

**BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC)
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070**

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: C. Bargar, J. Brazil, W. Brinsfield, G. Buckley, M. Guevara, A. Olson, D. Provence, D. Thoe, S. Vanderlip

STAFF PRESENT: B. Burns, C. Fromson, L. Low

Chair Dan Provence called the meeting to order at 5:48 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Shirley Johnson from the Bikes Onboard Project asked that attention be given to the resolution in the correspondence packet. Ms. Johnson said the resolution arose from her comments regarding EMU capacity at the September San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting where the chair asked if she could bring forth a resolution. Ms. Johnson requested the agenda be rearranged so the resolution could first be discussed and possibly voted on.

Hans Nielsen said he supported rearranging the agenda. He also noted there was mention of one successful and one prevented onboard bike theft in the correspondence packet, and that may be why cyclists are concerned about the need for seats by bikes. Mr. Nielsen said some thefts may not be reported.

Adrian Brandt said staff will be doing a Bikes Board First pilot at two stations to see if it reduces dwell time. Mr. Brandt supported the previous speakers' request to rearrange the agenda and stated that the bike ratio is problematic as customary ridership is already maxed out.

Mr. Brandt stated his desire for longer EMU trainsets and noted that Caltrain is ordering 96 cars for 16 six-car consists and so by moving two of the cars there could be 14 seven-car consists.

Chair Provence said he read the resolution and noted that some portions are out of date, such as the hanging bikes. He noted that staff might address these areas and answer some questions during the CalMod presentation.

Mr. Vanderlip stated his desire to move the resolution up on the agenda to make sure there was adequate time to discuss it.

Chair Provence stated many of the concerns listed in the resolution are the same concerns BAC members have voiced at prior meetings. He noted members have been

proactively trying to improve the design and there have been significant steps forward, although perhaps not as far as everyone would like.

Mr. Brinsfield said he would be uncomfortable taking action on the resolution at this time since it was not on the agenda and members of the public would not have had the chance to come and respond to it.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 24, 2017

Motion/Second: Bargar/Buckley

Ayes: Brazil, Brinsfield, Olson, Provence, Thoe, Vanderlip

CALMOD UPDATE

Lori Low, Government and Community Affairs Specialist, presented:

- Electrification – Infrastructure
 - Construction Activities in Segment 2
 - Progression of Field Activities
 - Progression of Design
 - OCS Foundations
 - Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition Contract
 - Tunnel Modifications
 - Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility
 - PG&E
 - Utility Relocation and Coordination
 - Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Participation and Labor
- Electric Train Design (EMUs)
 - Stadler
 - Safety
 - Quality Assurance
- Schedule
- Budget & Expenditures
- Contingency Drawdown Table
- Risk Management
- Environmental Compliance
- Real Estate
- Groundbreakings
- Outreach
 - EMU Outreach
 - Onboard Bike Storage

Chair Provence asked why one car couldn't be added to the trainsets.

Ms. Low said that the project is for 16 trainsets and explained that all are needed for fleet size and rail operations during the peak hour when factors such as the need for a gap train, servicing and maintenance, and turn-around time are taken into account.

Chair Provence asked if a seventh car could be added to a six-car trainset.

Ms. Low said two cars need to be added.

Ms. Thoe noted that there was a choice to not put any electrification components in the bicycle cars. She asked if that was why two additional cars are needed and requested a more detailed explanation.

Mr. Guevara arrived at 6:12 p.m.

Ms. Low said she would need to look into that.

Ms. Low continued the presentation:

- ADA Restroom
- Construction Outreach

Mr. Vanderlip asked if they could stack more than four bikes if it didn't infringe on the aisle width.

Ms. Low said that if the aisle is clear and meets the width requirement than more can fit.

Chair Provence thanked staff for the update and for incorporating some of the input from the last BAC meeting.

Ms. Thoe asked for more of an explanation regarding the change made to the ADA area and the flip seats.

Ms. Low stated staff worked with the bike coalitions on the design changes. She explained that none of the bike cars will have vertical hooks. She noted that within each bike car there are two ADA areas at opposite ends and that one ADA area will have flip seats whereas the other will not, but bikes could be stacked there.

Ms. Thoe asked if this design had the same number of bikes as the design with the vertical hooks.

Ms. Low said yes.

