



**AGENDA**

**March 21, 2019 - Thursday 5:45 p.m.**

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Call to Order/Roll Call
3. Public Comment  
*Public testimony by each individual speaker, for items not on the agenda, shall be limited to three minutes*
4. Approval of Minutes of January 17, 2019 Meeting
5. Bike Safety and Security 2018 Update
6. Bikes Board First Update
7. Bike Bump Presentation for 2018
8. Subcommittee on EMU Bike Configuration
9. Bike Share Policy Update
10. Safer Streets in San Francisco South of Market Street Letter
11. Sunnyvale Lawrence Station Area Plan Letter
12. San Mateo Micromobility Letter
13. Chairperson's Report
  - a. 2019 Work Plan
14. Staff Report
  - a. Bike Bump Report YTD 2019
  - b. Caltrain Business Plan
  - c. Bike Access Survey Update
15. Written Correspondence
16. Committee Requests  
 Committee members may make brief statements regarding BAC-related areas of concern, ideas for improvement, or other items that will benefit or impact Caltrain service or the BAC
17. Date and Time of Next Meeting: May 16, 2019
18. Adjournment

*All Items on this agenda are subject to action*

**BAC MEMBERS**

County  
 San Francisco  
 San Mateo  
 Santa Clara

Public Agency  
 Manito Velasco  
 Kaley Lyons  
 John Brazil

Bike Organization  
 Cliff Bargar (Vice Chair)  
 Jessica Alba  
 Miguel Guevara

General Public  
 Giovanna Guevara  
 Andrew Olson (Chair)  
 Nicole Rodia

## **INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC**

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant District Secretary at 650.508.6495 or [bacsecretary@caltrain.com](mailto:bacsecretary@caltrain.com). Meeting dates, minutes, and agendas are available on the Caltrain Web site at <http://www.caltrain.com>.

### Location, Date and Time of Regular Meetings

Regular meetings are held at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building located at 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, which is located one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real. The office is also accessible by SamTrans bus routes FLX, 295, 260, ECR, and 398. Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1.800.660.4287 (TTY 650.508.6448) or 511.

The Bicycle Advisory Committee meets regularly on the third Thursday of the month at 5:45 p.m. at the same location. Date, time and place may change as necessary. Please note bicycles are not allowed in the building. There is a bike rack in front of the building.

### Public Comment

If you wish to address the Committee, please fill out a speaker's card located on the agenda table and hand it to the Assistant District Secretary. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Committee and included for the official record, please hand it to the Assistant District Secretary, who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

Members of the public may address the Committee on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes and items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

### Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities

Upon request, the JBP will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and a preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be mailed to Assistant District Secretary at Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or emailed to [bacsecretary@caltrain.com](mailto:bacsecretary@caltrain.com); or by phone at 650.508.6495, or TTY 650.508.6448.

### Availability of Public Records

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306, at the same time that public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

**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 JANUARY 17, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** J. Alba, C. Bargar, J. Brazil, G. Guevara, M. Guevara, K Lyons, A. Olson, N. Rodia,

**STAFF PRESENT:** L. Low, J. Navarro, D. Provence

Chair Olson called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Johnson said at the December Board meeting they approved the option to purchase additional vehicles making the EMUs seven-car consists. She asked what percent of the fleet would be diesel and what percent would be EMUs, noting that diesels have a higher seat capacity than the EMUs.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2018**

Motion/Second: C. Bargar/N. Rodia

Ayes: J. Alba, C. Bargar, J. Brazil, M. Guevara, K Lyons, A. Olson, N. Rodia

Abstain: G. Guevara

Absent: M. Velasco

**INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER**

The members welcomed Giovanna Guevara, the San Francisco General Public Representative.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Mr. Bargar nominated Mr. Olson as chair.

Motion/Second: C. Bargar/J. Brazil

Ayes: J. Alba, C. Bargar, J. Brazil, M. Guevara, K Lyons, A. Olson, N. Rodia

Absent: M. Velasco

Mr. Olson nominated Mr. Bargar as vice chair.

