

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Summary of Public Comments and Questions**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment or Question Response
1	<p><b>Topic: Alternative Selection.</b> General comments on the preference of Light Rail Transit (LRT), Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Enhanced Bus, or No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>BRT was adopted by the RTC Board of Commissioners as the Locally Preferred Alternative. It will operate like a light rail system with enhanced passenger amenities and dedicated transit lanes along most of the route; but with the lower cost and flexibility of a bus.</p>
2	<p><b>Topic: Air Quality.</b> Comments that LRT would reduce emissions. Maryland Parkway BRT buses should not use fossil fuels, they should be electric.</p>	<p>The BRT alternative envisions use of 60-foot articulated buses running on compressed natural gas (CNG), while the light rail alternative would be powered by electricity and possibly incorporate battery technology. CNG is noted as one of the cleanest burning transportation fuels available, producing 20 to 30 percent fewer greenhouse gas emissions and 95 percent fewer tailpipe emissions than diesel fuel. Currently the RTC is migrating its bus fleet away from diesel to CNG. When electric buses become proven as a reliable technology, they may be phased into the RTC fleet. Additional information can be found in Sections 3.10 and 3.16 in the Maryland Parkway Environmental Assessment (EA)</p> <p>In 2018, RTC estimated that replacing 100 percent CNG-fueled buses on Maryland Parkway with electric LRT vehicles would result in daily bus vehicle miles traveled on Route 109 and daily idle (transit stops, traffic lights, and driver layover) reductions for carbon monoxide (CO) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions of 18.61 kg/day and 5.49 kg/day, respectively (or 6,793 kg/year and 2,004 kg/year, respectively).</p>
3	<p><b>Topic: Traffic Congestion.</b> Comments suggesting dedicated transit lanes will result in the removal of two existing traffic lanes along Maryland Parkway, which will increase traffic congestion. Keep the existing traffic lanes and add exclusive transit lanes by widening Maryland Parkway. Improve traffic signal timing in corridor.</p>	<p>A traffic model for the proposed alternatives indicated minimal impacts from dedicated curbside-running transit lanes, which will be used by buses and right-turning vehicles without slowing down the through traffic in the other two lanes on Maryland Parkway. Additional right turn lanes would be added to major intersections to allow right-turning vehicles to queue without impacting the adjacent transit lanes while they wait on pedestrians in crosswalks. This will also minimize the need for through traffic to weave in and out of the right lane around stopped buses or right-turning vehicles providing a better flow of traffic. Expanding the public right of way for additional exclusive transit lanes would result in the acquisition of many properties, impacting residents and businesses, and making the project cost prohibitive. The project will be designed to minimize encroachment into adjacent properties wherever possible. RTC will work with the City of Las Vegas and Clark County Public Works Departments to evaluate traffic signal timing performance and possible implementation of transit signal priority to help expedite BRT operations. Additional information can be found in the Transit Impact Analysis in Appendix K of the Maryland Parkway EA.</p>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
4	<p><b>Topic: Existing Pavement Condition and Safety Issues along Maryland Parkway.</b> Comments on the need for improvement of the pavement conditions on Maryland Parkway and other roads for vehicle traffic as well as the safety of pedestrians, bicycles, and wheelchair users crossing the roads. Promote vehicle-related safety measures, such as automated speed enforcement cameras.</p>	<p>In the near term, Clark County Public Works is scheduled to repave the southern portion of Maryland Parkway between Twain Avenue and Russell Road in 2019. Roadway improvements on Eastern Avenue between Desert Inn Road and Warm Springs Road are scheduled to be underway and complete in 2019. Additional road surface improvements on Maryland Parkway cross streets such as Tropicana, Flamingo, and Charleston will be completed by the County or City. The proposed BRT project will include repaving of a number of roadways along the route as needed, including Maryland Parkway, Carson Avenue, and Alta Drive. RTC works with all local jurisdictions, the Nevada Department of Transportation, and law enforcement agencies to consider transportation related safety measures for the design of roadways and application of new technologies.</p>
