



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

REVISED AGENDA

7-17-17

AGENDA

July 20, 2017 - 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 18, 2017 Meeting
5. **Bike Parking Management Plan Update – Melissa Jones**
6. Annual Passenger Count – Catherine David
7. CalMod Update – Lori Low
8. Chairperson's Report
 - a. 2017 Work Plan
9. Staff Report (Brent Tietjen)
 - a. Weekend Service Changes
 - b. Proposed Fare Changes
 - c. Bike Bump Report
10. Written Correspondence
11. 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
12. Date and Time of Next Meeting: Thursday, September 21, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
13. Adjournment

All Items on this agenda are subject to action

BAC MEMBERS

County
 San Francisco
 San Mateo

Public Agency
 Dan Provence (Chair)
 Gwen Buckley

Bike Organization
 Cliff Bargar
 Steve Vanderlip

General Public
 Danielle Thoe
 Andrew Olson (Vice Chair)

Santa Clara

John Brazil

Miguel Guevara

Wesley Brinsfield

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
2nd Floor Auditorium
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070**

MINUTES OF May 18, 2017

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: M. Guevara

STAFF PRESENT: L. Low, J. Navarro, J. Navarrete, B. Tietjen

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he has concern about the future capacity of the Electric Multiple Units (EMUs). He said he has come up with a different configuration that provided 891 seats and 120 bikes. Mr. Lebrun said Caltrain decided to go ahead with the Stadler procurement. Mr. Lebrun said Caltrain had received its Full Funding Grant Agreement that requires Caltrain to prove it can increase capacity from the current system. Mr. Lebrun said a whole bunch of the trains have been converted to six car sets. Mr. Lebrun said he calculated the capacity based on a webpage on Caltrain's website.

John Brazil arrived at 5:47 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2017

Chair Provence pointed out a typo in the Chairperson's Report and asked that it be corrected.

Motion/Second: Brazil/Bargar

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

Absent: Brinsfield, Guevara

Wes Brinsfield arrived at 6:01 p.m.

CALMOD UPDATE

Lori Low, Government and Community Relations Specialist presented:

- Bike Car Location
- Storage Concepts Considered
- Recommend Configurations
- Bike Capacity
- Timeline

Mr. Brazil said it was a good start on dialogue. Mr. Brazil said on Slide 3, the stand option is currently on some of Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority's (VTA) buses. Mr. Brazil said it could be problematic if you have a front fender on your bicycle and could break the fender in some cases. Mr. Brazil said it is important to think about everyday uses from cyclists. Mr. Brazil said Caltrain should also think about ingress/egress for bikes and dwell times. Mr. Brazil said he likes the hybrid option (stacking and diagonal) because it could improve dwell time. Mr. Brazil said although total capacity might be a little less, that option might be considered for other reasons. Mr. Brazil said with any type of option where you're putting your front wheel in a well, alternating heights should be considered.

Ms. Low said with the diagonal options, alternate heights were considered in order to get as many bikes in as possible.

Cliff Bargar asked if there were seats inside the bike car and that he had concerns with visibility if there are no seats. Ms. Low said it was more like the current Bombardier sets. Mr. Bargar said the Bombardiers have some seating in the lower level. Mr. Bargar said he imagines many bike riders would have concerns with leaving their bikes, especially with some of the options that are easier to access.

Mr. Brazil asked what Mr. Bargar thought about having a locking option on the bike stand. Mr. Bargar said if you could lock your bike to the stand that might help alleviate some concerns. Mr. Brazil asked if that could affect dwell time. Mr. Bargar said he thinks you could plan ahead to unlock your bike before you arrive at your station.

Chair Provence asked if there are six seats in the lower level. Ms. Low said that is where the flip seats are.

Mr. Bargar asked if there would be flip seats and hooks there simultaneously. Ms. Low said yes.

Mr. Bargar asked if someone with a bike gets on the train and someone is sitting in the seat, do they get bumped if all the other bike storage is full. Ms. Low said the priority is given to the person in the seat.