Public Comment

Shirley Johnson said her request was to rearrange the agenda and noted the agenda says all items are actionable. Ms. Johnson asked how many dedicated seats are in the bike car.

Ms. Low said there are three flip seats in the lower section.

Ms. Johnson said there are zero dedicated seats in the bike car and three flip seats. Ms. Johnson asked if there would be signage stating five bikes would be allowed to be stacked in the racks.

Ms. Low said signage would need to be discussed with the operations team.

Ms. Johnson asked if the ADA space and a bike rack share a space.

Ms. Low said when the ADA space is not in use by a wheelchair passenger it can be used for bike storage.

Ms. Johnson asked if there will be bungee cords in that location.

Ms. Low said yes.

Ms. Johnson said in 2015 staff recommended a 9:1 bike to seat ratio. She stated when the Board wanted an 8:1 ratio for better bike capacity, staff said they might not be able to increase seats and the Board was fine. Ms. Johnson stated that eight-car EMUs will have 756 seats while six-car bombardiers have 830 seats so eight-car EMUs will have fewer seats than six-car bombardiers. Ms. Johnson urged the agenda be rearranged so the resolution could be discussed.

Adrian Brandt said dedicated entry was tried before and it slowed boarding down. He offered the example of a station where 20 cyclists are waiting to board and only five cyclists are deboarding, which would leave an open door that's not fully used. Mr. Brandt said dedicated entry is not optimal and recommended against it.

Chair Provence said the resolution could be discussed, however he did not think it should be voted on since it wasn't on the agenda and it contained some inaccuracies.

Ms. Thoe asked if there was still the potential for conflict in the bike cars.

Ms. Low said passengers in wheelchairs would first board the lavatory car in a similar manner to today.

Mr. Vanderlip wanted to better understand why the seat capacity is less in the EMUs than in the old trains.

Ms. Fromson, the director of government and community affairs, said six-car EMUs have less seated capacity than the current diesel trains when the ADA spaces, bathroom, and bike spaces are factored in. She noted this information was shared with the Board when they discussed various trade-offs regarding capacity. Ms. Fromson clarified that staff recommended a 9:1 bike to seat ratio that's consistent with today and the bike community recommended a 6:1 ratio, and the Board compromised with an 8:1 ratio when trying to weigh the different needs of the system.

Ms. Fromson said that while per train there are less seats, there are improvements that electric trains offer that would not be possible with the current diesels. Ms. Fromson noted that during rush hour electric trains could move more people on the corridor—whether passengers are standing, sitting, or bringing bikes onboard. She noted that electrified service offers the ability to modify the schedule and improve turn-over rates since electric trains can stop and start faster than diesel; so instead of a baby bullet schedule that makes six stops in 60 minutes, the electric trains could make 13 stops in that time, moving people more efficiently and improving the amount of people that can be brought onto the system.

Ms. Fromson stated that if more cars are added to a current, aging diesel trainset performance weakens; however, with electric trains, the power is distributed so the train length can grow to an eight-car train and beyond without degrading performance. Ms. Fromson noted longer EMUs could still have great stopping patterns and the ability to make different schedules.

Ms. Fromson said electrification is the foundation for continued capacity growth and this phase is the first step, so while there were trade-offs made when the ratio was originally determined, this can give more context to those decisions.

Mr. Vanderlip said his concern is that the current trains hold both more passengers and more bikes.

Ms. Fromson said that if one is looking at a single train that is correct, but if one looks at the number of riders that can be carried in a peak hour, electrified service allows the system to carry more. She also noted there will be more standing space than there is today, in particular in the upper levels. Ms. Fromson reiterated there were impacts with the trade-offs; for example, staff originally recommended no bathrooms as one can take at least 12 seats, but this is the result of accommodating as many different components as possible.

Mr. Bargar asked how much space is taken up by the second set of doors in each car for High Speed Rail.

Ms. Fromson said that was another topic of much discussion at the time of the Board decision. She stated the EMUs did not lose space because when the vehicles start service the doors will not be in use since there won't be high-level platforms at that time. Ms. Fromson noted a decision on this would not be made until a future date when the doors would be needed. Ms. Fromson said the Board discussed the potential capacity loss when the doors are used, but when the system first opens there will be seats in that area.

Mr. Bargar asked if there would be seat loss if and when the doors go into use.

