



Bicycle Advisory Committee
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor

AGENDA

July 18, 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 May 16, 2019 Meeting
5. Introduction of New Members
6. Onboard Bike Decals
7. Project 529
8. Bike Improvements at Stations Update
9. Subcommittee on EMU Configuration
10. Chairperson's Report
 - a. 2019 Work Plan
11. Staff Report
 - a. Bike Bump Report YTD 2019
 - b. Bikes Board First
 - c. Santa Clara E-Lockers Update
 - d. Bike Share Policy Update
 - e. Comment Card Update
12. Written Correspondence
13. 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.
14. Date and Time of Next Meeting: September 19, 2019
15. Adjournment

All Items on this agenda are subject to action

BAC MEMBERS

| <u>County</u> | <u>Public Agency</u> | <u>Bike Organization</u> | <u>General Public</u> |
|---------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| San Francisco | Monica Munowitch | Cliff Bargar (Vice Chair) | Vacant |
| San Mateo | Julia Malmo-Laylock | Jessica Alba | Andrew Olson (Chair) |
| Santa Clara | John Brazil | Miguel Guevara | 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. 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; 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 MAY 16, 2019

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

STAFF PRESENT: C. Fromson, D. Provence, B. Tietjen

Chair Olson called the meeting to order at 5:46 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Olson said there would be a change in process at BAC meetings moving forward for agenda items the BAC will take public comment prior to Committee discussion so members can be more responsive to the public.

Public Comment

Scott Mace noted that secure bike parking, such as e-lockers, have been affordable in the past but that Bike Hub is requiring a seven-day pass for \$8/week. Mr. Mace asked if Caltrain had a policy on pricing along the corridor as new secure bike parking is installed.

Shirley Johnson thanked the Committee for their time and effort and encouraged them to continue to ask the hard questions.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2019

Motion/Second: J. Alba/A. Olson

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

Absent: M. Velasco

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 17, 2019

Public Comment

Shirley Johnson complimented the detailed minutes and asked that on page 4 her comment be changed to the "cost per seat is *misleading*."

J. Alba made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Motion/Second: J. Alba / C. Bargar

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

Absent: M. Velasco

CALTRAIN BUSINESS PLAN

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, presented:

- Starting to Build a Business Case

- Terminal Analysis
- Ridership Forecasts
- Grade Crossings & Grade Separations
- Next Steps

Public Comment

Shirley Johnson said the model being used by the Business Plan does not include bicycles and urged that the model be updated or a different model be used.

Mr. Brazil asked if the level-grade crossing estimates on slides 44 and 45 are based on service levels.

Ms. Fromson said she would get back to him.

Chair Olson asked if there was a threshold for downtimes.

Ms. Fromson said it was more about intensity and that they weren't picking a standard at this time.

Vice Chair Bargar said there needs to be an emphasis in the Business Plan on last mile connections, which would include bikes. He also noted there must be assumptions in the model about changing land use on the Peninsula and in the South Bay, and how that affects mode share, and what providers and transit agencies will need to do to reach these ridership levels.

Ms. Fromson said similar questions have come up in city discussions and that the Business Plan will include first and last mile information. She noted there's still six more months of planning for the project and before there's final action from the Board at the end of the year, all the information would be vetted publicly.

Vice Chair Bargar noted that the Business Plan doesn't say who will pay for future grade separations. He stated that fundamentally grade separations are car infrastructure, not necessarily transit infrastructure stating that while they may improve Caltrain's reliability it doesn't directly benefit passengers that drivers no longer have to wait for the trains to pass.

Ms. Fromson said in regards to the funding comment, she wanted to acknowledge there are several conversations happening at this time such as the regional measure. She also noted that grade separations are going to require multi-pronged funding approaches.

Vice Chair Bargar said the freeway analogy is a good way of framing this, and asked if there were projections of what it would cost to widen 101 or 280.

Ms. Fromson said in July the numbers for the infrastructure and the entire plan will be public.