Mr. Brazil asked if it is a non-ADA seat, can the priority be given to the person with the bicycle. Ms. Low said the priority is given to the person sitting down. Mr. Navarro said they can consider that in the policy.

Gwen Buckley asked if there is a bike hanging, can someone take the bike off and sit in one of the seats. Ms. Low said that is correct but if someone hangs their bike, it may be recommended they stay near their bike.

Ms. Low said ADA passengers will be boarded first in the lavatory car as the ADA mini-highs are lined up with the lavatory car.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if the lower level is the level with ADA access. Ms. Low said ADA passengers would need to utilize the mini-high ramp that is in line with the lavatory car.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if the ratio given includes the hooks. Ms. Low said yes.

Mr. Vanderlip asked what the aisle width would be. Ms. Low said the aisle would be 32 inches based on Federal Railroad Administration requirements.

Danielle Thoe said there are some unique bike sizes, shapes, and designs. Ms. Thoe said stacking is sometimes the only option for some of those unique bikes and having that confidence that you can stack a bike is important.

Mr. Brazil asked what kind of bikes Ms. Thoe was considering. Ms. Thoe said she was considering beach cruisers, mountain bikes, and smaller bikes. Mr. Brazil said that bikes like tandems and recumbent may no longer be accommodated with the stand option, even though they are not officially allowed under current policy.

Ms. Thoe said many people leave their bags on their bikes. Mr. Brazil said he is of the opinion that we should accommodate people best we can but he is okay with asking people to remove their bags so they can fit more bikes.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if there are security cameras where you could watch your bike from a cell phone or other option. Ms. Low said there will be cameras on board and a closed loop option is being considered.

Mr. Brinsfield asked if there is consideration of RFID tags or other options to track the real time capacity of the bike car. Ms. Low said there will be technology on the train that is counting people but there is not an option to track bicycles. Mr. Brinsfield asked if there is an option as in bike share systems that tell you when the rack is full.

Mr. Brazil said it was an intriguing idea and that we would have to ensure that everyone on Caltrain has the RFID.

Mr. Brazil asked what the value of the having a detector on the racks would provide. Mr. Brinsfield said it would allow real-time information for when the racks are full. Mr. Brazil said it would be useful for that purpose but it would not provide the information of when people are getting off the train.

Mr. Vanderlip said that is why he likes the camera option because it would allow you to see how full the car is.

Mr. Brazil said he would like to continue to consider it as an option going forward.

Mr. Vanderlip asked what the goals of the design were. Ms. Low said Caltrain's goal was to meet the required ratio and provide an enhanced service for commuters who take their bikes on board.

Ms. Buckley said when using the bungee with four bikes, she sometimes just wraps the bungee around another bike. Ms. Buckley said you would not be able to wrap the belt option around another bike.

Ms. Buckley asked if there was an intention with the diagonal stands for riders to go in one door and out the other. Ms. Low said that would have to be considered if the hybrid option is selected. Ms. Low said we'll have the samples at a later date where people can try out the options.

Vice Chair Andrew Olson said the belt solution could prove problematic.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if there would be one belt per bike. Ms. Low said it would be one belt for all four bikes.

Mr. Brazil said the bungees could be used with only one hand and the belt would likely require both hands.

Ms. Thoe asked if the belt was attached back to the metal railing or to the bike. Ms. Low said the design is to secure it back to the railing. Ms. Thoe said it seemed problematic, especially if there are four bikes.

Ms. Thoe said if a bungee cord breaks, it could still be utilized. Ms. Thoe said if the belt breaks, it would likely be unusable.

Vice Chair Olson said sometimes the bikes could be unstable and a belt could make that more difficult to manage.

Chair Provence said if he is using the bike car and he is the first one on, he would store his bike and use the seats on the lower level. Chair Provence said he thinks the hooks would not be usable and would not actually count.

Mr. Navarro said the bike community would set the culture and could set the tone for the bike car etiquette.

Ms. Thoe said right now there are people in the cars that can see what is going on. Ms. Thoe said she sometimes likes to get out of the car in order to get out of the way of everyone else.