Ms. Fromson answered that if the doors are opened there would be some loss in seated capacity and there would also be operational concerns as cyclists bringing bikes onboard would enter at the top level and then need to navigate down a series of steps to get to the bike storage area. Ms. Fromson stated that these trade-offs were discussed with the Board and it was decided not to preclude high level doors.

Mr. Guevara said he has consistently heard that there would be more capacity with the electric trains, but since "more" is a bit abstract he asked if there was a percentage increase regarding capacity during the rush hour.

Ms. Fromson said with electrified service in the peak hour there's an 11% increase in seated capacity, and when standing room is factored in it goes up to a 30% increase over today. Ms. Fromson stated that when there are eight-car vehicles—and the layout

of these will still need to be discussed—the capacity increase goes up to over 50% from today. Ms. Fromson explained this is just measuring physical space and not including turn-over rate due to a better schedule.

Ms. Low noted that when staff worked with the bike coalitions to remove the vertical bike hooks, they had to make the tough decision to lose some seats, and so it's now a 10.3% seat capacity increase for the six-car EMUs from today.

Ms. Fromson stated that to obtain the federal funding for the electrification project, the federal government required Caltrain to have a certain amount of capacity improvement and that threshold is based on seats. Ms. Fromson said in the peak hour Caltrain will be able to carry more people and there will be a 17% increase in bikes onboard.

Mr. Brazil asked if the EMUs have less capacity because ADA laws changed or if the actual physical space in EMUs is less than in the existing cars.

Ms. Fromson said the locomotive is not counted as part of the string of cars with the diesel trains, so a currently called five-car diesel train is actually longer when the locomotive and cabs are factored in; whereas with the EMUs the locomotive, two cabs, and other components are built into the passenger cars. Ms. Fromson suggested that members of the technical team could come to a future meeting to answer detailed questions.

Mr. Brazil said his understanding is that the EMU footprint and physical space has already been determined and so he asked that the focus be on practical proposals to increase capacity within these constraints.

Ms. Fromson said staff is working to secure funding to procure longer trains to go from six to eight-car EMUs.

Mr. Brazil wondered if there was a reasonable proposal from the advocates to improve capacity in a practical way.

Mr. Brinsfield said EMU passenger service is in 2022, approximately four years away. He noted the Bike Parking Management Plan (BPMP) was on the agenda and that Mr. Brazil is a long-time advocate of increasing bike parking at stations so that not all bicycles need to go onboard. Mr. Brinsfield said bike parking needs to continually be pushed for and concentrated on, as trying to keep increasing the trainset capacity to take on more bikes is not sustainable. Mr. Brinsfield said the trainsets have a limit, and at some point there needs to be 10,000 bikes at the stations as opposed to trying to get 10,000 bikes on the trainsets. Mr. Brinsfield stated there are already proposals to increase bike capacity—and that's to get them off the train cars and have better bike parking at stations.

Mr. Brazil said he agreed with Mr. Brinsfield and that's a bigger vision to work towards, but he's wondering if there's a practical proposal on the table to get more bikes onboard.

Mr. Brinsfield said he felt it was practical to increase bike capacity at the stations to keep the bikes from all going onboard.

Mr. Brazil said that while bike parking and bikes onboard can achieve the same goals and he agrees that Caltrain should look beyond just bikes onboard, he would like to specifically focus on the bikes onboard aspect right now. Mr. Brazil asked again if there was a practical proposal for improving onboard bike capacity.

Member of the public Shirley Johnson asked to speak. Ms. Johnson said the resolution suggests a fourth bike car be put on the diesel trains.

Member of the public Adrian Brandt said there is less capacity on the EMUs because with a diesel train all the power is in the locomotive. Mr. Brandt stated that a bi-level EMU does not have room under the train or on the roof so all the traction equipment is placed throughout the train. Mr. Brandt said this is a great advantage because the longer the EMU gets the same amount of power it will have, but that is the fundamental reason why there is a decrease in capacity from the diesels. Mr. Brandt said one way to increase capacity is to use 3x2 seating.

Ms. Thoe asked why seven-car trainsets are not possible.

Ms. Fromson said it might be advantageous for the rail operations team to come to the BAC to talk about how the trains are split and changed around. She suggested if the committee was interested in a more detailed explanation that might be something to agendaize for a future meeting.