Motion/Second: A. Olson/J. Brazil

Ayes: J. Alba, C. Bargar, J. Brazil, M. Guevara, K Lyons, A. Olson, N. Rodia

Absent: M. Velasco

**CALTRAIN BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

Sebastian Petty, Senior Policy Advisor, presented:

- Service Planning Overview
- Understanding the 2040 Baseline

- The Growing Market for Rail
- Developing "High Growth" Service Concepts
- 2040 Service Scenarios
- Community Interface and Outreach Update

Mr. Brazil thanked Mr. Petty for the presentation and asked if its purpose is purely informational or if he's asking for feedback.

Mr. Petty said the purpose is two-fold, noting the Business Plan is a long-range plan that will reshape the path of the railroad and so the presentation is informational, and if people want to get more involved there are different venues available.

Mr. Brazil asked if there was a slide that listed key decision points.

Mr. Petty said there is one major decision point that will occur in late spring before final adoption, and that's asking the Board to adopt a long-range service vision which will determine which growth trajectory they'd like for the system.

Mr. Brazil asked what the driving factors are that will influence that decision.

Mr. Petty said he doesn't know what the decision factors are for individual board members; however, he is currently working to put together cost numbers and a sort of business case for each option, noting that these kinds of factors together with community and rider input should be a basis for these decisions.

Mr. Guevara asked if there were cost estimates for the different options.

Mr. Petty said there's a level of complexity involved in estimating the cost, for example a bigger fleet may trigger the need for a new maintenance facility. He noted their work now includes building the tools that will allow them to evaluate that in detail.

Ms. Rodia asked if the plans for the different stops are symmetric between northbound and southbound.

Mr. Petty said Caltrain historically has not operated a symmetrical service, but the Business Plan is proposing a more standardized service in terms of being symmetrical and having fewer more regularly repeating patterns of trains.

Ms. Rodia asked what the reason would be for symmetrical service.

Mr. Petty said one of the biggest reasons is because it's easier for passengers to understand the system and for making transit connections to the system.

Ms. Rodia asked which option seems most closely aligned with previous Caltrain funding situations.

Mr. Petty noted that when Caltrain was funded for electrification it was the start of a new era, and the agency is at a moment of change. He said that Caltrain is very tied to

regional projects such as DTX, Diridon, HSR, and grade separations—all of which are in the baseline. He noted that all the options require an immense amount of investment, and the plan will be looking at where the funding can come from.

Vice Chair Bargar thanked staff for their work on the Business Plan and said he was excited about the possibility of Caltrain running so many trains per hour. He asked if there would be near-term milestones that build toward the long-term vision.

Mr. Petty said the Board would set the long-term vision, then the Business Plan can work on an incremental set of improvements that will ultimately get Caltrain to the long-term end state.

Mr. Brazil asked if freight still runs in the evenings, and if so how that affects evening service and the possibility of 24 hour service.

Mr. Petty said the Business Plan assumes that freight would stay on the corridor and none of the options include 24 hour service due to track maintenance needs.

Mr. Brazil asked about the purchase of the southern end of the right of way.

Mr. Petty said that Tamien to Gilroy is owned by Union Pacific. He noted that in the 2018 High Speed Rail Business Plan they announced they were looking at the existing corridor for their alignment and their intent was to purchase the corridor and extend it as a blended system.

Mr. Brazil asked why Union Pacific is not trying to purchase north of Tamien.

Mr. Petty said Caltrain already owns that portion of rail. He noted that the infrastructure south of Tamien is largely single tracks, and to the extent that HSR is successful in acquiring it they'll need to do significant upgrades to that infrastructure.

Vice Chair Bargar asked if there was any particular implication of Caltrain running on a corridor owned by HSR or if the same operating principals would apply on either Caltrain or HSR rails.

Mr. Petty said he thinks the assumption is that the same principals would apply, but presumably it would be someone else's corridor and so there would be some limitations to how one can operate.

Chair Olson asked how stakeholders along the corridor have been responding to the Business Plan and what their input has been in regards to the moderate to high growth options.

Mr. Petty said it's generally been well received. He noted there's a lot of growth along the corridor and with ridership increasing over the last 10 years, there's recognition of Caltrain's role in transportation and the communities. Besides excitement about more train service, he noted city concerns about at-grade crossings and expensive individual infrastructure projects.