Chair Provence said he thinks at least two people will want to sit near their bikes in order to ensure it is secure.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if the seats are spring-loaded so they stay up unless someone was sitting in it. Ms. Low said they stay in the last position.

Mr. Bargar asked if Caltrain is committed to having two bike cars per train or could there be more bike cars. Ms. Low said two bike cars were considered the best option operationally and that in the future if there are eight bike cars, the bike to seat ratio will

be maintained. Mr. Bargar said he thinks people will not be pleased that they cannot be seated next to their bikes for security reasons.

Ms. Buckley asked if you can see down to the lower level from the mid-level. Ms. Low said some of the seats could have a view of the lower level.

Chair Provence said with riding the train everyday, he thinks having seats near the bikes is important to a lot of riders. Chair Provence said exploring the option to have three bike cars with seats near bike storage would be important. Chair Provence said that people might stand near their bikes and cause more confusion when people are trying to access their bikes.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if when High-Speed Rail Authority will there be a change to which doors will be used. Ms. Low said right the upper doors will be plugged and seats will be in front of those doors until needed.

Mr. Bargar asked if those mid-level doors would be used only at the stations which serves high-speed rail. Ms. Low said the High-Speed Rail Authority is still in their environmental and planning process and Caltrain is monitoring their plans.

Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said a peer group wrote to the High-Speed Rail Authority Board and legislature on February 2 and stated they would like High-Speed Rail to consider bi-levels to be compatible with Caltrain. Mr. Lebrun said if you look at the tables you can see a bunch of trains with 558 seats which are the EMUs. Mr. Lebrun said if high-speed rail would ever come to pass, we would lose ten seats per car because of the use of the mid-level doors.

TOWNSEND CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Cameron Beck, Assistant Engineer, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) , presented:

- Project Context
- Townsend Today
- Project Goals
 - Protected Bike Facility
 - Improve Muni Reliability and Connection to Caltrain
 - Improve Livability
 - Better Managed Caltrain Loading Activity
- Intercept Surveys
- Project Planning Process

Mr. Brazil asked if staff had considered that with the current location of the station and increasing development in the area, would it make sense to separate the station access points by mode. Mr. Beck said the station has been increasingly busy over the last few years. Mr. Beck said that they are considering how the current access is configured and that everyone wants to arrive at the same spot in front of the station.

Mr. Brazil said the Central Subway could alleviate some of the traffic on Townsend. Mr. Beck said they would still be serving the station by bus and they were unsure how much of the demand would shift to the Central Subway.

Mr. Brinsfield asked if there are any options for flyovers or trenched paths. Mr. Beck said the concept for High-Speed Rail has trenching for Townsend Street. Mr. Beck said another consideration is to decide how much of the project is completed now and how much should be considered at a later date.

Vice Chair Olson asked if they are also looking to network with bike traffic along Market Street to make it efficient and safe to access that network. Mr. Beck said 7th and 8th streets both have protected bikeways for a couple blocks down to Townsend Street. Mr. Beck said the Division Street bike lane has recently been improved.

Mr. Thoe asked if SFMTA was looking at street layout or design that wraps around 4th Street. Ms. Thoe said looking at the interaction on 4th Street would be important to consider. Mr. Beck said the curb space along the frontage on 4th Street is included in the scope for the project. Mr. Beck said if something needs to change after Central Subway is constructed, it would likely be considered as part of this project.

Mr. Brazil asked if there are any paired couplets. Mr. Beck said there are one-way paired couplets on 7th and 8th streets.

Mr. Brinsfield asked how Vision Zero interacts with this project. Mr. Beck said Townsend is a high injury corridor for bike riders, pedestrians, and drivers. Mr. Beck said the project has analyzed all the collisions within the last five years and used that in their consideration for the project.

Mr. Bargar said Uber and Lyft drivers are often in the bike lanes. Mr. Bargar said having a designated space for Transportation Network Companies to pick-up/drop-off would be an improvement. Mr. Beck said they are considering those options and are having conversations with Lyft.