Vice Chair Bargar said a direct comparison of what it would cost to widen Highway 101 versus spending those funds on Caltrain would be useful information.

Chair Olson noted the importance of factoring in the environmental impact.

Mr. Brazil asked at what point will performance measures and goals be set on things like safety, dwell times, etc.

Ms. Fromson said specific to grade separations, Caltrain put in its budget money to look at how to have a corridor-wide approach. She noted that more effort is going to need to happen beyond the Business Plan.

Ms. Fromson said in July a financial component will be associated with each item in the Business Plan.

Ms. Rodia asked what speed Caltrain and HSR are planning to reach, since grade separations are required if a train exceeds 125 miles.

Ms. Fromson said 110 mph.

Ms. Rodia asked if HSR doesn't happen how does that affect these plans and will Caltrain still need sections of quad tracks.

Ms. Fromson said the entire project can't be built all at once and so they're looking at how it can be sequentially built and what makes the most sense.

Mr. Guevara suggested that when making a comparison between 101 and the train that start and destination points should be included to show how travel time on 101 may increase while travel time on Caltrain remains fixed. He noted this may help provide context when talking about over-capacity on the trains, as many individuals would prefer to get from point A to B in a fixed time than wait two hours on 101.

Ms. Fromson noted it was a good comparison.

Ms. Alba said it would be interesting to show what travel time would look like on 101 if we didn't have these investments.

Ms. Alba said in looking at the grade crossing and separation slides, the cost ranges between \$8.5 billion to \$11.1 billion. She also would like to see what the mode split would be at some or all stations, and if that means massive parking structures that would cost Caltrain and cities a certain amount to build versus investing in better bike access, bike storage, and active mobility options. She suggested looking at the cost implications of those decisions.

Chair Olson said there should be analysis about bikes on board for the long-term growth plan.

Mr. Brazil asked if they could learn more about the model being used.

Ms. Fromson said first/last mile and access mode investment information will be a part of the Business Plan, and that Mr. Petty could explain more about the model when he returns to the BAC.

Ms. Guevara said she supported Mr. Brazil's question and looks forward to learning more about how bikes are included in the model.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMU BIKE CONFIGURATION

Vice Chair Bargar reported the Subcommittee met on May 6; he was the only member in attendance and he offered feedback on the workshop; asked clarifying questions regarding the presentation at today's meeting; and discussed next steps, including meeting with the bike coalitions and station outreach.

EMU RECONFIGURATION AND BIKE IMPROVEMENTS AT STATIONS

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, and Dan Provence, Principal Planner, Station Access, presented:

- Overview
- Bike Parking & Micromobility at Stations
- Joint CAC/BAC Workshop
- Rider Survey
- Funding
- Staff Analysis & Draft Recommendation

Public Comment

Scott Mace noted different bike parking costs along the corridor with free valet at 4th and King, four cents an hour at Tamien, and \$8 for seven days at Palo Alto. Mr. Mace said that Bike Hub, which runs the Palo Alto parking, is priced similarly elsewhere in the state. He urged that some goals and policies be developed to have consistency, especially for those using bike parking two days or less a week.

Shirley Johnson defined a push poll and said the survey was designed to pit passengers against each other. She noted that in two places 25% and over 50% of people said bike spaces are important. Ms. Johnson said there needs to be a clear path to the emergency exit windows in the two bike cars and that the constraints put on the workshop were limiting. Ms. Johnson said the ratio in the staff recommended option is a step backward and there are less seats in view of bikes. She also commented that in the off-peak there will be hundreds of seats available while cyclists stand in the bike car to guard their bikes.

Mr. Guevara said that it feels like a zero-sum game. He suggested more context be included in slide 6 explaining the difference in what occurs when seats are at capacity versus bike spaces. He said the survey is not statistically significant because it was opt-in.

Ms. Fromson said a firm was hired to perform the survey and it is statistically accurate.