Mr. Bargar said that one EMU benefit Ms. Johnson informed him of was that the train cars could easily be rearranged to run shorter trains at off-peak hours. He's asked if that was something Caltrain was still considering and what the impact would be on the amount of bike storage in a given trainset.

Ms. Fromson said the current thinking regarding how the fleet would be deployed is that the EMUs are six-car trainsets that aren't decoupled, so six-car trains would still be running in the midday. She stated that if there was additional funding that led to more cars then there might be the possibility of mixing and matching a bit more; however, those determinations have not yet been made although they are being discussed.

Ms. Buckley asked if Caltrain had started to look for funding.

Ms. Fromson said yes. She noted that long-time BAC members are well aware of how long it took to put together funding for the current project. She said they are actively looking into other sources. Ms. Fromson said with the current contract, there is a built in five-year window where more cars could be ordered on the same production schedule; so they are looking into different funding sources, such as SB 1 funds for additional cars and bike parking implementation so that they can look holistically at how bike capacity can be improved along the corridor.

Chair Provence asked if additional cars were added to the trainsets would they be subject to the 8:1 ratio.

Ms. Fromson said the 8:1 ratio was specific to today's project and that in the future they don't know if they'll have 10-car trains or what the trainsets will exactly look like. Ms. Fromson said the 8:1 ratio was a Board level decision, and when they get closer to understanding what the trains will look like in the future there will need to be a discussion regarding what the ratio would be.

Chair Provence agreed that it would be premature to design additional cars when there is no funding, but noted it would be a way to get additional capacity in the not too far future. Chair Provence asked if there's been internal discussion about a fourth bike car on the diesel trains during mixed service.

Ms. Fromson said the proposal for four bike cars on the diesels is new to her but that doesn't mean there haven't been internal discussions on it.

Chair Provence said those are interesting areas that the Committee could explore further in the future.

Ms. Fromson said there is broad agreement from the agency and the bike advocates that the agency needs to do a much better job regarding bike parking at the stations. She emphasized the agency's desire to work with the BAC and the advocates to improve it so cyclists are able to park their bikes at stations. Ms. Fromson acknowledged that more funding and resources need to be put towards this and it should be a complimentary effort with the onboard discussions. Ms. Fromson noted the Board has shown a desire to improve bike parking at stations as well.

Mr. Bargar asked if there would be a vote on the resolution.

Chair Provence said that because the resolution was not on the agenda and it contained out of date information, he felt those were good reasons to not vote on it. Chair Provence noted he personally supports the sentiment behind the resolution and that other members support its spirit, and that has been conveyed to the Board.

Mr. Brinsfield suggested he would like the minutes to reflect that they are supportive of continued efforts to determine how bike capacity onboard could be improved. Mr. Brinsfield said he personally would not want to vote on the resolution as it is currently packaged, but he agreed their support of the spirit of the resolution could be made known to the Board through the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if members wanted to put the resolution on the agenda for the next meeting.

Chair Provence said he tried several times to speak with representatives from the SF BAC and although they weren't able to connect, his understanding was the resolution was going to be presented to the Board at the December meeting. He noted the BAC wouldn't meet again until January and so it would be past that deadline. Chair

Provence noted the resolution was not completely accurate and contained outdated information.

Mr. Bargar asked if this time was allocated only to the resolution or to the broader correspondence packet.

Mr. Brinsfield said he would be fine closing out discussion on the resolution before moving to correspondence.

Chair Provence said they could discuss correspondence during its slot on the agenda.

Mr. Brinsfield said he would like to motion that the minutes reflect members strongly support the spirit of the resolution, and that the agency continue to vigorously pursue ideas that would increase onboard bike capacity in the near future.

Mr. Bargar said that barring an increase in capacity, the current design as proposed is still unacceptable to him in that there is almost no seating in the lower level of the bike car and he feels that's something that still needs to be addressed.

Mr. Brinsfield said he did not accept that as a friendly amendment to his motion. He said he would rather concentrate on the overall nature of onboard bike capacity as it would be easy to get mixed up with capacity per trainset with overall capacity per hour or day.

Mr. Bargar said he felt it was important to include safety and onboard theft prevention with capacity, regardless of how large that capacity is.