Vice Chair Olson asked how many accidents there were in the last five years. Mr. Beck said he was unsure of the exact number but that it was around 100.

Ms. Thoe asked if there is any Caltrain coordination with SFMTA to reconfigure how the street meets the station. Liz Scanlon, Planning Manager, said Caltrain is doing an operations study that is considering how Caltrain improves the facility and access to the station.

BIKE PARKING MANAGEMENT PLAN

Melissa Jones, Senior Planner, presented:

- Overview
 - Background and Purpose
 - Summary of Phase 1 Findings
 - Update on Spring 2017 Activities

- Draft Goals and Performance Measures
- Draft Management and Administrative Options
- Next Steps
- Context for Project
- Key Questions
- Caltrain passengers and bicycle usage patterns
- Potential demand for bicycle parking at Caltrain stations
- Draft Goals and Performance Measures
- Management and Administrative Options for Caltrain's Bike Parking System
- Next Steps

Ms. Buckley asked if with the third part approach, would there be one vendor or multiple vendors for the system. Ms. Jones said they would not look at it by station but rather by function. Ms. Buckley asked that for the decentralized approach has staff found it easier for Caltrain or the cities to receive funding. Ms. Jones said she is not sure which one would be more likely to receive funding.

Vice Chair Olson said he would encourage Caltrain to consider the user costs when assessing the management approaches. Vice Chair Olson said for the decentralized and the third party approach the analysis may be flawed. Vice Chair Olson said Caltrain needs a realistic assessment of how much staff would be needed to make those options work.

Mr. Vanderlip asked if Caltrain could figure out a way for the third parties to make money, such as advertising. Ms. Jones said it has been considered and staff would hope that some of the operating costs could be covered by something like advertising.

Ms. Vanderlip asked if staff has considered e-bike charging options at the train stations. Ms. Jones said that is a great idea and is an example of the type of technology that Caltrain could be able to adapt to.

Ms. Thoe said she would encourage Caltrain to shift their thinking about the management approaches and to think of it from the customer's perspective. Ms. Thoe said riders will associate parking options with Caltrain and not necessarily a third party. Ms. Thoe said as a user she would hope that process is seamless.

Mr. Bargar said the different cities and jurisdictions have differing levels of resources and interest to manage bike parking. Mr. Bargar said it might make sense to have a hybrid approach where the active cities can be involved, but in other areas Caltrain could take the lead.

Mr. Brinsfield asked if the source of the data on slide 9 could be updated. Mr. Brinsfield asked for the goals and performance measure, what the difference is between perceived secure and actually secure. Ms. Jones said that staff can't guarantee security so that metric is about what options our customers perceive as secure. Mr. Brinsfield said he would strive as a goal to have secure facilities, not just have them perceived as secure.

Mr. Brinsfield said our goal should be getting more people to park bikes at the station. Mr. Brinsfield said for the management approaches, he sees the decentralized approach as infeasible. Mr. Brinsfield said it would be hard to have uniformity between the stations with that option. Mr. Brinsfield said managing all of that with the cities would be difficult as well. Mr. Brinsfield said he would like to make sure that there were limits to the advertising to make sure it looks appropriate.

Mr. Brazil said it is important to consider the other values of providing viable alternatives to driving alone such as the parking demand can be reduced. Mr. Brazil said the question of financing and funding should be asked as well. Mr. Brazil said identifying sources is also important.

Ms. Thoe asked how the Plan and the future recommendations relate to the Fiscal Year 18 Budget. Ms. Jones said staff is working hard to improve bike parking options and a request was put into the Capital Budget. Ms. Jones said unfortunately that item was cut from the budget along with other items due to constrained resources. Ms. Jones said the agency is facing a tough fiscal year. Ms. Jones said it is possible to amend the budget during the year and that staff is hoping funding could be pulled together to pursue the implementation.

Ms. Thoe asked if the capital budget for bike parking stays at zero, is there funding from operations that could continue some of the parking management options. Ms. Jones said the funding for the existing bike parking system is there and the challenge is finding funding to improve or expand upon the current system.

