fuel taxes and fees for transportation purposes other than road maintenance, it would be necessary to amend the *Constitution* or introduce an initiative petition. These options could take up to five years to implement.

The Committee acknowledged that the *Constitution* should be amended to allow for other uses of revenue collected from license or registration fees, gasoline taxes, or other motor vehicle fuel.

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

- **Draft legislation to amend the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* to allow revenue collected from license or registration fees, gasoline taxes, or other motor vehicle fuel to be utilized for other transportation needs, in addition to road construction, maintenance, and repair. (BDR 1048)**

As previously stated, the recommendations directing the DMV to charge and collect fees for newly issued driver's licenses and vehicle registrations cannot be approved unless the *Constitution* is amended. Members of the Committee indicated their support for the concept. However, it was noted that the recommendations should not state a specific fee amount; rather, the amount of the fee should be determined if and when the *Constitution* is amended.

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendations:



- **Include in the final report a statement of support directing the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to charge and collect a new fee for every newly issued driver's license, including a motorcycle license, to fund public transportation programs if Section 5 of Article 9 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* is amended.**
- **Include in the final report a statement of support directing the DMV to charge and collect a new fee for each registered vehicle to fund public transportation operations if Section 5 of Article 9 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* is amended.**

#### **B. Continuing the Study of Long-Range Mass Transit Needs in Nevada**

The Committee received extensive testimony on the long-range mass transit needs in Nevada from both providers and users of rural and urban transportation services. Based on the testimony, representatives of NDOT suggested that the Committee continue to study rural transit needs. Representatives of NDOT indicated the importance of clearly defining the transportation needs within a rural community and the needs between a rural and urban community. The results of the study should be used as a basis for conducting a comprehensive evaluation of options, including vehicle types, routes, and frequency of service to meet the needs of a community. The evaluation may also be used to establish the framework for a basic rural transit system in Nevada.

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

- **Draft legislation to direct the Legislative Commission to continue studying the feasibility of long-range mass transit needs of Nevada. The study would concentrate on the transportation needs within and between communities in the urban and rural areas of the state. It must also consider technological advancements in transportation and the need for the state to utilize these advancements. The study must include a comprehensive evaluation of the available transportation options, such as vehicle types, routes, and frequency of service. The Commission and NDOT must utilize this information as a basis for public transit services throughout the state. (BDR 1044)**

#### **C. Magnetic Levitation Technology**

The California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission gave an overview of its many activities to the Committee at the January 2004, meeting. The Commission made certain observations regarding the status of the project, including the importance of constructing the "First 40 Miles" between Las Vegas and Primm. Moreover, as the Project is still being considered for grants by the federal government, it was expressed by members of the Commission that it is important for the Project to have the support of the Legislature.

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

- **Draft legislation to express support for the California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission's efforts in constructing the 269 mile California-Nevada Interstate Magnetic Levitation (Maglev) Project between Anaheim, California, and Las Vegas, Nevada. (BDR 1045)**

#### **D. Transportation Services for Senior Citizens**

The Committee heard testimony indicating that senior citizens who reside in Nevada's rural areas often lack transportation within their communities and to outlying areas of the state. Senior citizens in rural communities rely heavily on transportation systems in order to attend health care appointments, shop for food, and even just to leave their homes. Moreover, transit services allow senior citizens to interact with other people in the community.

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

- **Include in the final report a statement of support encouraging NDOT, the RTC of Southern Nevada, the RTC of Washoe County, and other transportation organizations to provide transportation services for senior services between the rural and urban areas of Nevada.**

#### **E. Bike and Pedestrian Safety**

The Committee received testimony from concerned citizens regarding the need to consider human-powered transportation, specifically pedestrians and bicycles, in addition to mass transit. The Committee was informed of "the three E's," which are three essential components of making the streets safer: engineering, education, and enforcement. The Committee was advised on the importance of: (1) developing safer road designs and facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists; (2) educating the public at schools, service organizations, and through the media; and (3) working toward enforcing traffic laws.