Ms. Thoe asked if they could vote on the two issues separately.

Mr. Brinsfield agreed.

Motion that the minutes reflect the Committee's strong support of the spirit of the resolution and that the agency continue to vigorously pursue ideas that would increase onboard bike capacity in the near future.

Motion/Second: Brinsfield/Bargar

Mr. Brazil said what's needed to make an informed decision about the resolution is a full discussion where all the questions are raised and understood comprehensively and everyone who needs to be there is in the room together. Mr. Brazil said today's discussion raised additional questions for him, such as where the balance is between seated, standing, and bike capacity. He said he also needs to understand the financial commitments that have been made and what items can't be changed with the EMUs. Mr. Brazil proposed that this be on the agenda again with all the experts in attendance so there could be a whole picture understanding. For that reason, Mr. Brazil said he would probably abstain from voting on the motion.

Ms. Thoe agreed with the sentiment of not being well enough informed and felt that it was an ongoing issue over the last year, in particular regarding why there couldn't be a third bike car. Ms. Thoe said that an overall understanding has been missing and it came up again today regarding the seven-car EMUs, and so she would strongly support what Mr. Brazil is suggesting.

Mr. Brazil said this is not a criticism of staff as there are different areas of expertise and each person can't know everything; therefore, he suggested the Committee have all their questions on the table in order to have a comprehensive discussion. Mr. Brazil said he would also appreciate that after a request is made, staff be clear about what is possible and explain if there are big picture reasons or ramifications such as contract or cost constraints.

Chair Provence said there is a motion on the table. He also noted there is a separate interest in getting more information at a future meeting.

Motion that the minutes reflect the Committee's strong support of the spirit of the resolution and that the agency continue to vigorously pursue ideas that would increase onboard bike capacity in the near future.

Ayes: Brinsfield, Buckley, Thoe, Vanderlip

Abstain: Bargar, Brazil, Guevara, Olson, Provence

The motion did not pass.

Mr. Brinsfield noted there was discussion of a second motion.

Mr. Bargar said he would not put a motion forth at this time.

Mr. Vanderlip said he wanted to put it on the record that theft and the ability to watch one's bike is still a concern to the committee.

Ms. Buckley asked for clarification on the motion.

Ms. Thoe suggested possible language along the lines of the BAC does not believe the current EMU design addresses theft concerns.

Ms. Buckley said that theft has not been discussed in detail this meeting.

Chair Provence said theft was discussed at the August meeting and there were different ideas put forth such as bike locking and cameras and that there is still opportunity for the BAC to have input on those items.

Mr. Brazil reiterated that this is why a comprehensive discussion would be good because while it would be nice to have seats by the bikes for each cyclist, he'd like to know how that would impact other parts of the train and overall capacity.

Ms. Fromson said what would be helpful to staff is to understand where the additional information gaps are so they can plan for a holistic discussion and offer the Committee a better understanding of what decisions have been made by the Board and what still

can be done. Ms. Fromson said having a list of questions that the Committee want addressed on this topic would be helpful for staff planning.

Mr. Brinsfield suggested a subcommittee might be the best way to solicit input.

Ms. Buckley asked for clarification on the subcommittee's role.

Mr. Brinsfield said it would be to determine a set of items the BAC would like staff to provide information on.

Ms. Thoe asked if this was in general or in the context of EMUs in particular.

Mr. Brinsfield said it was in the context of Mr. Brazil's framing and various members feeling like they didn't have enough information on the EMUs. Mr. Brinsfield said the subcommittee could give staff guidance on what additional information the Committee desires on the EMUs.

Ms. Thoe said she would support creation of a subcommittee.

Chair Provence noted subcommittees have been successful in the past.

Ms. Buckley asked for clarification on the subcommittee's role.

Ms. Fromson noted anyone can make requests to the chair regarding items they'd like on the agenda.

Chair Provence suggested they move further discussion of the subcommittee to the Committee Requests agenda item.

Ms. Thoe said she would like more information on the EMU design requirements, such as what occurs when the upper doors go into use and why seven-car trainsets aren't possible.

Ms. Thoe noted the BAC and public were not asked for input on the overall design of the cars. Ms. Thoe said input was requested on a much narrower area such as hanging versus stacking bike storage and belts versus bungees for bike securing mechanisms, but they did not receive a comprehensive look at overall train design. Ms. Thoe said she understands in a region with such a big population it would be difficult to have everyone commenting on everything, but she thinks it would be helpful to understand the overall design better.