Mr. Guevara said he agrees it's accurate, but doesn't think it's significant since it reflects the sentiment of people who opted in versus the sentiment of the whole population.

Mr. Guevara referred to slide 37 and said he doesn't think the survey was a valid instrument, and that the bullet about conflict among passengers is speculation, and while it may be valid there should also be an inclusion of positive speculation regarding bikes on board.

Mr. Provence said he could speak to the item about minimizing conflict among passengers. He noted that when he was on the BAC, there was extensive conversation about the flexible spaces and discussion occurred regarding what would happen if someone was sitting and another person wanted to use the same space. He said at that time the BAC agreed they should minimize conflict in the design.

Mr. Guevara left at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Alba asked if there could be more detail regarding the \$10 million cost estimate of spreading the bikes over three cars versus the \$1 million for the two car reconfiguration, especially since there's a preference for more seated capacity.

Ms. Alba asked when they would know more about the 10 station capital plan and how much would it cost out of the \$3.5 million.

Mr. Provence said he's hoping to present the 10 station plan at the next BAC meeting and will be working to price those improvements out. He noted there are opportunities to partner, such as at San Carlos where there's money from the developer for bike parking facilities. He said they're looking for opportunities to make the \$3.5M go further, such as using it as matching funds, since it won't be enough to meet the total demand over time.

Ms. Alba said a firm plan to show that over the next two or three years there will be a lot of improvements in the active mobility space would help make bicyclists feel more comfortable.

Mr. Provence said they're looking at the growth projections and thinking about how that will factor into some of the bike capital plan discussions that are occurring.

Ms. Alba said MTC has started a seamless mobility group and they're looking at BikeLink lockers, especially pilot programs where Clipper could be used instead of BikeLink cards. She noted that BikeLink, MTC, and BART are possibly interested in making that the standard—that a BikeLink or Clipper card could be used to pay for an e-locker space. She said Kara Oberg would be the contact for more information.

Mr. Provence said that was good to hear.

Ms. Alba said BikeLink is also looking at expanded bike parking that is inclusive of longer and heavier e-bikes. She suggested Caltrain also consider making these more integrated into the seamless solution.

Ms. Guevara asked what the most popular bike share location in the south bay is, since Diridon Station is third.

Mr. Brazil said it fluctuates between MLK and Santa Clara, partly due to whether school is in session.

Ms. Guevara referred to slide 16 and said at the Joint Workshop she believes every group was concerned about the limitation of two or three cars. She said adding six seats is insignificant for capacity and that the 17% increase is not proportional to today's capacity.

Ms. Guevara asked for information on the duration of standing on the train. She noted one or two doors for boarding makes a difference and said from her experience the trains are less crowded further away from the doors. She said the focus should be on the three-car option and noted concerns that the survey was biased.

Ms. Alba said she would like to know how the three-car option would impact the project timeline; and if funding could be secured what other constraints such as staffing and conductors would impact that decision.

Ms. Rodia asked if there are high-level goals for bike parking and if there are also goals for consistency across all stations.

Mr. Provence said they're looking at using the same brand of e-lockers across stations and that fob access to a bike room should work at the different stations. He noted the importance of proximity of bike parking to the platform, visibility, and signage, as well as promotion and education.

Ms. Rodia asked if there are metrics for number of bike parking spaces in proportion to train capacity.

Mr. Provence said they're working on those numbers now and there were some old standards that they're working to update.

Ms. Rodia wanted clarification regarding how a design could prioritize bikes over people when the number of bike spaces and square feet is the same between the two designs.

Ms. Fromson said the physical reality is that when bikes are in a car a person cannot sit or stand there.

Ms. Rodia said she agrees with that, but asked isn't the trade-off between more seats versus standing space.

Ms. Fromson said they'll put thought into how that's worded.

Ms. Rodia asked for a budget breakdown or a description of what would be involved in either of the options.

Ms. Fromson said they could provide that information.

Ms. Rodia asked how was the placement of the seats determined.