Chair Olson asked if there was any pushback from communities regarding the possibility of four-track segments for the moderate and high-growth scenarios.

Mr. Petty said there's been a good amount of concern expressed and it's calibrated by where in the process the Business Plan is. He noted there has been extensive work in the service plan options to try to minimize the overtakes as much as possible.

#### Public Comment

Ms. Johnson thanked Mr. Petty for his work and noted that over the years she's been impressed with it.

#### **BIKE ACCESS SURVEY UPDATE**

Dan Provence, Principal Planner, Station Access, presented:

- Objectives
- Methodology
- Promotion
- Results
- Next Steps

Mr. Brazil asked if the survey tracked the age of respondents, noting his working hypothesis that 20 and 30-something year olds are more interested in scooters than older aged people.

Mr. Provence said he didn't think age was included but it would be good information to have.

Ms. Alba asked about the second and third slides and why there was roughly half the responses on bike lockers compared to the other ones.

Mr. Provence said he would look into this.

Ms. Alba said in regards to the pie charts, it would be helpful to have the labels next to the colors so it would be easier to read.

Vice Chair Bargar said it was good to see progress.

Mr. Brazil asked if Mr. Provence was surprised by the distances to stations for both on and off, as he thought there'd be more difference.

Mr. Provence said he was surprised as well. He noted there was discussion regarding how to word that question and whether it should be asked in terms of minutes versus distance as people's perception of how far away they are can vary.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Yarbrough discussed the slide on factors that may influence bike parking at station, noting almost 40% of the respondents indicated they weren't willing to consider the most popular alternative, and for the least popular alternative 70% of the respondents

weren't willing to consider it. He asked if the comments helped clarify what alternatives they might be interested in.

Mr. Provence said there were close to 400 comments and so they are still working through them.

Ms. Johnson said in 2007, there was a similar survey and the top reason people said they brought a bike on board then was the same as in this survey, due to concerns about their bike being stolen. She noted that the number of people who bring their bike on board could be reduced by 15% to 16% if bike parking is improved.

### **BIKE SHARE POLICY FRAMEWORK**

Dan Provence, Principal Planner of Station Access, presented:

- Bike Share – Existing Locations
- Scooter Share – Existing Locations
- Existing Operations
- Future of Industry
- Operational Issues to Address
- Infrastructure
- Governance
- Other Things to Consider
- Policy Approval Schedule

Mr. Brazil noted that at stations there's often an indistinguishable line between areas that are JPB and those that are City. He asked if there's been thought about how to manage the dockless bike parking in that regard.

Mr. Provence said they're establishing a procedure to work with cities and putting together a framework on how to deal with problem issues to proactively address them. He noted there are quarterly conference calls with cities so they can all be on the same page; however, he noted that the stations do vary a lot by jurisdiction and so he will be working with cities individually as well.

Mr. Brazil said that in San Jose they recently passed some regulations regarding shared microbility, noting the Mayor's desire to limit speed on sidewalks and where items can be parked. Mr. Brazil said the technology isn't there yet, but some companies have said within six months they might have technology that's better than six feet so operators can be more stringent about where items are parked.

Vice Chair Bargar asked if a local city's policy will overrule Caltrain in terms of whether or not bike share is in their jurisdiction.

Mr. Provence said historically it's been City-led, but he's open to ideas and there could potentially be a section on possible partnerships.

Vice Chair Bargar noted that while cities could ban bike share parking on their property, he wasn't sure if they could ban people from riding bike share on their streets.

He said a partnership where bikes could be left on JPB or an employer or university's property could be worth exploring. He noted Chair Gillett's interest in this.

Mr. Provence said that generally the stations have limited space so limiting the number of operators might have benefits, such as making it easier for the rider, and that these are considerations he'll keep in mind.

Vice Chair Bargar noted there are some stations that straddle multiple local jurisdictions. He asked if Caltrain could build some understanding around issues such as a bike that is left a few feet on a jurisdiction that doesn't allow bike share,

Mr. Provence noted there are a number of different jurisdictions with various approaches to the issue, but on issues like this he'd like to work towards good behavior.