Ben Burns, manager of rail operations, stated the reason why a seventh car couldn't be added is because the vehicles are articulated and some of the vehicles actually share trucks. He noted that with the EMUs, the horse power per ton stays the same when a pack is added on; whereas if additional cars are added to the gallery and bombardiers it reduces their horse power per ton.

Ms. Thoe asked for clarification regarding why the horse power doesn't degrade with the EMUs when cars are added.

Mr. Burns said it's because when additional cars are added to the EMUs they contain their own power components, unlike the diesels trains whose cars do not have their own engines, so for the diesels, each additional car reduces the horse power per ton.

Ms. Thoe asked how that affects the ability to add one more car to the EMUs.

Mr. Burns said it's because the EMUs are articulated.

Mr. Brinsfield said perhaps it's theoretically possible, but that may not be the way the design is made at this time.

Ms. Fromson said this could be part of the Committee's list of questions. She noted once staff has the questions in hand they will try to answer them as best as possible. Ms. Fromson said staff can also discuss what decisions were made at different points in time, what were the trade-offs and constraints, and what decisions can be made going forward.

Mr. Vanderlip said he didn't think the Committee realized how much capacity went down and he was wondering why EMUs were selected instead of traditional locomotives. Mr. Vanderlip stated he felt the capacity difference wasn't discussed.

Mr. Brinsfield, Ms. Thoe, and Mr. Brazil stated that it was discussed before.

ON-TIME PERFORMANCE & DELAY MITIGATION PRESENTATION

Mr. Burns presented:

- 2017 vs 2016 On-Time Performance
- On-Time Performance Overview
- On-Time Performance (5 years)
- On-Time Performance Findings
- On-Time Performance Improvements

Mr. Brazil asked for clarification on slide #7, bullet point 2.

Mr. Burns said one of the problems they had with OTP was a mechanical issue, so now they have a different shift schedule.

Mr. Brinsfield asked if that was so the mechanics would have a better chance of getting the fix right.

Mr. Burns confirmed.

Mr. Burns continued his presentation:

- Delay Minutes by Type
- September Delays

- September On-Boarding PAX Breakdown

Ms. Buckley asked if the conductor measures the time delay.

Mr. Burns said if it's more than 5 minutes the conductor must immediately report the delay to the dispatch center, and if it's less than 5 minutes the conductors log the information and then turn it in at the end of their shift and a system integrates and updates the information so it's available to the operations team.

Mr. Burns continued his presentation:

- October Delays
- October On-Boarding PAX Breakdown

Mr. Burns offered more details on the Bikes Board First pilot planned to occur at the Mountain View, Palo Alto, and Redwood City Stations.

Mr. Brazil asked how long the pilot would be.

Mr. Burns said the length has not yet been determined.

Mr. Brazil said he hoped the duration would be for at least a week to see if there was a learning curve for riders.

Mr. Bargar asked if the five minute delay that needs to be reported to dispatch is over the entire system or at one single stop.

Mr. Burns said it is for any five minute delay.

Mr. Bargar asked if there was a way to distinguish in the data the difference between the gallery trains and bombardiers.

Mr. Burns said he thinks there could be as the delays are categorized by the train ID.

Ms. Buckley said she would be interested in seeing how the type of train impacts bike delays.

Mr. Bargar said his instinct is the galleries have longer delays. He also wondered if there was any way to know how many passengers were on the train.

Chair Provence said he appreciates the Bikes Board First effort. He noted that on the gallery cars the most aggressive people that want to get on first also want to get off first, so rather than taking their bike all the way to the back, they store their bike in the first rack, potentially blocking people who are trying to get on the train. Chair Provence asked if there was a way to encourage people who get on first to go all the way in so they do not hold everyone else up as a way to help address some of the delays.

Mr. Burns understood that the suggestion was to help avoid a choke point from occurring.

Mr. Guevara applauded that staff is trying to improve the trains internally, from a mechanical standpoint, and also through better communication with cyclists and riders. Mr. Guevara asked if there is a comprehensive strategy to mitigate the delays from passengers, such as signage at stations indicating to passengers where bikes board.