5	<p><b>Topic: Improve Maryland Parkway into a Green Corridor.</b> Commenters noted that use urban trees to provide shade to the sidewalks was going to be very important for the image and function of the street regeneration. Pedestrians need shade to walk, so suggest the streetscape has to include more trees in or next to the sidewalks, accompanied with lighting to promote shops that have walking access.</p>	<p>As part of the final design of the BRT project, RTC will work with the City of Las Vegas and Clark County to consider urban design elements and landscaping that improve the image and functionality of the corridor. See Appendix E of the Maryland Parkway EA for the complete streets approach for Maryland Parkway.</p>
6	<p><b>Topic: Storage Capabilities on Transit Vehicles.</b> Comments that transit vehicles should have storage racks and areas available inside for bicycles, wheelchairs, walkers, luggage, shopping carts, and shopping bags.</p>	<p>RTC will evaluate BRT buses before ordering to determine the storage capacity for items such as bicycles, luggage, and other items.</p>
7	<p><b>Topic: Mobility Access onto Transit Vehicles.</b> For passengers with mobility issues, level boarding and designated areas on transit vehicles for wheelchairs, walker, and mobility chairs was important for ease of loading and unloading.</p>	<p>The BRT vehicles will have near level boarding at the stations which will make it easier to get on and off the buses.</p>
8	<p><b>Topic: Existing Safety Concerns on Maryland Parkway Transit System.</b> Numerous comments on safety concerns on the Maryland Parkway corridor and buses, such as homeless and rude passengers. Commenters suggested the bus stops need to be cleaner, have weather protection, and better signage.</p>	<p>The BRT station design will incorporate benches, weather protection structures, wayfinding, passenger information, and aesthetic elements to brand the system and complement the corridor identity. Security measures will be included as part of the design of new stations and on the buses. All buses are equipped with security cameras that can be accessed in real time by law enforcement. Bus operators are trained to watch for suspicious persons. Fare enforcement officers regularly patrol the RTC bus routes to help ensure that all who are on the buses or waiting at a stop are paying customers. Comment regarding the condition and cleanliness of the transit stops has been forwarded to the RTC's Transit Amenities Department. RTC's mobile app, rideRTC, provides a way for customers to report concerns, such as trash and graffiti, or other issues with its Transit Watch feature.</p>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
9	<p><b>Topic: Other Alternative Technology Considerations.</b> Commenters suggested RTC should consider a subway, elevated rail, monorail, or tubular rail option for Maryland Parkway project. RTC should also consider autonomous vehicles, virtual trains, and personal rapid transit in their planning efforts.</p>	<p>Subway, elevated rail, and monorail options were considered in the Maryland Parkway Alternatives Analysis (2014), but determined to be less accessible for patrons with much higher construction and operation costs than other at-grade options for the levels of ridership expected in the corridor. Therefore, these options were removed from further consideration in the Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>RTC will evaluate available transit vehicle technologies before selecting any new buses for the proposed BRT. When electric or driverless buses become proven as reliable technologies, they may be phased into the RTC fleet. If rubber tired 'virtual trains' with automated driving systems are rigorously tested and become viable as an option in the U.S., then they could be incorporated into the BRT system rather easily.</p> <p>It appears that the Tubular Rail concept has not yet been implemented as a mass transit solution, so it is unclear if it would be the right application for Maryland Parkway. The Boring Company's concept has not yet been implemented as a mass transit solution, so it is unclear it if would be the right application for Maryland Parkway. Based on available information, the Boring Company system would require vehicle elevators at each stop location, require additional property acquisition, and potential impacts.</p>
10	<p><b>Topic: Project Funding.</b> Commenters wanted to know where funding for the transit system will come from.</p>	<p>BRT was adopted by the RTC Board of Commissioners as the Locally Preferred Alternative. It will operate like a light rail system with enhanced passenger amenities and dedicated transit lanes along most of the route; but with the lower cost and flexibility of a bus. Funding for the BRT will come from a combination of primarily federal funds already appropriated to southern Nevada or available through competitive grant programs, along with existing local sources, such as sales tax revenues, passenger fares, and Fuel Revenue Indexing funds. It is anticipated that over 60 percent of the funding to develop the proposed project will come from federal sources.</p>