Vice Chair Bargar said that Santa Clara voted to put a moratorium on all bike and scooter share until December. He asked if during the quarterly call with cities on bike share if bike parking and local bike plans are also discussed.

Mr. Provence said the calls are currently set up to focus on bike share, but he can look into it and noted he has individual calls with cities as well.

Ms. Rodia said she likes the corral design or an assigned area for the bikes so people know where to put and find them. She also encouraged alternative surfaces be considered for bike parking areas similar to what Stanford does, and that car parking spaces be considered for bike parking.

Mr. Provence noted that bike share can serve a lot more people than one car parking space. He said they will probably prioritize other spots that might be even closer, but that putting them in parking lots will be a consideration.

Ms. Alba said she was supportive of clearly stating that shared micromobility devices should not be allowed on the train. She noted that bringing them on the train defeats the purpose of having bike and scooter share.

Mr. Guevara supported Ms. Rodia's statement and encouraged staff to think about corral bike parking in existing car parking space.

Mr. Provence said putting scooter or bike share as close to the platform as possible, whether it's in a parking lot or other place, is a big factor.

Ms. Alba said utilizing a number of parking spaces if they're located close to the platforms is something she'd support.

Ms. Rodia asked about a policy requiring levels of service in the space around Caltrain.

Mr. Provence said a lot of cities have maximum bike share numbers but not minimums and it would be good to discuss this with cities for rebalancing and reliability.

Ms. Lyons asked if Caltrain will be entering into formal agreements with the companies.

Mr. Provence said if there's a dock they currently sign a license agreement; but right now there isn't an agreement for dockless; however, he noted an agreement would probably be desirable.

Ms. Lyons said as Caltrain designates space at the station and enters into agreements she would encourage equity be a consideration, such as partnering with companies that have low-income programs.

Mr. Provence noted there are different requirements for the various cities, but it's a good thing to think about especially when companies are competing with each other for potential space.

Chair Olson said that reliability is key to making these programs successful. He noted the amount of transit oriented development occurring in some of the Peninsula cities and that some of these stations are served infrequently so having available bike share could be an important way to ensuring the developments actually use the railroad.

Vice Chair Bargar encouraged that bike parking be as inexpensive as possible since it's free to bring a bike on board the train. He also noted it would be nice to find ways to get the companies to give discounts to Caltrain passengers.

Vice Chair Bargar said Ford GoBike is likely to change their branding since they're now owned by Lyft.

Chair Olson said Clipper Card integraton with the different share companies would make it seamless for the riders.

### **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

- 2019 Work Plan

Mr. Brazil asked if there might be a desire to make a few select comments on the Business Plan.

Chair Olson asked if it might be good to have another Business Plan update so that there's an opportunity to give input.

Ms. Rodia asked if the input would be in the form of a letter.

Mr. Brazil said he's open to the format and this is an opportunity to give feedback.

Mr. Guevara said his biggest concern is how much bike capacity will be onboard per hour.

Chair Olson said he's excited about the growth options, in particular the higher growth option and would be willing to have the Committee give that input if they supported it.

Mr. Brazil said at the next meeting they could discuss what pieces they want to comment on and then at the following meeting they could generate their comments.

Ms. Rodia noted she wasn't sure the timing would work out.

Ms. Low said if timing is a concern a subcommittee could be formed.

Mr. Brazil suggested if there are items they want to comment on they can let staff know within two weeks and then once that list is aggregated and shared with the Committee, members could use the following weeks to further comment for a focused discussion at the next meeting.

Chair Olson discussed the possibility of a subcommittee.

Mr. Brazil said he'd prefer staff to aggregate the comments. He restated the aforementioned process.

Chair Olson concurred.

Mr. Brazil asked staff to send a prompt to the members with a deadline.

Ms. Low agreed.

#### **STAFF REPORT**

- a. 2018 Bike Bump Report (Full Year)
- b. EMUs and Bikes

Chair Olson motioned to create a subcommittee to track the EMU and bike process so they might provide feedback and inform the full Committee.

Vice Chair Bargar second the motion.