Mr. Brazil asked what the sample size for the 2016 online survey was. Mr. Jones said about 1300 responses.

Mr. Brazil said in the near-term, conversion of keyed lockers to e-lockers is important.

Mr. Brazil asked if there was more data that he could see for Distance of Origin/Destination.

Mr. Brinsfield said the data could be helpful for cities when they go to apply for funding.

Mr. Brazil said Caltrain is in a unique situation where the agency has lots of demand. Mr. Brazil said he hopes getting people out of single occupancy vehicles is part of Caltrain's mission and could be reflected in the Plan.

Mr. Brazil said there are co-benefits that active transportation provides for public health. Mr. Brazil said public health should be called out somewhere in the Plan.

Mr. Brazil said real time availability information could also be a performance measure.

Mr. Brazil said each station has current demands and planned future demands. Mr. Brazil said there should be some targets with how ridership at each station is expected to grow and how each station's bike parking is expected to grow.

Mr. Brazil said it would be helpful to have a report about security from the contractor who runs the trains.

Mr. Brazil said he thinks a hybrid system would work better in bigger cities which have the resources to manage the parking.

Vice Chair Olson said with limited resources it would make sense to focus efforts on the stations where bikes are used most currently.

Mr. Brinsfield said potential demand for bike ridership should also be considered.

Ms. Thoe said a hybrid approach could open up certain funding opportunities and Caltrain could manage the funds going to certain cities for implementation.

Chair Provence asked how cost for the user was factored into performance measures as a goal. Chair Provence said the 'hassle-free' metric is vague.

Chair Provence said in the past he has suggested free e-lockers for a few hours and then charging.

Chair Provence said a photo tour of different bike facilities would be helpful for people to understand the various parking options. Ms. Jones said photos of all the options would be included in the Final Plan.

Chair Provence asked how much subsidy the parking facility in San Francisco receives. Ms. Jones said she was not sure of the exact amount but that it was structured to decrease overtime to incentivize the company to make it as profitable as possible.

PROPOSED FARE CHANGES

Brent Tietjen, Government and Community Relations Officer, presented:

- Context
- Previous Fare Increase
 - Approved by the Board in 2015
 - Base fare increased from \$3.25 to \$3.75
 - Corresponding increases to the Day Pass, 8-ride Ticket and Monthly Pass
 - Maintained 15 percent Clipper discount
 - Maintained 50 percent Eligible Discount (Senior, Disabled, Youth, Medicare)
 - Daily Parking increased from \$5 to \$5.50
 - Monthly Parking increased from \$50 to \$55
- Proposed Fare and Parking increases
 - Go Pass increase from \$190 to \$285 (50%)
 - Zone fare increased from \$2 to \$2.25/zone
 - Monthly Pass based on 15 days/month rather than 13 days/month
 - Eliminate the discounted 8-ride ticket
 - Monthly parking fees based on 15 days/month (\$82.50) rather than 10 days/month (\$55)

- Establish a pilot program that provides a for weekend and evening discount (hours TBD)
- Revenue Potential
- Caltrain Fare Study Update
 - Fare structure
 - Off-peak pass
 - Go Pass
 - Means-based fare
 - Elasticity model
 - Peer review
- Comments
 - Take online survey – available online or pdf www.caltrain.com/proposedfarechanges
 - E-mail: changes@caltrain.com
 - Mail: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, JPB Secretary, P.O. Box 3006, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306
 - Customer Service Center – 1.800.660.4287
- Next Steps
 - Ongoing Public Outreach
 - Station, Public meeting, Electronic
 - Title VI and CEQA Analysis
 - July 6 – Public Hearing
 - August 3 – Board Adoption
 - October 1 – Implementation
 - Go Pass and Flex Fare in January 2018

Mr. Brazil asked what a GoPass was. Mr. Tietjen said it is an annual pass that employers can purchase for their employees. Mr. Tietjen said employers are required to buy it for all eligible employees and is provided at a discount. Mr. Brazil stated there may be more elasticity on that increase if employers are paying for it.