11	<p><b>Topic: Fare Increases.</b> Commenters wanted to know if fares for LRT or BRT option would be increased. What about reduced or no fares for low income and seniors?</p>	<p>BRT was adopted by the RTC Board of Commissioners as the Locally Preferred Alternative. BRT fares will be consistent with the rest of the RTC bus network. Due to fiscal constraints, the RTC cannot offer free transit service to everyone; however, the RTC does offer reduced fares (50 percent off) to youths (6-17 years), senior citizens (60 years and older), Medicare eligible persons, anyone with a disability, and local residents who are veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces. College students have access to specially priced passes and children 5 years or younger can ride RTC's buses for free when accompanied by an adult.</p>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
12	<p><b>Topic: Transit Options for Other Corridors.</b> General comments on additional bus/transit routes to other locations within and outside RTC’s service area as well as expansion of bus service on other city streets. Lack of paratransit service outside service area. Are RTC buses run by private companies?</p>	<p>The RTC is committed to providing a fast, reliable, and sustainable public transportation system and is considering future expansion and enhancement of the transit network through a long term planning effort called 'On Board' and encourages everyone's participation in the On Board planning process. Stay up to date on the plan's development and upcoming events by going to <a href="http://www.onboardsnv.com">www.onboardsnv.com</a>.</p> <p>In recent years, the RTC has reconstructed Las Vegas Boulevard North, Boulder Highway, Sahara Avenue and Flamingo Road, all key transportation corridors, to improve transit performance and enhance mobility and will continue to develop a more robust public transportation network.</p> <p>To be eligible for paratransit service, customers must live within the current service area. The overall bus system is funded by the RTC and operated by two main private contractors. While RTC is continually looking for ways to expand and enhance the bus network, it is limited by available funding.</p>
13	<p><b>Topic: Pedestrian Crossing Safety at UNLV.</b> Commenters suggested there should be overhead walkways across Maryland Parkway in the vicinity of UNLV due to the large number of students and faculty that cross the street, especially in between stop lights. More signalized pedestrian crossings needed and median barriers around UNLV.</p>	<p>The proposed project will include new paving, sidewalks, ramps, crosswalks, median fencing to prevent jaywalking, new lighting, and traffic signals for pedestrian crossings where warranted. During the final engineering phase of the project, median barrier and flashing crosswalks will be evaluated to minimize mid-block pedestrian crossings around UNLV. During final design, RTC will coordinate with Clark County and UNLV to determine best placement of those pedestrian control measures.</p>
14	<p><b>Topic: Separate Bike Lanes.</b> General comments that separated bike lanes are important as well as bike sharing programs and bike storage at stations.</p>	<p>Separated bike lanes are proposed on each side of the street behind the curb and at the same elevation as the sidewalk, giving bicyclists their own space and providing a buffer for pedestrians. RTC has coordinated with local bike organizations to determine the safest placement of the proposed bike lanes along Maryland Parkway. RTC will also be looking at the first mile/last mile opportunities such as bike sharing and storage at stations. See Appendix F of the Maryland Parkway EA for bike station options.</p>
15	<p><b>Topic: Connection to Airport.</b> Comment that connection to McCarran International Airport and South Strip Transit Terminal (SSTT) is important. Why does the transit project stop at Russell Road?</p>	<p>BRT was adopted by the RTC Board of Commissioners as the Locally Preferred Alternative. It will operate like a light rail system with enhanced passenger amenities and dedicated transit lanes along most of the route; but with the lower cost and flexibility of a bus. The BRT Alternative will enable continued bus service between Maryland Parkway, McCarran International Airport, and SSTT. The RTC continues to coordinate with the Clark County Department of Aviation related to the existing bus routes that serve Terminals 1 and 3 and the Maryland Parkway BRT service to the airport once the project is completed.</p>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