Ms. Guevara said she would be willing to be on the subcommittee with Chair Olson and Vice Chair Bargar.

Motion/Second: A. Olson/C. Bargar

Ayes: J. Alba, C. Bargar, J. Brazil, M. Guevara, K Lyons, A. Olson, N. Rodia

Absent: M. Velasco

#### Public Comment

Mr. Yarbrough noted his desire for there to be seats within view of bikes and for a design that will limit dwell time issues due to boarding/deboarding.

Ms. Johnson presented two alternate car design ideas.

Ms. Rodia said her understanding was that the EMUs are not designed to be regularly uncoupled.

Ms. Low confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Bargar asked for clarification on why Ms. Johnson's design does not work.

Ms. Low responded that the items included are too large in the aggregate, for example in some of the seating areas, the amount of leg room required was not included. She also noted that chairs with high backs should not block access to the emergency exit windows. Ms. Low said they appreciate the work that was put into these ideas and staff is looking into options and wants to have a robust interactive workshop with the BAC and CAC on this topic.

Mr. Brazil thanked Bikes Onboard for their years of advocacy. He noted that it's not the advocates job to do the design and that he would like staff to present what they can do instead of what's not possible. He said he's sympathetic to the physical constraints and design issues, but wants to know what's being worked on so they do not miss an opportunity.

Ms. Low said the seventh car, made possible by the TIRCP money, has given staff the ability to look at possible options, and so there will be a robust public process over the spring. She said they're hoping to have a joint BAC/CAC workshop where design options would be discussed with active input from the members.

Chair Olson said it sounds like the process will try to address the security issue.

Ms. Low said the security concerns and the concerns brought by the committee and public are definitely factored into what options are explored.

Mr. Bargar said he appreciates that Ms. Johnson and Mr. Yarbrough brought multiple options forward and he would like to see multiple options that staff believes will work.

Ms. Rodia asked for clarification regarding which cars the new design would include.

Ms. Low said they will be discussing the outreach process with the Board and that might be determined by those discussions.

Ms. Rodia said she thought timing was a big factor as last year it was stated that some of the cars couldn't be changed.

Ms. Low said the process would have to be cognizant of cost implications.

Mr. Guevara said he'd like the Committee to be updated after the workshop and then the Committee could voice support for a specific option or two.

Ms. Low said if the Board supports the process then they would come back to the BAC after the workshop with a staff recommendation as they would want the BAC's feedback.

Mr. Guevara asked if it could be a joint presentation with the coalitions so the Committee could hear their recommendations as well.

Ms. Low said that could occur during public comment, and letters can also be a formalized way of expressing support for a specific option.

Mr. Brazil said that the advocates can push for concepts, but it's not their role to be engineers. He noted that VTA went through a process with mockups and he asked for clarification on the workshop.

Ms. Low said at the Board meeting they would discuss the process for public outreach, which includes a desire for a workshop in the spring time.

Ms. Brazil asked if that would be after their next meeting.

Ms. Low said depending on what the Board says, there could be a special meeting as it might be something the CAC and BAC is all invited to work on together.

Mr. Brazil said it would be ideal if the BAC chair could have input on what the workshop looked like and what things would be addressed.

Chair Olson said the subcommittee of which he's a part of could help take care of that.

- c. SFMTA: Bike & Caltrain Related
- d. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Station Improvements
- e. Bike Webpage Update

Chair Olson encouraged people to send their photos in to Ms. Low for posting to the BAC webpage.

- f. Recruitment
- g. Bikes Board First
- h. City of San Carlos Master Bike and Pedestrian Plan
- i. Holiday Service

#### **WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

Vice Chair Bargar noted that more than 60 people wrote in regarding their desire for seats near bikes on the EMUs. He also noted a person wrote in offering bike repair services at stations.

Mr. Provence said he would look into that.

Chair Olson said San Mateo is planning to site some bike repair stations and one of the locations in the online poll was the downtown San Mateo Station.

Ms. Alba thanked staff for putting the correspondence summary list together.

**COMMITTEE REQUESTS**

None.

**DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING**

March 21, 2019 at the Central Auditorium in San Carlos.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

DRAFT