Mr. Provence said once the new discussion occurred there were some clarification questions asked about emergency window access and so the design shows that consideration. He noted that most likely dividers, similar to the Bombardier cars, would need to be included.

Ms. Fromson said there was also a difference in opinion regarding whether the seats should be at the ends or in the middle, and so this design tries to address those desires.

Mr. Provence noted that at the workshop they heard a desire for tranverse seats to be located closer to the doors, but when they tried this scenario it was difficult walking bikes between seats, so that consideration was also taken into account. The flip seats provide a little more room for circulation inside the car.

Ms. Rodia asked if there needed to be seats in front of the exit windows instead of bike racks.

Mr. Provence said tranverse seats may not meet a requirement but flip seats or a table do.

Ms. Fromson clarified that there aren't requirements set in stone as they're having evolving conversations and there's an effort to think about what would be acceptable to the FRA in the future.

Ms. Rodia asked if bike rack spaces can be in front of the emergency exit windows.

Ms. Fromson said the requirements today do not say bikes cannot be in front of the emergency windows, but conversations with the FRA are evolving and Caltrain wants to be consistent with what they're currently thinking and they appreciate the discussion is occurring now.

Mr. Brazil asked what was the rule of thumb used in the Business Plan regarding standing passengers.

Ms. Fromson said 135%.

Mr. Brazil said if one assumes that some cyclists will stand next to their bikes, there would need to be space for 29 people to stand. He asked if the model considers if that's feasible.

Ms. Fromson said they'll look into if that's equivalent to what they're thinking about for long-term growth.

Mr. Brazil noted two core issues, capacity and seats in view of bikes for security. He wanted thought put into if there's enough room for people to stand to watch their bikes.

Chair Olson said he would also like to have more details on the cost estimates and that he would like to have known what the cost would have been to spread 12 bikes per car across the trainset as he was disappointed that possibility could not have been examined at the workshop.

Vice Chair Bargar said he's glad to see a hard commitment to enacting the bike parking plan before the start of electrified service. He noted the amount of work that would entail and stated the BAC's support of it.

Vice Chair Bargar asked if the survey asked to what extent people are deterred from riding because of not wanting to stand.

Ms. Fromson said that was not in the survey but currently there is speculation that the trains are so crowded some people aren't getting on.

Vice Chair Bargar said he's seen posts about that but has not seen an attempt to quantify that. He also noted that bike bumps have led people to pursue other forms of transportation, although they don't know the actual numbers for this, and that if standing pushes people to not ride Caltrain, then those who stand to stay in view of bikes may also not ride Caltrain. Vice Chair Bargar said there are real trade-offs, but they haven't seen an analysis that more people are being lost due to crowding than due to bike bumps.

Chair Olson said the crowding also impinges smooth loading and egress of bikes and passengers.

Vice Chair Bargar said he agrees. He stated that the survey felt biased and yet there was still support for bikes onboard. He also would like more information on the \$10 million estimate. He noted his disappointment regarding the level of detail given, especially in comparison to the Business Plan. He said the presentation doesn't match the level of public investment or interest in this effort.

Ms. Fromson said she appreciates their comments and they will work to improve it.

Vice Chair Bargar complimented the Business Plan and was disappointed to see this more as an afterthought.

Ms. Alba recommended deleting the comment about prioritizing people versus bikes.

Ms. Fromson said she was planning to make updates based on their comments.

Ms. Alba said including slides with more information on cost, crowding, and timeline impact would be helpful.

Ms. Rodia asked if the other considerations the two-car design addresses are on slide 37 and if the bike security concern could be explicitly spelled out.

Ms. Fromson said that was an oversight and that should be included, but it is also part of public input.

Ms. Rodia noted that if the three-car configuration addresses dwell time it should be included.

Ms. Lyons said she's excited to see more on the bike parking capital plan and noted the importance of having bike parking consistency both in what's available and how it's paid for to make it easy to use. She asked if bike rooms are part of a TOD, would it be in the development and open to the public.