16	<p><b>Topic: Master Planning and Gentrification Concerns.</b> Commenters suggested the need for a master planning process in the corridor to address gentrification concerns.</p>	<p>Both Clark County and the City of Las Vegas have master planning documents that account for planned growth in the Maryland Parkway corridor. See Section 1.2 and Section 3.1.1.1 in the Maryland Parkway EA for a brief description of relevant master planning documents. Clark County Planning Department developed an overlay district for Maryland Parkway to enable higher density, mixed use development, City of Las Vegas and Clark County have included in their planning documents the need for low-income and senior housing, zoning controls, and other methods to minimize gentrification impacts in the corridor.</p>
17	<p><b>Topic: Current and Future Route 109 Service.</b> General comments on headways, late and overcrowded buses, lack of benches and shelters at stops on existing RTC routes, and access to bus schedules. Need more options on routes to purchase weekly, monthly, and reduced fare cards.</p>	<p>The current route 109 bus service provides 15-minutes headways throughout most of the day. The proposed BRT may provide 10-minute headways during peak periods of the day and could be reduced further as ridership demands increase. The BRT station design will incorporate benches, weather protection structures, wayfinding, passenger information, and aesthetic elements to brand the system and complement the corridor identity. RTC's regular and reduced fare passes are available for purchase on the RTC mobile app or in person at Bonneville Transit Center, RTC Administration Building, and select vendor locations throughout the Las Vegas Valley. In the future, ticket vending machines may be provided at new BRT stations along the proposed Maryland Parkway route. The RTC has a mobile application where customers with smart phones can see specific schedule information and real time arrival information as well as purchase their fares and store them on their phones. To make this information available and avoid data charges, the RTC provides free WiFi on all of its buses and at each of its transit centers. Comments of this nature on other RTC routes have been forwarded to RTC's Transit Department.</p>
18	<p><b>Topic: Projected Ridership Numbers.</b> Provide justification for ridership numbers. How did RTC arrive at 16,000 passengers per day for light rail vs. 13,300 boardings per day for the BRT alternative vs. 9,000 for enhanced bus?</p>	<p>Currently, the Maryland Parkway bus route 109 carries 9,000 to 10,000 riders per day and has more boardings per mile and boardings per hour than any other bus route outside the Strip. Additional information is located in Section 2.2 and Table 2.2-2 in the Maryland Parkway EA.</p> <p>The transit ridership forecast approach employed for the Maryland Parkway corridor analysis is based on a travel demand model, whose methodology has been approved by the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration, and developed and refined by the Regional Transportation Commission over the past 20 years. The basis of the travel demand model is the well-established "Four Step Model" process including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Trip Generation</li> <li>2. Trip Distribution</li> <li>3. Mode Choice</li> <li>4. Trip Assignment</li> </ol>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
18 (cont)		<p>The 4-step process is performed for existing and future (2040) land use and socioeconomic conditions in order to estimate current and forecast future travel demand.</p> <p>The first step in the process, trip generation, uses socioeconomic data to determine the number of trips produced in all the traffic analysis zones (TAZ) that represent the entire Las Vegas metropolitan area. The TAZs are subset areas of the region based on census tract, census block group, or other geographic division. The socioeconomic data for each TAZ includes population, income, auto ownership, and employment information. The trip generation model estimates both productions (the home end of trips) and attractions (the non-home end of trips). Trip productions are estimated for each TAZ using a cross-classification procedure. First, the households in each TAZ are stratified into household categories. For example, for home-based work trips, the households are stratified into a matrix of household categories based on the number of persons in the household, the number of workers in the household, and the income level of the household. After households have been stratified, trip production rates are applied to each household category, and the resulting trips are aggregated in each TAZ for use in the model. Trip attractions are estimated by a set of linear equations that convert households, employees, and school enrollment to trip attractions. Finally, the productions and attractions are “balanced” so that the regional totals match for each trip purpose.