Mr. Burns noted that placing fixed signage for bikes on the platforms, similar to the ADA squares, is difficult due to the two different train types which require different demarcations. Mr. Burns noted his team's approach is akin to the Japanese *kaizen* philosophy of continuous, small improvements rather than one big one.

Ms. Buckley said the conductor on the train she takes every day always tells people there's more room towards the back of the train, which makes a difference. She would encourage conductors to make that type of an announcement if they notice there's space.

Mr. Brinsfield asked Mr. Burns if he had an idea of how the EMUs and grade separations might further improve the situation.

Mr. Burns said in October bike delays accounted for 1,241 minutes of delay, so even if there was a 25% improvement—which would be approximately 350 minutes—that's essentially JPB's capital projects and other rail service improvements combined, so this is an area where they can make a big improvement.

Ms. Buckley said the 329 train she takes daily is consistently delayed by five minutes, and she thinks it's due to heavy ridership. She was wondering if in cases where it's a predictable delay, if it could somehow be avoided.

Mr. Burns said he would need to look at that particular train's information.

Chair Provence thanked Mr. Burns for the presentation and stated the Committee is looking forward to hearing the results of the Bikes Board First pilot.

Public Comment

Shirley Johnson thanked Operations for the Bikes Board First pilot and said it's important to lump all passengers together. She noted that years ago the Committee asked how bike delays are calculated which resulted in a 2010 Bike Count and Dwell Time Study. Ms. Johnson said the study showed bikes do not cause delays, passengers do, and that gallery and bombardiers board at the same speed.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

- 2017 Work Plan
- 2018 Work Plan
- 2018 Calendar

Mr. Brinsfield said he would like Measure B impact information to be included in the Work Plan. He also wondered if the staff EMU information exchange would fall under a CalMod update.

Chair Provence said when staff responds to the subcommittee's information requests that could be part of a CalMod update.

Mr. Brazil noted that under staff suggestions, Measure B is listed. Mr. Brazil asked that the item "SF MTC Bike Share" be changed to "Bike Share" as there are a number of programs, including dockless systems, currently going online. He noted San Jose has the second most stations in the MTC system and they are also going to pilot a 300 bike dockless system.

STAFF REPORT – Lori Low

- BAC recruitment

Mr. Brazil said he hopes everyone who is now serving reapplies.

Mr. Vanderlip said he is not reapplying, that he's done it for a number of years and wants to give someone else the opportunity. He said he appreciates the work of staff and the Committee and that he has tried to improve upon the work of Caltrain, making what's good even better.

Chair Provence thanked Mr. Vanderlip for his service.

Ms. Low continued with the:

- Bike Parking Management Plan
- Bike Bump Report
- 4th & King Bike Lockers
- Bike Share Update
- October Schedule Change

Chair Provence said SFMTA was able to secure funding for some on-demand lockers which they're looking to site street level at the 22nd Street Station, which he noted has been a high bump station.

Mr. Guevara asked if there will be updates next year on how BPMP implementation is going in relation to the plan.

Ms. Low noted that while the BPMP is already listed in the 2018 Work Plan, once they hire a dedicated staff person they can then re-examine when the best time for an update would be and see if it makes sense to move it earlier in the year.

Mr. Guevara said he would prefer to have information earlier rather than later.

Chair Provence noted that with different cities using different bike share programs, someone who travels between cities might have to have multiple memberships. He asked if anything is being done regarding a single fare that would make it more user-friendly and cost effective.

Mr. Brinsfield said the VTA BPAC recently received a presentation where they heard the various providers are in preliminary discussions, and that while many are just trying to get their own system up and running, they are hearing that this is a need, including possible integration with the Clipper Card.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Bargar said he would like to draw attention to the three bike theft emails in the correspondence packet as they highlight the need for more security in the bike car.

Mr. Brinsfield said it was requested in the past that the staff report include a standing item summarizing all security incidents on the train, in particular onboard and off-board bike theft. He also mentioned that they had presentations from the head of security in the past.

Ms. Buckley asked if bike thefts occurring at stations are typically reported to the local police department. She also asked if Caltrain is alerted if it's on Caltrain property.

Ms. Low said the website encourages people to contact the Transit Police.

Ms. Thoe asked for webpage information.

Ms. Low said it's the caltrain.com/bikes page.