Mr. Provence said Caltrain has different rights at different stations, but if a developer is building on JPB property than they can work to get an actual room.

Chair Olson asked when the presentation would go to the Board.

Ms. Fromson responded it would be presented at the June Board meeting. She said the CAC unanimously supported the staff recommendation and it's another consideration that will get factored in. She noted she's taking feedback from both the CAC and BAC, as well as from the general public.

Vice Chair Bargar said he's glad a few more seats have been added to the two-car design which is an improvement, but it's far enough away from what currently exists that they don't know how that would impact bike security.

Chair Olson said in 2016 they were presented with bike storage options in the train, and after stating their security concerns they had the workshop with a lot of constraints. He noted there were other options such as the 12 bikes per car put forth that weren't costed. He said he's not clear on why there were constraints and thinks most members would be in favor of a more spread-out option and widening the scope and distributing the bikes across more cars.

Mr. Brazil said he remembers some discussion of other options over the last several years, but he didn't recall if they talked about them in enough detail to know why for example 12 bikes per car wasn't feasible.

Ms. Fromson said at the beginning of the process with the Board several months ago, the constraints were laid on the table. She noted that the process has been consistent with that and the rationale was described then. She said they had these specific constraints but it's up to the Committee to determine whether they support this.

Vice Chair Bargar noted the former subcommittee's work, but said there weren't cost estimates associated with redesigning all the cars.

Ms. Fromson said there is a timeline and the train manufacturing is moving forward. She noted if this decision is delayed it would impact the schedule of the trains. She noted she's been to the Salt Lake City manufacturing facility and this will start to impact real costs and production above just the cost of design.

Vice Chair Bargar moved that the BAC express to the JPB that they disagree with the staff recommendation and ask that the Board support a three-bike car option.

Motion/Second: C. Bargar/N. Rodia

Ayes: J. Alba, C. Bargar, J. Brazil, G. Guevara, A. Olson, N. Rodia

Abstain: K Lyons

Absent: M. Guevara, M. Velasco

Chair Olson requested that the Subcommittee meet again prior to the Board meeting.

Mr. Tietjen said he would make that request known to Ms. Low.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

- 2019 Work Plan

Ms. Alba asked for clarification if the bike improvements at stations update in July would include the capital plan.

Mr. Provence said yes.

Ms. Alba requested an update in July if there is progress on a coordinated active mobility sharing program coordinated by Caltrain.

Ms. Alba noted that if the Board is taking action on the Business Plan in July, the BAC meeting will be after that. She requested that there be an update at the July meeting.

Mr. Tietjen said the Business Plan is on the Board agenda for July but he doesn't think they are taking a vote.

Ms. Alba said she would like to add the Business Plan to the September and November BAC meetings since they will be going into actual Business Plan development over the fall.

STAFF REPORT

- a. Bike Bump Report YTD
- b. Bike Share Policy Update
- c. Santa Clara E-Lockers Update
- d. Bike to Work Day
- e. Station Outreach Events

Vice Chair Bargar said it would be good to increase awareness about the new bike lockers and educate riders about how to get a BikeLink card.

Mr. Provence said he's open to hearing ideas on how to get the word out.

Vice Chair Bargar suggested a sandwich board at the bike boarding area on the platform.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Public Comment

Ms. Johnson said it's not true that the trains are more crowded today than in 2015. She noted the graphs in the correspondence packet and said that while there are more passengers today there is also more capacity because of the Metrolink cars. She said things are presented in a biased way and urged the Committee to continue to ask questions.

Ms. Lyons left at 7:56 p.m.

COMMITTEE REQUESTS

Ms. Rodia said she was on the train and a rider told the conductor about a bike theft at Mt. View Station and since the conductor did not tell the rider to call the Transit Police, she took the initiative to do so. She also noted that in the correspondence packet someone wrote about accessories being stolen off their bike and the conductor's response was that Caltrain was not liable. Ms. Rodia said she thought a training for conductors when passengers report theft—bike related or not—would be helpful.