Mr. Brazil said it was interesting to see the revenue potential and that the GoPass increase has the largest potential. Mr. Brazil said he was in favor of the parking price increase.

Mr. Brazil asked why there was a discount for the weekend and evenings. Mr. Tietjen said there was a proposed discount on the weekends because Caltrain is changing the weekend schedule to accommodate for construction activities.

Mr. Brinsfield asked how there was a revenue increase by eliminating the 8-ride ticket. Mr. Tietjen said by eliminating a discounted ticket, riders would have to utilize another ticket option.

Mr. Navarro said the 8-ride ticket is also being considered for elimination because it can be utilized to evade fares.

Mr. Brinsfield asked if the GoPass was an annual pass for the proposed \$285. Mr. Tietjen said that was correct. Mr. Brinsfield said it was a pretty good deal for employees.

Mr. Brazil asked if the GoPass was good for any zone. Mr. Tietjen said yes.

Mr. Brazil asked about the monthly parking fee increase. Mr. Tietjen said monthly parking would be increased from a 10 day base to a 15 day base.

Ms. Thoe suggest that the 8-ride ticket still be available and said she would like to hear more about the fare evasion issues. Ms. Thoe said it was simple fare option for riders.

Mr. Navarro said with the 8-ride ticket, if a conductor does not come through to check the ticket, you can continue to use for 30 days.

Vice Chair Olson asked if the GoPass could be purchased by a member organization such as the bicycle coalitions. Mr. Tietjen said that is not allowed currently and would require a change in the codified tariff.

Ms. Buckley asked if the employee pays the employer for the GoPass. Mr. Tietjen said generally it is a benefit for the employees. Vice Chair Olson said at Stanford they expanded it to post doc and graduate students and those were required to pay a share of the pass. Mr. Bargar said for those students, the full cost was charged.

Ms. Thoe said she as some concerns with increasing the fares in October. Ms. Thoe said to an average rider there have been many changes including recent fare increases and schedule changes. Ms. Thoe asked if there was any way to push the fare changes to the first of the year.

Mr. Jones said it was not possible to push the results of the larger fare study up to match the need for the proposed fare changes.

Ms. Thoe asked if there are expected fare changes shortly after the fare study in complete. Mr. Tietjen said the fare study is more comprehensive than the current proposed fare changes.

Mr. Brinsfield said VTA is going through fare changes and having these changes coupled with Caltrain's proposed changes could hurt people in Santa Clara County.

Chair Provence asked if there is a double hit because of the zone increase and the day multiplier. Mr. Tietjen said there is a multiplier effect.

Chair Provence asked if there was a daily parking increase. Mr. Tietjen said that was correct.

Mr. Brinsfield asked if it could be more equitable to also increase daily parking.

Chair Provence asked if there was an analysis of elasticity for ridership as part of this increase. Mr. Tietjen said he was unsure and would get back.

Chair Provence asked if there was a ballot measure being considered.

Mr. Brazil asked if a daily parking increase could be considered. Mr. Navarro said staff could look into it.

STAFF REPORT

Mr. Tietjen reported:

- Bike Bump Report
 - 116 bikes reported bumped for 2017

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

The written correspondence packet was distributed.

Mr. Vanderlip said it was interesting about the email comment regarding the 8:1 seats to bike ratio.

Chair Provence asked about the San Francisco bike lockers possibly getting removed. Mr. Navarro said there were security concerns and there are discussions with staff about bike parking options at that station. Mr. Tietjen said we would not make any changes without first briefing the committee with the proposed plan.

Mr. Bargar said he had a comment about 22nd Street Station. Mr. Bargar said bike rails on the stairs at 22nd Street would be a good option. Mr. Bargar said with the bridge replacement project, the sidewalk has changed back and forth and can make bicycle access difficult. Mr. Tietjen said that the street is expected to be open on May 21.

COMMITTEE REQUESTS

None

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:

July 20, 2017 at 5:45 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.