As the designated MPO for Clark County, Nevada, the RTC is responsible under federal regulations for the Regional Transportation Plan. All street and highway, transit, and transportation related bicycle and pedestrian projects proposed to be built with federal funds must be consistent with this plan. The RTC addresses a broad range of improvements for both bicycle and pedestrian travel, including bicycle paths, bicycle lanes, bicycle routes, bicycle storage, sidewalks, access for persons with disabilities, and traffic signal improvements for both bicycle and pedestrian use throughout the metropolitan area. This plan is consistent with "the three E's."

Therefore, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

- **Include in the final report a statement of support for the RTC of Southern Nevada's Alternative Mode Plan. This is a master plan for bikes and for pedestrians in urbanized southern Nevada.**

## **V. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The Committee wishes to thank the many individuals who contributed to this study through their correspondence or testimony at the public hearings. The Committee members also recognize the cooperation and assistance provided by the staffs of the California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission; Economic Development, Department of Business and Industry; Elko County; Interstate Traveler Company; NDOT; ODU; RTC of Southern Nevada; RTC of Washoe County; State Advisory Committee on Transit; Transit Systems Management; U.S. DOE; and White Pine County.



## VI. APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix A	
Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 of the 2003 Legislative Session. ....	15
(File No. 90, <i>Statutes of Nevada 2003</i> )	
Appendix B	
Suggested Legislation.....	19



## APPENDIX A

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 of the 2003 Legislative Session  
(File No. 90, *Statutes of Nevada 2003*)





Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31

FILE NUMBER 90

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Directing the Legislative Commission to conduct a preliminary feasibility study of long-range mass transit within the State of Nevada and to large urban areas in neighboring states.

WHEREAS, With the rapidly increasing population of our state, alternative methods of transportation must be considered to deal effectively with the problems that arise from such an increase; and

WHEREAS, Because of the recent changes in the economic climate of our country and our state, and the security concerns of travelers, it would be beneficial to expand the methods of transportation to bring tourists and business people to the State of Nevada; and

WHEREAS, Our state is unique in that one must sometimes travel long distances between communities, and alternate transportation suitable to that environment would allow those distances to be traversed in a very short period; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, THE ASSEMBLY CONCURRING, That the Legislative Commission is hereby directed to appoint a committee to conduct a preliminary feasibility study of the long-range mass transit needs of the State of Nevada and its communities, including, without limitation:

1. Buses and other motor vehicles that travel on the streets and highways of this state;
2. Light rail service between urban, suburban and rural communities;
3. Magnetic levitation trains and other forms of rapid mass transit, both within this state and extending to large urban areas in neighboring states;
4. Commuter trains;
5. Monorail systems; and
6. Other forms of mass transit; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the study must include, without limitation, an evaluation of:

1. Alternative future transportation systems;
2. Factors such as public safety, environmental protection and efficiency;
3. Economic concerns; and
4. Infrastructure needs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Legislative Commission shall submit a report of the results of the preliminary feasibility study and any recommendations for legislation to the 73rd Session of the Nevada Legislature.



## APPENDIX B

### Suggested Legislation

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| BDR 1044 | CR: Directs the Legislative Commission to continue the interim study of the feasibility of long-range mass transit needs of Nevada.   |
| BDR 1045 | CR: Expresses the support of the Nevada Legislature for the efforts of the California-Nevada Super Speed Ground Transportation Commission in facilitating the California-Nevada Interstate Magnetic Levitation Project. |
| BDR 1046 | Makes an appropriation to match local money for Rural Transit Operations.   |
| BDR 1047 | Revises provisions governing the use of the interest earned on the money in the State Highway Fund.   |
| BDR 1048 | JR: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to allow the use of revenue generated from gas taxes for additional needs related to transportation.  |