Mr. Tietjen said it was a good suggestion and he would also let rail operations know about the specific conductor comment regarding the theft at Mt. View Station.

Chair Olson said at the security presentation the Transit Police stressed they streamlined the reports, and so the conductors should be passing that information along in a helpful manner.

Mr. Brazil said making Bikes Board First was a good step, but from his personal observation, passengers don't pay attention and aren't aware if they don't have a bike. He suggested that the non-bike cars have a sign on it that says "bikes board first."

Mr. Tietjen said they would look into it.

Chair Olson said he's witnessed that when the conductors announce it, the program works, but when they don't passengers revert to old behavior.

Ms. Guevara said that when the recommendation goes to the JPB, the number of seats in view of bikes lost should be emphasized as well as cost details. She also said she has not found the dwell time difference for when there's only one door versus two doors.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING

July 18, at the Central Auditorium in San Carlos.

Meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

DRAFT

Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee 2019 Work Plan

Purpose

The purpose of the Committee is to facilitate dialogue between Caltrain and its current and future customers who use bicycles as their primary mode of access to the Caltrain rail line. This Committee will provide a formal venue for the interests and perspectives of bicyclists to be fully integrated into Caltrain decision-making processes, particularly with respect to:

- New ideas related to the needs of bicyclists on Caltrain
- Proposed investments and pilot programs
- Operating procedures
- Caltrain communications

The Committee shall be advisory in nature, and actions taken shall be brought to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board by Caltrain staff, when appropriate. Although the Committee was not created by a legislative body, it has been created as a venue that is open to the public and shall follow the Ralph M. Brown Act to ensure transparency and consistency with the Joint Powers Board and other Caltrain committees.

Function

The function of the Committee is to promote and advance overall communication between Caltrain and members of the bicycling community, and to explore the realm of needs bicycle riders have with respect to utilizing current and future Caltrain services, while taking into account the needs of all Caltrain customers.

- Helps to educate the community-at-large, as well as other bicyclists, and serve as a communication conduit to ensure broad feedback on Caltrain initiatives related to bicycles.
- Provides a connection to regional and local bicycle related planning processes between bicycle community stakeholders, the public and public agencies.

List of Agenda Topics/Presentations for 2018:

Meetings

- Jan. 17
 - Election of Officers
 - Caltrain Business Plan
 - Bike Access Survey Update
 - Bike Share Policy Framework
 - EMUs and Bikes

**Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee
2019 Work Plan**

- March 21
 - Bike Security 2018 Annual Update
 - Bike Bump Presentation for 2018
 - Bike Share Policy Update
 - Subcommittee on EMU Bike Configuration
 - Safer Streets in San Francisco South of Market Street Letter
 - Sunnyvale Lawrence Station Area Plan Letter
 - San Mateo Micromobility Letter

- May 16
 - Caltrain Business Plan
 - Subcommittee on EMU Bike Configuration
 - EMU Configuration & Bike Improvements at Stations

- July 18
 - Welcome New Members
 - Onboard Bike Decals
 - Bike Improvements at Stations Update
 - Subcommittee on EMU Configuration

- Sept. 19
 - Caltrain Business Plan
 - Hillsdale Station Closure and Bikes
 - Bike Improvements at Stations Update

- Nov. 21
 - Diridon Station Area Planning as Related to Bikes
 - Bike Improvements at Stations Update
 - Corridor City/County Bike Plans
 - CalMod Update

Staff Suggestions:

- Grade Separation Toolkit Update as Related to Bikes
- Rail Corridor Use Plan as Related to Bikes Update
- Bike Theft Prevention App

Committee Suggestions:

- Measure B Update (written or presented)
- Bike Share Outreach

**Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee
2019 Work Plan**

- Wayside Bike Parking Outreach
- Bike Access Along Corridor
- Bikes on Board Improvements
- EMU Queuing