</p> <p>The second step is trip distribution. Once the number of trips is known, trip distribution determines where the trips will go. This step considers several factors, including the number of trip productions, the number of trip attractions, and impedance values or the resistance to travel in terms of distance, time, cost, or a combination of these factors. One of the main objectives of this step is to ensure an accurate and comparative representation of the travel times and costs between TAZs by various modes of travel. The travel times and costs estimated by the model are commonly referred to as skims. The highway and transit skims are used as input to both the trip distribution and mode choice models. Transit skims comprise a combination of variables that have been found to affect both the choice of the transit mode and the path choice for transit options. The variables include the in-vehicle transit travel time, access time between transit stops, wait time, number of transfers, and transit fare.</p> <p>The third step is mode choice. This step determines what mode of travel (drive alone, shared ride, transit) each trip will utilize when going from one TAZ to another. The mode choice model application is performed separately for the peak and off-peak time periods for five trip purposes. The time-of-day factors are used to convert the vehicle trip tables from production-</p>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
18 (cont)		<p>attraction format to origin-destination format for the four time periods (AM peak, midday, PM peak, and nighttime).</p> <p>The final step in the travel demand modeling process is trip assignment. This step takes all of the trips from mode choice (drive alone, share a ride, use transit, or use another mode of transportation) and assigns them to the transportation (roadway and transit) network. The vehicle trip tables are assigned to the highway network using a multiclass assignment procedure for three auto modes (drive alone, two-person, and three-or-more person) and three truck modes. The transit trip tables are assigned in production-attraction format to the AM peak transit network (peak transit trips) and the midday transit network (off-peak transit trips).</p> <p>The transit ridership forecast approach uses a predictive subset of variables to evaluate the ridership impacts of the transit alternatives under study. Briefly, the required data needed to apply the model approach are observed trip tables (origin to destination) of existing transit markets for trips for current riders in the corridor. The observed trip tables were estimated from 2014 Transit On-Board Survey collected on Route 109 and the entire RTC bus system. In order to avoid double-counting, survey data for the Maryland Parkway corridor was deleted from the systemwide dataset before combining with the Route 109 dataset. The methodology used to create the observed trip tables was based on guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The ridership forecasts for the proposed alternatives include a broader regional assessment of ridership impacts, including transit ridership diversion from other transit corridors to the Maryland Parkway corridor.</p> <p>The RTC's regional travel demand model estimates of 16,100 boardings per average weekday for the LRT alternative and 13,300 boardings per day for the BRT alternative were based on the speed and travel time factors included in the 4-step modeling process. The speed and travel time factors were based on the proposed dedicated curb lane operation for both LRT and BRT. The current Route 109 serving Maryland Parkway operates in mixed traffic flow which is slower due to impedances caused by traffic congestion and therefore has lower ridership.</p> <p>It should be noted that BRT was chosen by RTC Board of Commissioners as the Locally Preferred Alternative on Maryland Parkway. It will operate like a light rail system with enhanced passenger amenities and dedicated transit lanes along most of the route; but with the lower cost and flexibility of a bus.</p>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
18 (cont)		For more detailed information on the travel demand model, visit the RTC's access 2040 (2017-2040 Regional Transportation Plan) webpage at <a href="http://www.rtcsv.com/planning-engineering/transportation-planning/2017-2040-regional-transportation-plan/">www.rtcsv.com/planning-engineering/transportation-planning/2017-2040-regional-transportation-plan/</a> and review Appendix D – Regional Forecasts and Appendix E – Model Technical Report.