Ms. Thoe asked about the relationship among the local police, the Sheriff's office, and the Transit Police.

Ms. Fromson said the Transit Police work closely with other first responders and agencies along the corridor.

Mr. Brazil asked if it's across all counties.

Ms. Thoe said the Transit Police are at 4th and King Station as well.

Mr. Brazil asked if it was possible for the BAC to see the work priorities and job description for the new staff person that will handle the BPMP.

Ms. Fromson said the new hire's main work will be implementing the BPMP, and since this dedicated staffer would take on a range of bike issues and coordinate all those efforts it makes sense for them to hear directly from the Committee.

COMMITTEE REQUESTS

Regarding the EMUs, Mr. Brinsfield said it would be good to have a list of non-negotiable constraints, whether they are due to the laws of physics, regulations, or funding.

Mr. Bargar said on the topic of Committee Requests he wanted to highlight the recent release of Caltrans State Rail Plan. He noted the report addresses bike storage at train stations and the importance of bikes as a first and last mile solution, but it does not mention bikes onboard trains. Mr. Bargar said he submitted comments to Caltrans and encouraged other members and the public to do so as well.

Ms. Buckley asked what rail systems Caltrans has jurisdiction over.

Mr. Bargar said it might have jurisdiction over some of the Amtrak lines, but part of Caltrans plan is to administer different state grants. Mr. Bargar said he wasn't sure if the High Speed Rail Authority is separate.

Ms. Fromson said it's underneath them now.

Mr. Bargar said that as the reality of high speed trains operating on the corridor nears, the possibility of bike space seems like a relevant topic for the BAC.

Vice Chair Olson asked if the subcommittee discussion is done and if not who would be interested in serving on the subcommittee.

Mr. Brinsfield noted subcommittee guidelines.

Ms. Thoe asked if the subcommittee's parameters would be broad or be in relation to EMUs in particular.

Ms. Fromson said she would recommend narrowing it so the scope is focused. She also said the Committee could discuss now what items they would like staff to come back to them on.

Mr. Brinsfield suggested the subcommittee's focus be on items that inform, constrain or otherwise influence seating and bicycle capacity onboard the EMUs. Mr. Brinsfield said he would be hesitant to leave it wide open as the BAC charter is to advise on issues related to bicycles, not issues related to the mechanics of the train.

Chair Provence asked if members supported the formation of a subcommittee.

Members acknowledged their support.

Mr. Bargar and Ms. Thoe indicated their interest in serving on the subcommittee.

Motion to form the subcommittee which will be comprised of those who volunteered and will report back to the Committee at large at a date to be determined by the Chair.

Motion/Second: Brinsfield/Olson

Ayes: Bargar, Brazil, Buckley, Guevara, Provence, Thoe, Vanderlip

Ms. Fromson asked for clarification if the subcommittee is going to determine items they'd like more information on beyond the list of non-negotiable items.

Ms. Thoe said they are interested in information particularly in relation to seating and bike capacity on the EMUs.

Ms. Fromson restated the subcommittee's process—that the subcommittee will determine what information they'd like more of, and after staff receives the list, staff will come back to the Committee and provide answers on those issues.

Mr. Bargar commented on the resolution and said that while it sounds like they are not going to vote on it, if they were he would motion to make several changes. Mr. Bargar also pointed out that in the very thick correspondence packet many members of the public wrote to the Committee expressing support for more bikes onboard.

Vice Chair Olson brought up a separate Committee Request, noting that a jury summons only promotes parking and does not mention public transit. Vice Chair Olson said the jury commissioner's office was open to revising the summons to include public transit information. Vice Chair Olson mentioned that jury duty offers free parking and perhaps a jury summons could serve as a free ticket to ride Caltrain on that day. He has since given staff the appropriate person in the jury commissioner's office to contact.

Ms. Thoe said she supports this effort and hopes staff will let the BAC know if there's anything they can do to help support it. Ms. Thoe asked that staff report back on this effort.

Mr. Brinsfield announced that it's his last meeting.

Chair Provence thanked Mr. Brinsfield for all his time, work, and effort on the BAC, especially as chair and vice chair, and noted that Mr. Brinsfield helped accomplish a lot of great things.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING

January 18, 2018 at the Central Auditorium in San Carlos.

Meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.