19	<b>Topic: Additional Parking Lots or Garages at Stations.</b> General comments on the need for additional parking lots or parking garages at new station locations.	The RTC is not planning to add park and rides at the new station locations at this time due to the abundance of free parking at various shopping centers along the corridor as well as structured garages in downtown.
20	<b>Topic: Center-running Lanes.</b> Comments that center-running dedicated lanes would be better. When considering side-running vs center-running, need to consider utilities under rails that could rupture.	The center-running option for LRT and BRT lanes was analyzed and presented in the Maryland Parkway EA's Summary of Initial Alternatives Analysis (Appendix B) and Summary of Locally Preferred Alternatives Refinement Process (Appendix C). The center-running configuration was removed as an alternative due to concerns with the loss of roadway capacity and reductions in levels of service. A center-running configuration eliminates a high number of left turn access points, requires more space for transit stations, eliminates two general purpose traffic lanes, and requires more property acquisition due to the need for wider rights of way to maintain current levels of service, particularly if replacing the two eliminated lanes. Therefore, the proposed build alternatives were limited to those with curbside running transit lanes. Utility relocations may have been more extensive for the LRT alternative based on the need to remove longitudinal underground utilities from the area of the tracks, but are not as much of a concern with the selected BRT alternative.
21	<b>Topic: New Station Locations and Spacing of Stations.</b> Commenters proposed new station locations or moving existing stations. For example Sunrise Hospital Main entrance has moved, so new station should move. UMC has also asked for coordination of station location and design with respect to wider sidewalks and emergency vehicles. Several commenters indicated stations should be closer together than 0.35-mile.	<p>With the proposed BRT, the existing bus stops near the pedestrian overpass at Sunrise Hospital will be removed and new stops added near Sunrise Hospital Drive, where there is a traffic signal to facilitate safer crossings for pedestrians. The northbound stop at Desert Inn Road will be relocated across the intersection, adjacent to Sunrise Hospital. RTC will also coordinate with the hospitals in the Medical District on station locations, street parking, and other issues during the engineering design phase of the project. RTC is also committed to including additional training and updated operation plans for transit drivers and emergency transport vehicles around the hospitals.</p> <p>BRT was adopted by RTC Board of Commissioners as the Locally Preferred Alternative, which will move the stops from approximately 1/4-mile spacing to nearly 1/3-mile spacing between stations. The intent is to make the transit service along Maryland Parkway faster. By adding more stations closer together, it would actually slow it down more than today. RTC is looking at ways to enhance the first mile/last mile services around the stations to make the proposed service more accessible, especially to medical facilities.</p>



**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
22	<p><b>Topic: Final Design Coordination with Other Stakeholders.</b> Coordination with Maryland Parkway Stakeholders (City of Las Vegas, Clark County, UNLV, medical facilities, businesses, and property owners) will need to occur during final design and construction. Need to coordinate with businesses next to stations on canopy designs that may visually block businesses.</p>	<p>The RTC will coordinate with City of Las Vegas and Clark County staff throughout preliminary engineering and final design to address traffic signals, transit signal priority, roadway design, drainage upgrades for stormwater, joint pole use, utility relocation, accessibility, Complete Street principles, urban design and landscape enhancements, and final station locations. The RTC also plans to coordinate with the hospitals and medical facilities on design and creation of an Operations Plan for emergency transport and transit vehicles. RTC will work with the City to determine alternate nearby parking to mitigate on-street parking removals.</p> <p>The RTC will work with property owners and businesses along the corridor to consider potential concerns in developing the proposed passenger station designs and other project elements in order to complement the adjacent land uses and minimize potential impacts as best as possible. Prior to and during construction, RTC will continually coordinate with property owners and businesses along the project corridor to ensure they are aware of upcoming activities and can communicate any concerns.</p>
23	<p><b>Topic: Construction and Operation Costs for New Transit System.</b> What is the justification for construction cost for all three alternatives as well as operation and maintenance costs for each?</p>	<p>The \$29 million cost estimate for the Enhanced Bus alternative was developed in 2016 with the other alternatives and was based on replacement of the existing bus fleet assigned to Maryland Parkway with new buses as they reach the end of useful life, which is 12 years or 500,000 miles, along with costs for upgraded bus shelters and other passenger amenities. The BRT alternative was estimated at \$335 million to develop, while the light rail alternative was estimated at about \$750 million, both based on calculated quantities and construction bids from similar projects in other cities (Table 2.2-6 in the Maryland Parkway EA). Proposed annual operation and maintenance costs for BRT would be \$7.2 million and for LRT \$11.5 million based on RTC’s current costs for bus operations as well as similar BRT and LRT systems in other communities as reported to the National Transit Database (see Table 2.2-9 in Maryland Parkway EA). Additional cost information is located in Section 2.2 of the Maryland Parkway EA. The updated cost estimate for BRT that was presented to the RTC Board for consideration in their decision included estimated financing costs.</p>
24	<p><b>Topic: UNLV Transit Center Connections with other Routes.</b> Comments on expanding additional RTC connections to UNLV Transit Center.</p>	<p>The UNLV Transit Center is located on the main campus. Development of the site and the usage of the transit center was a joint venture between the RTC and UNLV. Amenities currently include six transit vehicle bays for Centennial Express (CX) and future RTC fixed route connections and UNLV campus shuttle vehicles.</p>

**Table A-1 Maryland Parkway High Capacity Transit Project Environmental Assessment Public Comment Topics**

Topic Number	Topic Comments or Questions	Topic Comment Response
25	<p><b>Topic: Property Acquisition.</b> Right-of-way acquisitions may be necessary on some properties for the new station locations, the addition of dedicated bike lanes and right turn lanes, widening of sidewalks, and adding streetscaping.</p>	<p>There is no full property acquisition for the BRT alternative. The RTC, City of Las Vegas and/or Clark County will negotiate with the property owners who will be directly impacted by partial property acquisitions in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, ensuring they will receive fair market value for the acquired right-of-way. The removal of parking spaces within the corridor would require compensation and/or replacement of those parking spaces on the same property or adjacent property. Access to adjacent businesses and residences during construction activities will be maintained. See Section 3.1 in the Maryland Parkway EA for additional information.</p>
26	<p><b>Topic: Economic Development Incentives.</b> Comments to provide economic development incentives to revitalize the corridor.</p>	<p>Economic development is a key outcome when considering large infrastructure investments such as this; but it is difficult to anticipate how specifically real estate developers and businesses will respond. As shown in other cities, BRT may attract transit oriented development and population growth around station locations. Business are more likely to stay or move closer to an BRT station because of the increase in patronage along the corridor. Clark County and City of Las Vegas would be responsible for any economic development incentives.</p>
27	<p><b>Topic: Proposed Construction Schedule.</b> Comments on timing for construction activities. Maintain business and residence access during construction activities.</p>	<p>Construction activities for the BRT Alternative are anticipated to begin in the fourth quarter of 2022 and be completed through the third quarter of 2024 (2 years). The project would potentially be phased into eight construction segments to minimize the amount of traffic and business disruptions at one time. Construction of the BRT components in each segment is anticipated to be 2 to 3 months. The construction schedule and timing would be determined during final design and after selection of a contractor. Access to adjacent businesses and residences during construction activities will be maintained throughout the project.</p>
28	<p><b>Topic: Transit Line Extension from Downtown to Medical District.</b> Comment that extension of transit from Downtown to the Medical District is not needed, passengers would not utilize it.</p>	<p>There are thousands of jobs in the Las Vegas Medical District and as it continues to see new growth, there will likely be an increased demand for public transportation. In addition, the BRT alternative would provide a direct transit connection between the main UNLV campus on Maryland Parkway with its Shadow Lane campus and the new medical school.</p>